

Appendix E: Feedback from Consultation on Legh Road, Holmes Chapel, Gawsworth, and Bolin Hill Conservation Area Reviews

Contents

1. Legh Road	1
2. Holmes Chapel	54
3. Gawsworth	56
4. Bollin Hill, Wilmslow	57

1. Legh Road

Legh Road Consultation Comments				
Comments	Actions/Proposed/Taken	Object	Neutral	Support
Objection to the removal of Lilybrook Drive from the CA	Noted and will remain	X		
It is a good very detailed proposal. We would like to see more adherence by planners in this area to plot size requirements in the LRCA. A number of properties have been developed despite surrounding property owners voicing objections.	Some of these points are for highways/hard to enforce verges. Consider these			X

<p>We would also like to see all areas currently in the LRCA to maintain conservation tree protection despite removal of their property conservation status.</p> <p>It is difficult to maintain verges in Leycester Road given the tree coverage and number of contractor vehicles parking and compacting the verges causing driveways and verges to regularly flood. Hence we would prefer to retain posts, not least to protect tree roots many of which are exposed due in the past to vehicles and of course foot traffic. Leycester Road also has poor drainage and soakaways in the verges would help.</p> <p>Planners should insist on verges and footpaths being restored after development before it is "signed off" responsibility being with the property owner or utility company.</p> <p>We would like to see hedges and verges properly maintained particularly where there are blind bends to negotiate and difficult vehicle entry /exits to Leycester Road and also to enable people to walk properly on the verge.</p> <p>More regular leaf clearance would help.</p>	<p>points for future management of the area.</p>			
<p>Reference the above I would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>1) I am happy to agree with the proposed boundary changes to the LRCA</p> <p>2) I am NOT HAPPY / vehemently oppose the proposals on: (A) Removing security signage</p> <p>In my former career, I spent quite some time trying to prevent fraud and property crimes, which involved working with security specialists. Were you to seek an off the record comment from the police on their views as to the appropriateness of the security signs in deterring crime, I would suggest they would regard them as helpful. Not sufficient in</p>	<p>Appraisal has been amended relating to the security signage issue</p> <p>Grass verges are an important part of the conservation area.</p> <p>Enforcement issue/also to</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>isolation, nor in absence of other appropriate security measures, but helpful, nonetheless.</p> <p>Something that may be contrasted with the generic "homewatch" signage that your consultant Morris so lauds, which has consistently been shown to have no significant value in crime prevention in several research studies conducted on the subject [Cirel et al. (1977), Lowman (1983), Research and Forecasts Inc. (1983), Henig (1984), Anderton (1985), Veater (1984), Jenkins and Latimer (1986), Forrester, Chatterton and Pease (1988), Bennett (1990), Matthews and Trickey (1994), Tilley and Webb (1994), Matthews and Trickey (1994b) Further, in areas where crime decreased while a Neighbourhood Watch was in place, there is no clear indication that it was due to that organisation. (Medford, 2014)]</p> <p>Specific deterrents always have more impact than generic. Interestingly, one of the benefits most lauded about "Neighbourhood watch" schemes is the improvement in relations between the community and the police and that these schemes provide a mechanism for improving that interaction. That is something that we have in the LRCA through the South Knutsford Residents Association —ie separate to Neighbourhood Watch — which has already seen joint initiatives on other matters including speed watch programmes and so on. My point being that it isn't neighbourhood watch that is bringing any benefit, but other factors such as the South Knutsford Group and the successful deployment of so many security signs.</p> <p>The consultant's document, rightly, talks about the history and heritage of the LRCA, but it is also important to recognise that we don't live in aspic. This is not a Portmeirion we are trying to recreate here. Indeed, I warrant, that were Watts, Harding et al still alive then, sadly given the way society and crime is these days, compared to their time, they too would have installed the same security prevention signage.</p>	<p>consider planning conditions relating to the construction management. Advisory only</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

<p>(B) Making people remove the pegs/posts/rocks etc that protect their property & verges from vehicle intrusion</p> <p>Some poor folk, by virtue of their properties bordering the key roads within the conservation area, regularly suffer damage from vehicles (ironically, coming from outside the area!) which destroy their grass verges and related parts. Again, somewhat ironically, they are only installing these posts, stones etc to try and protect (their) green spaces within the conservation area. I know from first-hand experience when walking my dog through the LRCA, that were it not for these brave attempts to protect these spaces, the LRCA would be a lot less green, scenic and attractive.</p>				
<p>We agree with the proposals in the sections below with a few comments -</p> <p>Enclosure - Agree Trees - Agree - some large trees are overhanging Legh Road and dangerous in high winds Grain and spatial quality - Agree Infrastructure - Agree - Not mentioned - solar panels on walls and roofs as in 36 Goughs Lane - the wall solar panels should be removed. The view from the road is an eyesore. Affecting neighbouring gardens with glare and radiation. Building Heights - Agree Roof materials and massing - Unsure Important Open Space - Agree Ancillary buildings - Agree Building materials and palette - We don't agree with the new modern houses being built in Goughs Lane as it is detrimentally affecting the ambience of the Lane. Historical Plot divisions - Agree as it is important to reinstate historic boundaries and very important not to over develop plots.</p>	<p>Commented and changed where applicable</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>Streets, Traffic and Highway Management - Agree a pavement should be down both sides of Legh Road.</p> <p>Grass verges should be preserved in the LRCA and Goughs Lane without rocks, stumps and reflective posts. If construction vehicles damage the grass verge they should reinstate them.</p> <p>Do you agree or not with the Boundary Changes for the LRCA - No - the eastern part of Goughs Lane should NOT be deleted from the LRCA.</p> <p>Comments - This part of the town is historically rich and naturally beautiful and should be preserved and not overdeveloped.</p>				
<p>I fully support the LPA's intention to preserve and where possible enhance the LRCA but make the following comments on the consultation document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More emphasis should be placed on protecting green corridors, such as large gardens, and development in these spaces should be restricted. - I object to the removal of the area of Goughs Lane which is currently in the CA. - The fashion over recent years has been to demolish perfectly good houses and to replace them with huge dwellings that virtually fill the plot leaving minimal garden. I feel this is counter to the ethos of the LRCA and any new properties should be much more proportional to their plot. - I support the emphasis put on retaining traditional boundary walls. There is now far too much close boarded fencing that detracts from the previously open nature of the CA. 	<p>Noted, changes incorporated relating to green/low density and sylvan character.</p>	<p>x</p>		

