

## Appendix L      Parish Council Meetings

## **Somerford Parish Council meeting**

**Date: 27<sup>th</sup> January 2014**

This document presents a summary of the above meeting.

Members of CEC and Jacobs UK Ltd presented and took questions on the Congleton Link Road scheme to an audience of approximately 120 people for 2 hours.

Attendees were in full opposition to the proposed link road. Somerford Parish Council was also against the proposed new housing forming part of the local plan.

Several queries were raised regarding why the link road did not connect to the A34 and the subsequent potential for rat running using Wallhill Lane.

There were concerns about differing information from Councillors regarding whether the scheme would be delivered as a whole or in sections and whether the connections into the business parks would form part of the scheme.

There was a query regarding the width of the link road.

A general request for more information to be made available so that people could make a more informed choice.

Several actions were recorded from individual attendees; these actions have been added to the actions register.

## **Eaton Parish Council meeting**

**Date: 14<sup>th</sup> January 2014**

This document presents a summary of the above meeting.

Members of CEC and Jacobs UK Ltd presented and took questions on the Congleton Link Road scheme to an audience of approximately 80 people for an hour.

Concerns rose that the leaflet and questionnaire had not arrived to residents of Eaton. It was confirmed that the information would arrive shortly and was available on the website.

A comment was made regarding the appraisal of individual improvements strategies (EAST assessment) and the conclusion that a new link road was the preferred solution. It was asked if a combination of minor improvement strategies was considered rather than being assessed individually and whether this would change the conclusion.

Mixed response from Eaton on whether they wanted an option to the north, south or no link road at all.

Concerns that a link to the north would increase noise impact and potential for urban sprawl into Eaton from Congleton.

Concerns that a link to the south would increase traffic flows through Eaton resulting in severance to the village.

Attendees were very interested in the traffic flows through Eaton with and without the proposal. Copies of the Opening Year and Design Year flows left with Eaton Parish Council. Request for information of how the forecast flows compare with current flows.

A number of attendees asked why a highway option even further north than the Blue/Green Option had not been taken forward especially considering the potential impact on Eaton and the bad bend in the existing A536 Macclesfield Road just north of the tie in point. It was explained that there would be increased impact on the Mineral Safe Guarding Area at Eaton Hall Quarry which would lead to an increased scheme cost.

It was claimed that the link road did not serve its purpose if it did not connect to the A34 south of Congleton.

Several actions were recorded from individual attendees; these actions have been added to the actions register.

**EATON PARISH COUNCIL**  
**(In the authority of East Cheshire)**

**Clerk: Mrs. D. Waite, 8 Beechwood Drive, Eaton,  
Congleton, Cheshire CW12 2NQ – Tel. 01260 276385  
e.mail [eatonmaccclerk@aol.com](mailto:eatonmaccclerk@aol.com)**

**RECEIVED**

24<sup>th</sup> February, 2014

**25 FEB 2014**

**Cllr. Michael E. Jones  
Cheshire East Council  
Westfields  
Middlewich Road  
Sandbach  
Cheshire  
CW11 1HZ**

**Dear Cllr. Jones**

**CONGLETON LINK ROAD – EATON VILLAGE CONSULTATION OUTCOME**

**Due to the detrimental impact of the Congleton Link Road on Eaton Village, the Parish Council undertook a consultation of opinion with Eaton Village residents. This was undertaken to enable us to respond collectively and reflect the views of the majority of residents.**

**The outcome of this exercise presents as follows:**

**53% do not support any of the four options proposed**

**21% do not support the road beyond the A34 on the Northern end**

**The remainder of the votes were split between the Northern and Southern options – this we assume to be dependent on the location of their residence.**

**The Parish Council's response on behalf of the residents is reflected in the following points:**

- 1. All proposed routes are detrimental to the village**
- 2. Southern Route would see a large increase in traffic through the village, giving rise to pollution, noise and vibration for residents and cuts the village in half.**
- 3. Northern Route would decimate the countryside and deprive residents and others of walking, cycling and riding etc. Farming communities would be cut off from the village and further this route would have a negative impact on the supply of silica sand, which is of national importance to British industry.**

4. There are no provisions in the plans to restrict future development along the routes or towards the village from Congleton or to mitigate the impact of the road on village life.
5. Taking into account the Cheshire East projected traffic volumes, there is small benefit to the residents of Congleton (20% decrease in traffic on West Road) and no benefit to the East and South of the town.