I hope the above is useful and look forward to the next version of the document.				
I wish to confirm that we support the proposals for the new boundaries and management plan for the Legh Road Conservation Area.	Noted support for the boundary amendments			x
I do not support any change to fences and boundaries. The report was written in 2021 shortly after Covid when burglary was at an all-time low and therefore is now factually incorrect in that the report says “the level of crime and theft is relatively low in this conservation area” and mentions “perceived threat of theft”. There have been at least 4 properties that have been broken into in the Legh Road Conservation area by masked burglars in the last 6 months. The long term effect of having burglars in your home, especially when you are in, is devastating so I think people should have the right to privacy and protection. The report also makes a small reference to problem of vehicles over-running verges along Legh Road and Leycester Road. The roads themselves, especially Legh Road, is in an awful state now so this should be the most important issue not the height of fences or security signs showing people have invested in safeguarding their property.	The document now reflects the need for security signage	X		
Object to the removal of wooden signs form verges /security signage – it is required for the safety of residents and prevent burglaries, neighbourhood watch simply wont suffice in an area such as this	Policy wording amended and updated to reflect changes since the draft published . amendments to the figures made where required and appropriate.	x		
The Review is a scholarly, comprehensive and practical document providing an accurate assessment of the nature and standing of the whole area and the buildings it contains. It builds effectively on the 2005	Amendments to the text			x

<p>11. Croft Lane: Molly Potts should read Mollypotts and is numbered 10 - 12 Croft Lane.</p> <p>12. Toft Road East Side: 2-5 The Toft (column 6) Nos. 2 and 3 are a former C18 farm building, "known as The Dairy Farm until ca 1990", previously of the Toft Estate; now in residential use.</p> <p>13. East side of Legh Road (n to s): a strong case can be made for the local and possible national listing of significant buildings on the northern end of this side of Legh Rd. For example, Bramley (TM Davies), The Sycamores, Kanzan, Hazelfield, Eskdale and, possibly, The Mount. They all represent a very different architectural expression of high contemporary quality. Each deserves serious evaluation against the Listing criteria. They are a little earlier than the Italianate villas opposite and are a counterpoint to the Watt villas. Together they exemplify the evolution of architectural expressions from High Victorian to Arts and Crafts/Art Nouveau in the Edwardian period. They help to set the Watt creations in context. They contribute strongly to the character and appearance of the area. They are at risk because virtually all have been subjected to applications for unsuitable and incongruent extensions, to which the LPA has sometimes agreed. Their presence in a CA alone is not enough to resist the pressure for unsympathetic changes. Listing will also give an additional layer of protection for historic boundary treatments, gate posts and obviate inappropriate 'barrack' gates that harm rather than enhance the public realm.</p> <p>APPRAISAL SECTIONS 1 – 9 AND THE MANAGEMENT PLAN: GENERAL POINTS</p> <p>14. This may fall beyond the possibilities of adjustment: the vocabulary used to indicate applications incompatible with the Appraisal Management Plan (eg 'will be resisted') are firmer than those seeking to promote positive actions. The tentative 'should' appears 12 times in section 9 and 24 times in The Management Plan. Plenty of synonyms exist to provide something stronger without closing the door to potential</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>acceptable development: 'will be expected to'; 'necessary to'; 'needs to be'; 'ought to be'. Also, negatives to emphasise what is not required are available too: 'is likely to be unacceptable'; 'inappropriate'; 'undesirable'.</p> <p>15. The use of stronger vocabulary would make matters firmer and clearer for householders who wish to extend or otherwise modify their homes and for developers with more ambitious plans. On the same point, the summary of Negative Factors at the end of each of the Character Area analysis is useful in identifying where enhancement can be directed. However, it is a pity that they are not preceded by Positive Factors ie what features make a positive contribution and which will be defended robustly when considering any planning application.</p> <p>16. For example, Character Area A, Positive Factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Toft Estate cottages' rural setting around the fields that mark their historic past. - Hedged boundaries and tree-lined, sunken routes of a pre-industrial age - Striking views from Toft Road across the valley to Watt's Italianate Terraces - Georgian, Victorian and Arts and Crafts villas that acknowledge Knutsford's growth. <p>17. The aphorism 'comply or justify' in relation to the planning stipulations where the applicant wants something different is not stated explicitly. It is the assumption in the Knutsford Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) and is the implicit approach to planning issues in the LRCA and, it is hoped can be made explicit somewhere.</p> <p>18. Is it intended to require PP or offer guidance about the location of electric vehicle charging points in relation to the frontages of listed and other dwellings visible as part of the street scene (ie within garages wherever possible; on side rather than the frontage of the main building)?</p>	<p>Agree, further commentary added to the Appraisal</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

<p>APPRAISAL SECTIONS 1 – 9 AND THE MANAGEMENT PLAN: SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON DRAFT TEXT</p> <p>19. Page 6: Para 3.3 It should be made clear that Sanctuary Moor has two distinct areas: the southern section is wet woodland as described but the northern section is open water and meadow land. The meadow has never been subject to modern farming methods. It should ideally provide summer grazing for light cattle breeds, such as Dexters. It was of high ecological value as rare unimproved grassland, as James Baggaley can confirm, but it has deteriorated over the past ten years under different owners.</p> <p>20. The meadow was offered in the SADPD call for sites as ‘Land South of Lilybrook Drive’ (Site FDR1756). The SADPD document ED34 Knutsford Settlement Report did not record that FDR1756 was in the LRCA, nor that it was then protected as a Site of Biological Importance Grade A. In preparing for the KNP, Sanctuary Moor was classified by Cheshire Wildlife Trust as having High Habitat Distinctiveness. In KNP Policy E3, such areas are not considered acceptable for development.</p> <p>21. The site was sifted out from development potential not because of its heritage or ecological importance but because it offered only five dwellings, well below the stipulated minimum of 10. Does the Appraisal make a strong enough statement about Sanctuary Moor’s importance as the setting for the heritage assets in Legh Road as well as its contribution as green open space and as a wildlife site and green corridor to the town? In any case, this section needs updating as the SBI designation is no longer recognised nationally.</p> <p>22. Ground works have been and are being undertaken on the meadow section of Sanctuary Moor, notably the construction of a raised boardwalk and other surface excavations. The PP for these activities, if PP is required, cannot be found. The board walk now prevents the grazing of cattle and could constitute ‘previously developed’ land on the meadow (see para 17). The LPA is asked to check the precise standing of these groundworks and take appropriate action as required.</p>	<p>There is great detail within the appraisal about that makes a positive contribution.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

<p>The adoption and publication of the LRCA Appraisal could provide the means to make the planning status of this part of Sanctuary Moor clear to all parties. (see also para 25)</p> <p>23. Pages 18-19: the firm judgements on the important contribution which Croft Lane and Dairy Farm Field make to the agricultural heritage of the area and to the Toft Estate is warmly welcomed. The protection the Appraisal provides for Dairy Farm Field as the setting for its scattered agricultural dwellings (Humber, Rowley Bank and Roebuck Cottages and Toft Estate cottages 3 and 5 Goughs Lane) are particularly important in establishing the sense of place and the agricultural heritage that would otherwise be obliterated. The field is in the Green Belt.</p> <p>24. Page 19: In 2007 following a survey of the Sanctuary Moor SBI/LWS by Cheshire Wildlife Trust and a meeting of the SBI Review Board, the field south of Woodvale Road was removed from the LWS as it was considered no longer to be of special interest for wildlife. This removed an additional layer of protection from this site which provides the setting for the Paradise Green cottages and The Lodge, both Grade II Listed, on Toft Road. It is also the setting for the LRCA in that it provides one of the most important and historic views from Toft Road across Sanctuary Moor of the western facades ('The Terraces') of the Watt villas on Legh Road. It is understood that, regrettably, the field cannot be added to the LRCA in this Appraisal, despite its crucial importance to the designated heritage assets.</p> <p>25. Page 53 New Development: This is an exceptionally helpful summary of the LPA's design aspirations. But does it need something stronger? "Evidence will be expected that the following design sources have been consulted to inform any applications for development in the conservation area".</p> <p>26. Each subsection on pages 54 and 55 provides the justification for general and specific management planning expectations that follow and are fully supported. The Building Materials and Palette subsection</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

is very helpful identifying LPA's expectations for the three LRCA character areas.

27. Clear ground rules need to be applied so that case officers do not approve truly inappropriate extensions on designated and non-designated heritage assets. Some officers ascribe to the idea extensions must be aggressively 21st century to show that they are different. No sense of complementing or enhancing the host building was evident in these extensions to the Coach House of Aldwarden Hill. The end product here violates the context in which it is placed. It also exemplifies the importance of assessing the effect of the development on every façade of the host building, especially if listed, and not just from the perspective of the 'street scene'.

© Savills Estate Agency

BOUNDARY REVIEW

28. The areas proposed to be added (Paradise Green and dwellings east of Chelford Road) are strongly supported. They make good sense to protect designated heritage assets and preserve their setting.

29. The two areas proposed for deletion are more debatable. The consultant's justification for their removal is well founded and understandable. That for the removal of the northern section of Brook Street and Lilybrook Drive would certainly remove a largely modern development at variance with the LRCA. However, the following points need to be weighed in the decision:

a. The new, northern boundary created by the deletion would not be strong. The land has recently changed hands and the original field fence and gate which marked the northern boundary have disappeared. The delineation of the boundary is unclear.

b. The general protection of the trees in the removed area afforded by the LRCA will be lost. A survey by CEC Trees will likely be required to create TPOs for trees that contribute strongly to what will become the setting of the LRCA in this area.

<p>30. The removal of the northern and eastern side of Gough's Lane, as far west as the Legh Road properties, seems even more finely balanced. Again, the justification is clear and the contrasting nature of the 'cul de sac' development accepted, but the following require careful consideration:</p> <p>a. The Closes have been in the LRCA for the best part of twenty-five years. Why the sudden discovery that they are incompatible? The consultations preceding their approval and the conditions applied were very thorough and found to be acceptable in the 1990s. They were rigorously applied during construction. Mike Scammel, who drew up the 2005 Appraisal, did not seek to exclude them.</p> <p>b. Goughs Lane northside is a clear defensible border for the LRCA; shifting it to back garden fences behind the Closes offers a much less visible and enforceable boundary. The Closes would remain in the 'setting' of the LRCA but would not have the automatic tree protection. The tree survey and TPO designations in Para 26b above would probably be needed.</p> <p>c. The Closes new status as the 'setting' for the LRCA offers weaker protection, as can be seen from the approvals in the current setting on the southside of Goughs Lane. Judging by recent (refused) applications, some residents in the Closes are keen on disproportionate development of their plots. It is more difficult to curb such enthusiasms outside the LRCA.</p> <p>d. What are the heritage grounds for retaining Leycester Close in the LRCA but excluding the better designed Crosby Closes?</p> <p>31. As summarised in response to several planning applications, the community's view about the Crosby development is that 'the three gated developments on two fields on Goughs Lane were specifically designed to offer spacious, up-to-date living accommodation but of a consistent design that referred to late Victorian/Edwardian styles such as would complement the leafy environment of the LRCA. The community's aspiration is to preserve the principal characteristics of the</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>area's low-density housing on substantial plots, the landscaped settings and boundary treatments, and the variety and quality of individually designed homes that reflect but do not imitate what has gone before. The Crosby Closes meet these criteria and exemplify the design style and characteristics of the 1990s'. In that sense, they may already have become part of the LRCA's heritage and worthy of inclusion in the LRCA. Decision left to Built Heritage! PLANNING CONTROL</p> <p>32. The term 'pastiche' is used in the Appraisal as a derogatory term in relation to two sets of buildings. It is also used in the CEC's Design Guide and elsewhere in CEC planning as a term of disapproval. It is often code for modernism 'good', traditional 'bad'. The Scruton Commission has moved thinking on. It is particularly dangerous to use the term in the context of the LRCA where many of the listed and celebrated buildings are 'pastiche': The Old Croft, Queen Anne English Domestic Revival); Bexton Croft, Baillie Scott, Arts & Crafts; and all the Watt villas are pastiche. No-one condemns Lutyens's buildings as pastiche, yet he drew on many earlier buildings for inspiration. Where designs are inferior it is better to say so and why. (Pages 19, 21, 38 and 55).</p> <p>33. Page 58 Article 4 Direction: is strongly supported. Various interpretations of PD rights (sometimes by LPA case officers) has led to a general deterioration of the street scene in the LRCA. Boundary treatments are key to maintaining the character and appearance of the LRCA.</p> <p>34. Removal of doubt will be a great step forward. It may need to be made clear that no intention exists to require removal of existing boundary treatments but, when the time come to replace them, owners will be expected to adopt one of the acceptable styles or make the argument for non-compliance. The text could usefully add that a good thorn hedge is a more effective deterrent than a 2m close boarded fence.</p>	<p>These points have been considered in the final decision regarding removal and inclusion of parts of the conservation area. It is generally agreed that the design is inkeeping, albeit modern interpretation and does provided a</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>avoiding 'blacktop'. It will take a lot of persuading for owners who maintain the grass and plant snowdrops/daffodils/wildflowers outside their homes to remove the posts, rocks and other deterrents to parking and incursion onto their manicured verges.</p>	<p>individual homes/character areas to support the existing Design Guide. Word pastiche removed.</p> <p>The appraisal does advocate the use of natural hedging and boundary enclosure over close boarded fencing options.</p>			
<p>Residents on Legh Road and Goughs Lane and other roads in the whole maintain all the verges alongside the roads themselves. The council does not maintain or repair verges that are either overgrown, bare (no grass), or have been damaged by vehicles continually parking half on the road, half on the verge. In order to attempt to preserve the condition and appearance of the verges within Legh Road and Goughs Lane residents, at their own expense, have placed verge posts. The verge posts prevent further damage and importantly enable adults, children, folk with prams, and others with disabilities to walk along the verges and pavements safely and easily. Does the Council and Conservation department intend to implement permanent HSE measures to fully repair and maintain these verges?</p> <p>Regarding the very poor condition of both the paved verges and tarmac surface along the length of Legh Road road itself, which are a disgrace and not in keeping with the overall appearance expected of any</p>	<p>Guidance on the verges has been included.</p>		<p>x</p>	