Taking into account the above and the views of our village residents, Eaton Parish Council are unable to support the Congleton Link Road.

We would welcome a formal response to the views of Eaton Village and look forward to hearing from you in the near future and we would further welcome an opportunity to sit down and discuss this with you.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Waltho', followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Stephen Waltho  
Chairman – Eaton Parish Council

N.B. This letter has also been sent direct to Cllr. David Brown and David Rutley MP together with a copy to our Ward Councillor Lesley Smetham.

## **Newbold Astbury Parish Council meeting**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> February 2014**

This document presents a summary of the above meeting.

Members of CEC and Jacobs UK Ltd presented and took questions on the Congleton Link Road scheme to an audience of approximately 40 people for one and a half hours.

The main concerns of the attendees was the level of traffic (current and induced should a scheme materialise) on Wallhill Lane, Padgbury Lane and the A34. Some attendees felt that these roads were an issue and had therefore been left out of the traffic flows presented in the public consultation to date.

The Parish Council stated that even though the physical footprint of the scheme did not impact significantly on the Parish, the knock on effects could be severe through 'rat running', etc.

The Chair of the Parish Council pointed out that Astbury was classed as a conservation area.

Many attendees stated that should the scheme go ahead, that a connection to the A34 was required to avoid large scale 'rat running' in the area. A response was provided to the audience regarding a poorer business case for this section and the relatively lower traffic levels on this extension. Furthermore, it was explained that the traffic model suggested that the majority of the A34 through traffic would still stop on the existing road due to it being less congested with the link road and being a shorter distance. There was some criticism as to why the assessment had not been made public if this was the case.

Prior to the meeting, a leaflet had been circulated which suggested that Wallhill would act as another section of the link road and increase traffic significantly on this road. A member of the Parish Council stated that if a new A34 connection was provided then the local area would become more attractive for development to the south of Congleton, and that this should also be considered.

CEC confirmed that an extension to the A34 was not being promoted by the Council at this stage and that the council would look at what measures could be implemented to discourage any potential increase in traffic on the local roads.

## **NEWBOLD ASTBURY CUM MORETON PARISH COUNCIL**

**Clerk C Pounton    The Hollies   Astbury   Congleton   Cheshire   CW12 4RN    01260.274891**

24 March 2014

BY EMAIL

Jacobs UK Ltd  
Leeds  
Attention Peter Shaw, Senior Highways Engineer

Re Congleton Link Road

In response to your email of 3 March, the formal response of Newbold Astbury cum Moreton Parish Council follows.

The unanimous decision of the Council was to totally oppose the build of any of the three proposed Link Road routes and also to totally oppose an extension of the Link Road from the A534 to the A34.

The decision followed a lengthy discussion and took into account information provided at the meeting held on 15 February, together with other information provided by Cheshire East and by Jacobs UK Ltd. To date there have been no opinions expressed to the contrary by any parishioner to the Parish Council either verbally or in writing. Several parishioners, as at the 15 February meeting, have expressed opposition to the scheme in respect of specific areas of the parishes.

The reason for the Link Road decision is that, whichever route was chosen, it would bring no discernable benefits to the parishes; would undoubtedly cause significant damage to agriculture and to the open countryside around Congleton throughout its length and increase traffic volumes on rural lanes.

In addition to the above factors, the Link Road extension decision was due to the scheme causing excessive intrusion into the area with no advantages of any kind to the inhabitants.