<p>conservation area, does the council and conservation department intend to continue to neglect the area and allow it to decay further?</p> <p>Comments in the review suggest residents should perhaps replace certain hedging and fencing - who is expected to cover the expense of meeting these subjective recommendations?</p> <p>Within the review (Management Plan (pages 53-65) it states the Local Planning Authority intends to discharge its statutory duty to 'preserve and where possible, enhance' the LRCA. Please advise the current CE and Knutsford Town Council overall budget, and future funding allocation, for the maintenance, repair and protection of the LRCA and other conservation areas in Knutsford?</p> <p>Is built heritage a 3rd party consultancy that has been contracted by CE for services to CE (full disclosure please)?</p>				
<p>Some modest changes to conservation area Proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include Woodvale Road (currently excluded) • Exclude cul-de-sacs in Legh Road vicinity (proposal to retain is not supported) • Retain Sanctuary Moor (included and to stay in) • Include Lilybrook Drive/Brook Lane (proposal to exclude is not supported) <p>Recommend strengthened control over and management of wildlife and moorland areas</p> <p>Our response to the proposed conservation areas is set out under the following headings.</p> <p>1. We propose and would support the addition of certain areas – namely Woodvale Road</p>	<p>The area was surveyed for inclusion, no further areas are proposed at this time.</p>			<p>X</p>

<p>2. We express our concerns regarding planning decisions within the boundary areas</p> <p>3. We qualify our position regarding inclusion of some areas – named cul-de-sacs</p> <p>4. We strongly support the retention of one area in particular – namely Sanctuary Moor</p> <p>We support much stronger protection for Wildlife and designated Moorland areas</p> <p>5. We do not agree with certain proposed changes to the boundary – namely Lilybrook Drive</p> <p>6. Conclusions</p> <p>1. We propose and would support the addition of certain areas</p> <p>It was raised at the Town Hall meeting that a case be made to include Woodvale Road properties within the Conservation area. We would be supportive of this approach.</p> <p>2. We express our concerns regarding planning decisions within the boundary areas</p> <p>There are a number of occasions, some identified within the document, where planning decisions appear to have been made that reduce, or worse, the architectural and or design quality of our historic buildings and heritage and their appearance eg new build, fencing style etc. Whereas by way of example, renovation work to the Old Post Office at Mobberley Cross (opposite Legh Arms) has sought to retain that history and frontage.</p> <p>We would encourage Planning consents that preserve and enhance the appearance of our buildings and heritage, rather than replace with unsympathetic, modern, design, build and materials quality and fencing.</p> <p>3. We qualify our position regarding inclusion of some areas</p> <p>We note on p26 reference to the higher density of modern development eroding character, with larger buildings dominating with a much smaller</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>garden space - this being particularly problematic where there is limited space between properties.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.3 then refers to properties in the heart of the conservation area with developments that do not preserve the character. These are cul-de-sacs comprising Fairmead and Lovat Drive, Greenacre Close and Leycester Close. The reason given for their inclusion is their location, not their design or heritage.</p> <p>We believe these buildings generally detract from and are ‘oversized’ in proportion to their site and when compared to the surrounding conservation environment. Some are built in the bland design of white and inner grey materials that are prevalent in Alderley Edge and elsewhere, with a recent addition in Grove Park facing in towards Sanctuary Moor. We believe such buildings have no place in Knutsford. We do not accept such cul-de-sacs have a place in the Legh Road conservation area.</p> <p>4. We strongly support to the retention of one area in particular – Sanctuary Moor</p> <p>It is worth repeating the introductory text to Sanctuary Moor below: “The name ‘Sanctuary Moor’ is said to have been given by Watt to the low-lying area below the houses which he adapted and landscaped, by creating artificial ponds from digging out low-lying ground and partially culverting the River Lily. In this way, Watt was able to provide the new houses with a generous setting, long gardens, which stepped down the hillside in terraces, and a physical link to Sanctuary Moor. Although publicly inaccessible, the land is now a designated wildlife site managed by Cheshire Wildlife Trust who oversee a wetland management strategy.”</p> <p>The site is deemed one of High Habitat Distinctiveness to be preserved. It is protected for planning purposes.</p> <p>We are shocked to see the Moor Meadow area was included in the Cheshire East Council’s call for development sites, published in August</p>	<p>These points relate to Nature conservation , and have been passed to the relevant officer. They aren’t points that would be included in the CA review document.</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