The report in the Congleton Chronicle following the meeting held on February 12th at Astbury Village Hall was not in any way a reflection of the feelings of the Parish Council and parishioners. Views expressed at that meeting were incorrectly reported by the local press as representing the views of "Astbury".

Congleton Link Road as currently proposed, ending at A534 roundabout.

Whichever route may be preferred, the only roadworks which would affect the parishes is the proposed roundabout on the A534 Sandbach Road. This comment assumes that the final "tail" of the total route, from the A534 to the A34 has yet to be decided; at present it does not form a part of the proposed route and that a decision has yet to be taken as to its ever being implemented. To even comment on such an abstract plan is difficult.

Why has the Link Road been proposed ?

The Link Road is proposed for two purposes, Firstly to provide an improved access to both the Radnor Park Trading Estate and to the Congleton Business Park . This is illustrated by the dotted lines of "assumed links" on the Cheshire East leaflet, "We Want Your Views". These "assumed links" derive from the flawed Congleton Town Strategy document.

Jacobs UK Ltd . . . . . 2.

The second purpose of the Link Road, as in many other similar “ring road” developments, is to provide a new extended area for the growth of Congleton Town. The future development boundary will become the Link Road. This is shown in the flawed Congleton Town Strategy document and there have already been proposals by Congleton Town Councillors to extend the Town boundaries into certain of the surrounding parishes. This would allow the development to aid the finance of the Link Road itself.

Whichever route is chosen must increase traffic on rural lanes around Congleton and be detrimental to agriculture and the environment generally.

Traffic flow data included in the maps provided is from historic rather than recent counts and is therefore most likely to exclude recent house building and cannot possibly include allowance for the excessive planning applications for new housing recently agreed or imposed on the Congleton area.

#### Connection of Link Road to A34, (from A534 roundabout)

The Parish Council consider it is obvious, even to developers, that a connection of the Link Road from A534 to A34 would have a significant negative effect on the parishes. Whatever the chosen route, its construction and very existence must lead to the virtual destruction of large areas of the parishes and either to the replacement of rural lanes with new roads or extremely heavy traffic volumes on country lanes not constructed for such purpose. Specific obvious examples are Wall Hill Lane, Childs Lane, Brownlow Heath Lane and Brook Lane. Experience has shown that any form of “restriction signage” for vehicles is largely ignored.

There would also follow, as for the Link Road itself, increased pressure for housing or industrial development into the open countryside and Green Belt out to the new Link Road which would become the new development boundary.

The outline Link Road costs, as contained in the Cheshire East leaflet, do not contain any allowance for a possible extension from A534 to the A34. These costs must be in the order of at least 20 to 30 million pounds at present day prices. This must add to the pressure to allow development into the areas newly released by the Link Road construction to pay for the new road.

The traffic volume figures on the maps do not include the traffic from North Staffordshire which at present passes through Astbury and Moreton parishes en route to destinations North, West and South.

The most recent local traffic count, on Peel Lane outside Astbury Village Hall, was taken approximately 10 years ago during the stewardship of Cheshire County Council. At that time the traffic volume during peak hours was nominally 1000 vehicles per hour passing from North Staffordshire through Astbury Village.

The Parish Plan, published in 2005 following consultations with parishioners, identified that traffic volumes on local lanes was the main cause of concern to residents. The Parish Plan can be accessed on the Parish Website and copies were provided to the planning department at Cheshire East Council. Early returns show that a similar result is likely in the Neighbourhood Plan at present in preparation.



Jacobs UK Ltd . . . . . 3.

Astbury Village is a Conservation Area . To quote from the Objectives of the Conservation Policy as contained in the document which set it up.

- (I) To preserve the essential elements of the Area, which combine to give it it's special character, from neglect of decay and FROM THE POTENTIAL THREATS OF UNSYMPATHETIC OR UNNECESSARY DEVELOPMENT AND ALTERATION.
- (II) To protect the surroundings of the Conservation Area, SO THAT VIEWS OUT OF THE AREA ARE NOT SPOILT.
- (iii) To ensure that development or redevelopment blends in with it's surroundings and does not impair the character of the Area.
- (iv) Ultimately to take positive steps to improve the character and visual appearance of the Area, including MEASURES TO DIMINISH THE IMPACT OF VEHICULAR TRAFFIC BY CONTROLLING TRAFFIC FLOWS RATHER THAN THE IMPROVEMENT OF STREETS BY WIDENING, REALIGNMENTS, AND VISIBILITY SPLAYS.

The imposition of a vastly higher level of traffic is obviously at conflict with the stated objectives of the Astbury Conservation Area. Should the Link Road and it's extension be delivered, a new relevant detailed traffic analysis will be necessary.

“We Want Your Views” is a leaflet published by Cheshire East regarding the Link Road.

This leaflet states that “Cheshire East is considering a number of options regarding the route of the Link Road”. The document is flawed in that it does not allow for views that the Link Road is not necessary or that there there may be other solutions to the stated problems.

It does not include any statement on the benefits or otherwise of the Link Road build and the entire scheme is obviously for the sole benefit of Congleton Town. There is no mention of the irreversible damage to agriculture, countryside and the environment generally.

It begs the question – Has anyone involved with the Link Road proposal considered the outcome of a Sustainability Appraisal for the project ?

On behalf of Newbold Astbury cum Moreton Parish Council,

Yours sincerely,

Charlie Pointon  
Clerk to the Council

**CHESHIRE EAST STRATEGIC PLAN  
PROPOSED CONGLETON RING ROAD “CRR”**

Cheshire East Council

27<sup>th</sup> February, 2014

**MARTON & DISTRICT PARISH COUNCIL (“MPC”)  
RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION REQUEST  
CONSULTATION PERIOD ENDING 28<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2014**

We write to update the Marton & District Parish Council submission of 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2013 and 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 in response to East Cheshire Council’s request for comments on the Core Plan. In summary, we make the following key points:

- Whilst MPC does not oppose the CRR if approved by Congleton residents;
- MPC believes that the CRR will have negative traffic implications for the stretch of the A34 which affects Marton. In particular, the character of Cocksmoss Lane may be negatively affected. MPC requests that a detailed traffic assessment be undertaken and appropriate ameliorative actions be implemented based on its conclusions;
- MPC concludes that the number of new houses which are planned to be built near the CRR is designed to meet demand from outside Congleton and as such should not encroach the green fields north of CRR.
- In order to protect the area north of CRR towards Marton and Siddington, we request that a Green Gap be designated to ensure that ribbon development does not extend outwards from CRR.

**1. Background**

- 1.1 In common with other parish councils and residents, MPC received due notice of the Cheshire East Draft Strategic Plan (The Plan) and of the consultation period 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 – 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2013. We note the extensive investment in effort involved in drawing up The Plan and support the aim in The Plan for a successful and prosperous county. We received notice of the Core Strategy Pre-submission Document requesting comments prior to 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2013. We similarly received notice of the CRR consultation requesting comments by 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2014.
- 1.2 An extraordinary Parish Council meeting was held in January 2013 to discuss The Plan. Following the meeting, extracts of The Plan were circulated to all Marton residents in a leaflet which offered opportunity for feedback by post or by phone or via East Cheshire Council’s website.

- 1.3 Marton & District residents were invited to attend the 8<sup>th</sup> February 2013 meeting at the Scout Hall organised by Gawsworth Parish Council at which details of The Plan were outlined at length and discussed by Adrian Fisher of Cheshire East Planning Department.
- 1.4 Matters arising from the special meetings were discussed at the scheduled February 2013 meeting of Marton Parish Council.
- 1.5 Adrian Fisher presented the details of the Plan to a General Meeting of The Marton District.
- 1.6 An extraordinary village meeting was convened to discuss Capesthorpe Planning proposals in July 2013.
- 1.7 A meeting convened by David Rutley MP was attended by a representative of Marton Parish Council.
- 1.9 The Plan, including the specific CRR proposals, have been subject to on-going review at the regular meetings of MPC.
- 1.8 The purpose of this paper is to summarise the feedback collated during the above process.