<p>2020. It was rejected on grounds only of not reaching the minimum number of 10 houses.</p> <p>There have been further recent encroachments and changes to the Moor including a Legh Road property garden extension down to the Lily Brook with wooden erections, gateway and fencing; a wooden walkway stretching from that garden onto Lilybrook Drive (which is not sufficiently closed to the public and who have gained entry on occasion); trees removed to enable that works, and more recent signs of strimming, including of significant areas of the Moorland Meadow. The moorland is not a garden or area for clearance. It is an area to be left in its natural state. The only justifiable reasons for intervention would be to reduce flood risk or remove incidental non-native growth. "The encroachment of domestic gardens into the nature reserve and changes to the use of the land should be resisted, as this is likely to result in loss of habitat. The selective removal of trees should only be undertaken with ecological management expertise, as this can cause further loss of surrounding trees." "It is very important, therefore, that there is a shared management which is cohesive, and which promotes the site ecology, habitats, and the retention of the wet woodland." We can see no justification whatsoever for such works in terms of preservation of the Watt Moorland design or its intent, preserving nature and habitat, nor for conservation. We believe there should be a total ban on developments, domesticized routes of entry or travel, tree removal and ground clearance in any part of Sanctuary Moor and that the natural habitat should be preserved wholly for nature and wildlife as a Sanctuary. It is unclear how Moor management is effected between the Council and the Wildlife Trust, and the public process by which consent is given for any changes deemed necessary for preservation of wildlife or the Moor habitat. The risk, if no one party takes responsibility, is of increased domesticisation by skipping around Planning consent nets.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>It is hard to believe the recent changes cited could have been approved by the Council or Wildlife Trust for such an area of High Habitat Distinctiveness.</p> <p>We strongly support the continuing inclusion of Sanctuary Moor within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>In the same way the Conservation proposals outline the Policy for Protection of Trees, we believe there should be clear Policies developed and publicised for Protection of Wet Woodland, Nature Reserves, Wildlife Areas and Moorland.</p> <p>We strongly advocate Sanctuary Moor and other wildlife habitats must form part of the recorded planning consent processes of the Council into which the Wildlife Trust will have an input. This should include refraining from using domestic garden encroachment and domestic gardening approaches so that the habitat remains undisturbed.</p> <p>We urge the Council Planning Teams to resist property owners attempts to replace Moorland and Woodland with domesticised gardens, constructions or other such interventions that interfere with this preserved natural habitat.</p> <p>5. We do not agree with certain proposed changes to the boundary – Lilybrook Drive</p> <p>The narrative description and representation of Lilybrook Drive is totally unacceptable and completely underplays its significance in relation to its proximity to Sanctuary Moor and ecosystem, which impacts on Lilybrook Drive/Brook Lane and also the Town Centre Church Walk/Moorside properties and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Lilybrook Drive is not a Home Zone. Wikipedia definition states: “A home zone (or play street) is a living street (or group of streets) as implemented in the United Kingdom, which are designed primarily to meet the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, children and residents and where the speeds and dominance of cars is reduced.”</p> <p>Tucked into the low lying area below Legh Road, Lilybrook starts from Sanctuary Moor, with open views at the back of both the Woodland and</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Moorland areas, and runs along the course of the Lily Brook up to where it joins Brook Street. It is a relatively short, relatively unknown, well hidden Drive, set in a wide, open space, leafy green cul-de-sac, with a mix of detached houses, town houses and flats, sympathetically designed to be in keeping with the Watt style. This can be seen from the very impressive and grandiose design of the 'statement piece' white single construction Town House block set into the Woodland area as background and which the photograph does not do justice to. This block alone will retail in the marketplace at a total of around £4m, whilst the detached houses could achieve around £1m each.</p> <p>Unlike the cul-de-sacs lying off Legh Road, this beautiful, quiet Lilybrook Development gives the impression of space rather than housing density and of private, rather than public access. There are no children, cyclists, street games or community facilities.</p> <p>Sadly, we have a problem with cars because the road is not private and the users of the gym on Brook Street treat the Drive as a race track, turning circle and free Car Park, along with people shopping in Knutsford or using the Train Station. This is becoming an increasing issue for residents who are then left with no spaces for visitors to park. It can be difficult for cars to pass and near impossible for larger vehicles, such as removal vans, let alone emergency vehicles, to get through unless they mount the pavement, or possibly at all. We will be raising this matter again with the Council.</p> <p>There is reference in the narrative to Lilybrook Drive as an area which has removed all evidence of rear boundaries. We are unclear regarding the significance of this statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was a planning requirement of Macclesfield Council to preserve the fencing between our White Town House gardens and that extended thin strip of garden/moorland of a Conservation Area Brook Street property, which separates our Development from the Sanctuary Moor Woodland and Moor area lying behind it on the north (Legh Road side) of Lily Brook. That back fencing is in place. 	<p>Noted and alterations have been made to the document to retain these areas. Beyond those recommended for inclusion, no further areas are being put forward for consideration at this current time. The review was extensive</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a planning requirement to maintain a permanent stock fence separating the Lilybrook detached houses and land from Sanctuary Moor on the south side of the Brook (Grove Park side). This was in place until c18 months ago when the wooden walkway was put through. We understand that the fencing, and Access gate (for the purposes of Wildlife Trust and Owner Access only) were due to be put back. To date this has not happened. Unfortunately this has now made this once inaccessible and fully protected Moorland more easily accessible to the public, even though it is marked Private Property. It is Knutsford Town Council's policy for a buffer between areas of High Habitat Distinctiveness and Residential Developments. A strip of our undeveloped Freehold land sits inside the boundary fence line to our Development, which we assume is intended to meet this requirement, along with the boundary fence, which needs to be put back. In addition to the presentation and style of this beautiful open Lilybrook Development, we believe this area makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and is an area of special interest for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lily Brook is Integral to the Sanctuary Moor ecosystem. There is an integral relationship regarding management of the flow of Lily Brook from the 'Watt' Pond areas through the Moor, through Lilybrook Drive/Brook Lane, across and down to Church Walk/Moorside and into Tatton Lake. The narrative on p50 sets the scene. <p>"As a local wildlife site, much of which is managed by agreement with the Cheshire Wildlife Trust, with large water bodies, an area of historic bog and water meadows, the ground holds considerable water, but water levels have risen increasingly in recent decades and flooding has affected standing trees; works to the ponds and natural water courses and drainage ditches can cause flooding at the Brook Street end, whilst any downstream obstructions or changes such as temporary damming can cause water to rise at the Croft Lane end. The consequences of</p> 	<p>and reflects what is considered to be important/significant to the CA.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>any interventions into this area are often felt in different localised areas, so the whole area is susceptible to different management practices. It is very important, therefore, that there is a shared management which is cohesive, and which promotes the site ecology, habitats, and the retention of the wet woodland.”</p> <p>It is worth noting the investigation into the cause of rising water levels on the Moor suggested “the River Lily is unable to cope with this extra load as it was constructed, along with its’ culverts, for a smaller flow”.</p> <p>Residents living adjacent to the Brook have a duty to maintain the channel and keep the water free flowing. A main culvert stands within the grounds of a property on Brook Lane. Any blockage directly impacts on flows into the town centre and stops the Moorland and Lilybrook Flow. Flooding can occur if the blockage is not quickly resolved.</p> <p>The lower corner of Lilybrook’s white Town House block lies at Brook level on the north side and can flood if the culverts are blocked at Brook Lane or by Moorland lying water released into the Brook or in wetter periods of the year. Currently this property is in the Conservation Area but would be taken out if the Conservation Proposal is upheld, whilst the area immediately opposite on the south side of the Brook would remain in the Conservation Area as it lies just within Sanctuary Moor. Higher water levels and water retention is also impacting on Flow in the Town Centre Moorside area which can be overwhelmed and does flood at those seasonal points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garden areas and land. Continuing careful management of the Lilybrook garden areas and land that neighbours the Moor boundary is essential to prevent encroachment of non-native species and also 	<p>Further design guidance or SPD will be produced which may assist in design/planning decisions in the future.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

<p>invasion by aggressive native weeds that could otherwise threaten the natural moorland habitat if not kept in check.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature. It is of note that Lilybrook Residents have recently provided to the Cheshire Wildlife Trust a list of 74 different species of Birds viewed from the white Town House block that overlooks the Moor woodland areas and enjoys its garden visitors. This list includes some rare and uncommon species. The bird list includes some breeding birds that have Amber and Red Listed UK Conservation Status. It is worth noting here that Sanctuary Moor is also home to a wide variety of plant, mammal and amphibian species. No change. There has been no change to those factors which led to Lilybrook Drive being designated as part of the conservation area and no changes made that are so significant that the special interest no longer applies. Rather we see ourselves, as do Croft Lane property owners, as gatekeepers of the Moor and essential to its survival. <p>We strongly advocate that Lilybrook Drive and Brook Lane remain within the Conservation Area, that the Permanent Boundary fence is put back and the buffer zone is fully restored and reinforced. We also request that the Council enables permit parking for Residents only along the length of the Drive.</p> <p>Conclusions: Our Response Proposes Some modest changes to the conservations proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include Woodvale Road (currently excluded) Exclude cul-de-sacs in Legh Road vicinity (proposal to retain is not supported) Retain Sanctuary Moor (included and to stay in) Include Lilybrook Drive/Brook Lane (proposal to exclude is not supported) 	Noted			
--	-------	--	--	--

<p>Some tightening of Planning decisions within the primary Conservation Areas to preserve heritage</p> <p>Clarification of responsibilities between the Council and Cheshire Wildlife Trust regarding Wetland, Nature Conservation, Woodland, Wildlife and Moorland areas.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction and reinforcement of Policies regarding such Areas • Introduction and reinforcement of Planning applications and formal consent for changes to such Areas, having regard to Council and nature conservation policies in force. 	<p>Noted , the document has been revised to retained the areas suggested for removal based on resident comments.</p>			
<p>I refer to the above. I and my partner live on Astley Close, Knutsford, WA16 8GZ (just off Goughs Lane) and it is proposed that we are removed from the CA. We strongly support being removed from the CA. Our house is 25 years old and in our view there is no reason, other than historical before our house was built and there was a field which our house was subsequently built on, for our house to be in the CA. We heard at a meeting at the Knutsford Town Hall, that the houses off Goughs Lane, provide a buffer to the CA. This is not a reason for us to be in the CA. The houses off Leycester Road with their large gardens</p>	<p>Noted, this has been carefully reviewed , the area is to remain within the CA. the strong northern boundary this retains, along with low density</p>			<p>x</p>