## **2. Summary of impact on Marton**

- 2.1 The Plan makes no explicit proposals for development in the Marton District. However, Marton is affected, implicitly, as noted below.
- 2.2 The Congleton bypass through Hulme Walford to Eaton will impact on the open space between Congleton and Marton and on the transport infrastructure around Marton.
- 2.3 The fill-in housing planned for north of Congleton will impact on the transport infrastructure around Marton.
- 2.4 The South Macclesfield bypass will impact on the open space between Macclesfield and Gawsworth/ Marton and the transport infrastructure around Marton.
- 2.5 The planned fill-in housing will impact on the open space between Macclesfield and Gawsworth/ Marton and the transport infrastructure around Marton.

## **3. Detailed feedback**

- 3.1 We decided to defer to the wishes of residents of Congleton in assessing the merits of the Congleton Bypass. The existing traffic congestion in Congleton and the consequent impact on business were noted.
- 3.2 In terms of options for alternative routes for the Congleton Bypass, we consider that the option offering minimum intrusion into green-field space should be preferred.
- 3.3 We understand that there will be a demand for new housing built on green fields around Congleton as envisaged in the Plan. However, we have not seen statistics demonstrating that Congleton itself is short of housing. Consequently we suggest that any demand for housing largely comes from outside the town.
- 3.4 We did not consider that sufficient analysis of the traffic implications of the proposals is included in The Plan. We anticipate that the combined effect of the Congleton Bypass and associated new housing north and west of Congleton will place new and possibly intolerable stress on the A34 running through Marton, on properties adjacent to the A34 and, finally, on the historic Church of St James and St Paul, regarded as one of the oldest timber framed churches in Europe. The A34 at Marton already has an unreasonable number of accidents and currently impacts unfavourably on village life in Marton. Consequently, we strongly urge

that any development to the north and west of Congleton, including the bypass be kept to a minimum.

- 3.6 We note that the plans for a bypass south of Macclesfield towards Gawsworth, together with associated plans for new housing, do not directly impact on Marton. However, we do note that motorists seeking to access Macclesfield from Monks Heath already experience significant delays and we have seen no traffic assessments that would suggest that the planned bypass south of Macclesfield towards Gawsworth, together with associated plans for new housing, will do anything other than increase this congestion. We strongly urge that any development south of Macclesfield towards Gawsworth be kept to a minimum and that these factors be considered in selecting the option for the north end on the CRR.
- 3.7 **We consider it imperative that a detailed traffic assessment be undertaken to identify the likely changes on usage of Cocks Moss Lane and the A34 through Marton Village which will be caused by the developments envisaged in the East Cheshire Plan and that appropriate measure be taken to protect the interests of Marton District.**
- 3.8 Like many rural councils, we urge Cheshire East Council to recognise that our green fields in rural areas are already a scarce resource and should not be diminished, except as envisaged in the Plan. This view is strongly supported by our MP, David Rutley as being the interests of the Macclesfield Constituency. At the Village Meeting, the Community was resolutely opposed to plans for the development of the field in the centre of the Village, proposed by by Capesthorpe Estate. In so far as Marton & District should make a contribution to providing site for in-fill development to assist the County Housing requirement, we urge that consents for new housing be targeted at brown field sites. We do note however that we have not been party to assisting how further brown field sites can be identified and promoted. We invite East Cheshire to open a dialogue with MPC to with a view to correcting this reality. We look forward to the next stage of the planning process. At a strategic level, we request the following:
- 3.9 **Consequent to the above, MPC requests that East Cheshire Council instigate a “Green Gap” for the area north of Congleton through Marton & District to Siddington and Monks Heath. This is requested to explicitly discourage ribbon development on this area. We ask that we be invited to assist with the development of this proposal.**

H J J Rylands  
Chair Marton Parish Council