<p>are in the CA and provide what should be the boundary line of the CA, rather than some houses off Goughs Lane. The other side of Goughs Lane to us is not in the CA and there is no conservation reason for Astley Close to be in the CA. It is appropriate that we are removed from the CA.</p>	<p>modern development consistent with the wider area.</p>			
<p>I live in Goughs lane and understand the extent of the Legh Road Conservation is under preview. Although my property is on the south side of the lane I am very concerned about the proposal to take out part of Goughs lane from the LRCL this would be detrimental to the whole area. Although I am not in the conservation area but what happens on the other side of the road affects all of us. I am sad that we have already lost too bungalows one on the south side the other in the conservation area this one is now in the process of having a large house erected Bungalows are very much needed in the Knutsford area and it is sad to see them go I wonder what will replace the too that are due to be knocked down soon they are on the left side of where Legh road joins Goughs lane I have seen many changes in the 40 years that I have lived here and do understand that things have to change so I am glad that the LRCL is there to keep an extra eye on things</p>	<p>Noted, area is to remain within the boundary for the reasons stated above</p>		<p>x</p>	
<p>We wish to object to the proposed boundary changes to the Legh Road Conservation Area ('LRCA') and specifically, the proposal to remove the three residential 'closes' at the northeastern end of Goughs Lane, namely Rutherford Drive, St George's Close & Astley Close.</p> <p>As the LRCA Appraisal 2021 ('the 2021 Appraisal') confirms (page 39), the land on which the three Crosby closes were built was originally identified for development within the LRCA in November 1982, 40+ years ago. Planning permission was granted in the spring of 1998 and the properties were built, marketed, and sold during 1999 (i.e., the best part of 25 years ago). Since then, they have been an integral part of</p>	<p>Noted – as above , wording amended to reflect the contribution made to the conservation area.</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>the LRCA. The 2005 Appraisal (seemingly very similar to the present one?) didn't recommend their removal. So, the obvious question is, what has changed?</p> <p>In 1997/8 Crosby/Berkeley Homes (the builders) and Macclesfield Borough Council (MBC) went to considerable lengths to ensure that the positioning, design and detailing of the properties within the three closes complemented those of the LRCA, within which they were designed to sit. The 2021 Appraisal mentions many common features of the broader LRCA, such as:</p> <p>a rural, sylvan character (p22) the dominant character is one of gardens surrounded by soft perimeters (p32) an abundance of mature trees, which mark the boundaries of dwellings and sit within their gardens (p29) {which} have {often} been supplemented with...hedging (p29) boundaries {tend to be} dominated by mature hedges and trees (p31) {properties tend to be} part-hidden, high-status, genteel housing (p4) {or} prestigious, usually detached villas...sitting in generous garden plots with mature tree planting. Despite leaf cover, very few {residences} are completely hidden (p21) {the houses tend to have} a particularly strong, coherent and individual design (p17) {there is some} Cheshire black-and white half-timbering (pp24, 26 & 35) {the roadways} follow gentle curves with short, unfolding progressive views (p28)</p> <p>The 23 properties on St George's Park are of at least 12 completely different designs, are all 5-bedroom detached houses, "planned to the highest standards..."; "on an open-plan site..."; "with many mature</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>trees and ... hedging”; ”on the edge of the LRCA”; “with appealing and individual elevations” (the latter phrases are taken from the original sales literature).</p> <p>The only significant change to the developer’s original proposals for St George’s Park, which MBC insisted on, was an increase in the number of properties from 19 to 23 – which of course meant that the resulting density was rather less than the 1-2 houses per acre found in some (but certainly not all) of the rest of the LRCA.</p> <p>Many, (actually 37!) additional compulsory design details, covering everything from window design and materials to street lighting for the properties, were specified in a ‘conditions’ letter attached to the final grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Given all this history (which spans the 2005 Appraisal), it is rather surprising to read that your consultants now consider the three Crosby closes to be ‘out of place’ (p47) and ‘generally of low or no architectural value’ (p39).</p> <p>We would argue that, as a result of all this care and attention, the three Crosby closes are less ‘out of place’ and have considerably more ‘architectural value’ than most of the other modern developments in the LRCA such as:</p> <p>Greenacre Close (p25, p37) Leycester Close (p37) Lovat Drive (p37) Fairmead (p14, p22, p37) Molly Potts Close (not referred to in the 2021 Appraisal?), and</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>on the tiny portion of the Old Toft Road (between Croft Lane and Woodvale) (p19),</p> <p>We note that it is recommended that all of the above should remain in the LRCA despite their having ‘little or no architectural or historic interest’ (p37) and ‘not preserving its character’ (p37). Why therefore should the three Crosby closes be singled out for removal? Particularly when their removal will leave such an awkward boundary with adjacent properties – as opposed to the simple and easily understood triangle of Chelford Road, Goughs Lane and Toft Road we have now? What possible advantages will this change bring?</p> <p>Over the past 25 years the ‘look and feel’ of the three Crosby closes have matured as the numerous trees, bushes and hedges have grown and the building materials have weathered. The 2021 Appraisal is how much of the street scene is obscured in other parts of the LRCA. It also mentions on how some of the boundary treatments (walls, fences and hedges), pavements and accessways etc within the historic part of the LRCA leave much to be desired (pp 23, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 46 et al).</p> <p>The street view along Goughs Lane and Chelford Road bordering 2 St George’s Close is now particularly pleasing with mature trees, native holly/hawthorn hedging being the first sight entering the gateway into Knutsford and the Conservation Area (p27).</p> <p>The LRCA planning rules have proved vital to preserving the carefully crafted character and appearance of the three Crosby closes and, amongst other things, we are concerned that their removal might encourage even more extreme proposals. These may not only affect the Crosby closes themselves but may also impact the appearance of the remaining areas of the LRCA</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Summary</p> <p>We will be very disappointed if the proposal to remove the 3 Crosby closes from the LRCA goes ahead. They were always intended to be part of the LRCA - and meticulously planned (by MBC and the developers) to fit in with it. 25 years on they have matured nicely – and are arguably one of the best features of their particular part of the LRCA. As owners/residents who actively sought out a property in the LRCA we are concerned about the potential loss of CA planning protections, and the effect on property values if the proposals are adopted. It seems strange that some other modern developments within the LRCA which would appear to have even less architectural or historic interest than ours are being recommended to remain. We do not understand what possible benefits Cheshire East Council (CEC) or Knutsford Town Council (who have commissioned and paid for this report) will see by making the change. The new boundary will presumably be awkward to manage and the reduced level of planning control in the 3 Crosby closes could easily lead to them having a negative impact upon the adjacent LRCA. Overall, it seems unnecessary and inappropriate to declassify these three Crosby closes at this point - and after all this time. Removal of the Crosby homes from the LRCA could lead to over development, loss of the green boundaries and be detrimental to the gateway into Knutsford from Macclesfield.</p>				
<p>As a resident of that part of Goughs Lane being considered for removal from the Legh Road Conservation Area (LRCA) I would kindly ask that this proposal be reconsidered and rejected.</p>	<p>Noted- amendments made as above</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>My wife and I have been residents within the LRCA for the last 40 years and have noted the development of the area first hand. Our properties have been both modern (Leycester Close built to our design in 1984) and early 20th century (Oldfield, built 1914) and in the latter case we saved a property (that had been allowed to deteriorated badly) by significant refurbishment within the original structure.</p> <p>I reject the idea that newer properties such as those built by Crosby have little or no architectural value solely because they were not individually designed. There are many prominent new properties within the LRCA that fall into this category which have been received planning approval within the last few years having been designed to a formulistic concept similar to the Crosby houses albeit on a smaller numerical scale. They can be seen along the principle roads of the LRCA - over dominant, over prominent, too big for the plots that previously contained small to medium sized properties of low density.</p> <p>I live in Astley Close but outside of the gated area and feel that our property plus others built by Crosby 25 years ago, blend well into the mix of properties within the LRCA. They are surrounded by mature trees (there are approximately 60 mature trees along the northern side of Goughs Lane!) which continues the theme of rural greenery of which the LRCA is proud. The priority should be to maintain the current spectrum of properties and protect those that are considered to be under threat (such as Pendle Cottage and Lane End on Legh Road).</p> <p>Do you plan to "cherry pick" the good from the less good within the LRCA leaving an area without a real easily defined southern boundary? I ask that you reconsider your proposal and leave the northern side of Goughs Lane within the LRCA.</p>				
<p>As a resident at 33 Goughs lane, I would like to register my concern in relation to the southern boundary change of the LRCA as proposed in the recent appraisal.</p>		x		

<p>It is a privilege to live in the LRCA which is a significant heritage asset to the town of Knutsford. The present boundary formed by Goughs Lane between Toft Road and Chelford Road forms a natural coherent enclosure containing the major assets and attributes of a conservation area. Clearly not everything within the boundary has the same degree of merit, particularly in comparison with the century-old properties on Legh Road. But Goughs Lane is by no means an outlier: there seems to be little logic in singling out the eastern section of Goughs Lane as an anomaly warranting exclusion.</p> <p>My strong preference would be to retain the clear and obvious boundary of the entire south side of Goughs Lane and ensure that future developments are more consistent with the conservation area ethos than past ones have been. Rather than make boundary changes to accommodate historical failings in planning, wouldn't it be preferable to maintain the boundary and focus on future enhancements?</p>				
<p>As mentioned, I live in the area on Goughs Lane currently in the LRCA but proposed by the consultation report to be taken out of it. Whilst I can appreciate comments about the Crosby development, those houses have now been there over 20 years, the landscape around them has matured considerably and they now form part of the established setting down Goughs Lane. In addition at least one house within the area proposed to be taken out is stated in the report as having some architectural merit. Looking at the houses on the part of Goughs Lane proposed to be retained within the LRCA, apart from the pair of old cottages which deservedly need protection, there are 2 new builds, an undistinguished pair of brick semis, and three or four other houses (1960's or 1970's?) which by themselves are not very special. It therefore seems to me to be illogical to take out of the LRCA an area which deserves protection, even if only as a barrier and some</p>	<p>Document amendment as above</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>guarantee against inappropriate development in the future, while leaving in an area which in the main has no particular merit and certainly no more than the Crosby end of the street. Goughs Lane itself along the full length is a natural boundary for the rest of the Conservation Area and it should continue to be looked at as a whole, avoiding any possible erosion of or damage to the overall Conservation Area. I have also pointed out that the plan as presently drawn includes in the LCRA 2 houses on Rutherford Drive which were part of the Crosby development. If they are in why not the rest?</p> <p>I would strongly urge there to be a reconsideration of the proposal to take out part of Goughs Lane from the LRCA.</p> <p>I am also concerned that taking out part of Goughs Lane from the LRCA could lead to requests to change the street scene by adding street lighting and pavements. Again I appreciate others may raise highway safety issues, but on the whole, apart from the morning and evening traffic, (and blockages caused by developer's vehicles which are hopefully a temporary matter), Goughs Lane remains a quiet leafy street for most of the time, and I would not want to see any encouragement to heavier traffic use by making the street more urban and changing its character – it has already been changed enough over the last 30+ years.</p> <p>Within the LRCA, the consultation report makes much of fencing and driveway development. I agree that some of the boundary treatments which have taken place especially along Legh Road are out of keeping with the general character of the neighbourhood, but in practice is the Council likely to do anything about this? I expect not.</p> <p>I would also add that I am concerned that taking part of Goughs Lane out of the LRCA could be detrimental to the tree cover which presently exists as the Conservation Area protections would no longer apply, and indeed although some trees have TPO protection there could be calls for the TPO's to be removed as not being appropriate in a non-</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>conservation area neighbourhood. This would seriously affect the nature of Goughs Lane.</p>				
<p>We would like to comment on - and object to - the proposed boundary changes to the Legh Road Conservation Area ('LRCA') and specifically, the proposal to remove the three residential 'closes' at the northeastern end of Goughs Lane, namely Rutherford Drive, St George's Close & Astley Close. The first two of these, adjacent to one another, are sometimes referred to as St George's Park. In this letter, we will focus on Rutherford Drive (where we live), St George's Park and/or 'the three Crosby closes' as appropriate. We have numbered our paragraphs.</p> <p>2. As the LRCA Appraisal 2021 ('the 2021 Appraisal') confirms (page 39), the land on which the three Crosby closes were built was originally identified for development within the LRCA in November 1982, 40+ years ago. Planning permission was granted in the spring of 1998 and the properties were built, marketed, and sold during 1999 (i.e., the best part of 25 years ago). Since then, they have been an integral part of the LRCA. The 2005 Appraisal (seemingly very similar to the present one?) didn't recommend their removal. So, the obvious question is, what has changed?</p> <p>3. In 1997/8 Crosby/Berkeley Homes (the builders) and Macclesfield Borough Council (MBC) went to considerable lengths to ensure that the positioning, design and detailing of the properties within the three closes complemented those of the LRCA, within which they were designed to sit. The 2021 Appraisal mentions many common features of the broader LRCA, such as:</p> <p>a rural, sylvan character (p22) the dominant character is one of gardens surrounded by soft perimeters (p32)</p>	<p>Noted, as above document altered</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>an abundance of mature trees, which mark the boundaries of dwellings and sit within their gardens (p29) {which} have {often} been supplemented with...hedging (p29) boundaries {tend to be} dominated by mature hedges and trees (p31) {properties tend to be} part-hidden, high-status, genteel housing (p4) {or} prestigious, usually detached villas...sitting in generous garden plots with mature tree planting. Despite leaf cover, very few {residences} are completely hidden (p21) {the houses tend to have} a particularly strong, coherent and individual design (p17) {there is some} Cheshire black-and white half-timbering (pp24, 26 & 35) {the roadways} follow gentle curves with short, unfolding progressive views (p28)</p> <p>many of which were deliberately and carefully incorporated in the layouts and designs of the three Crosby closes. To add to the picture, the 17 properties on St George's Park are of at least 12 completely different designs, are all 5-bedroom detached houses, "planned to the highest standards..."; "on an open-plan site..."; "with many mature trees and ... hedging"; "on the edge of the LRCA"; "with appealing and individual elevations" (the latter phrases are taken from the original sales literature).</p> <p>4. The only significant change to the developer's original proposals for St George's Park, which MBC insisted on, was an increase in the number of properties from 15(?) to 17 – which of course meant that the resulting density was rather less than the 1-2 houses per acre found in some (but certainly not all) of the rest of the LRCA. However, within Rutherford Drive, two properties (#'s 7 & 5) are believed to still meet this criterion.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>5. Many, (actually 37!) additional compulsory design details, covering everything from window design and materials to street lighting for the properties, were specified in a 'conditions' letter attached to the final grant of planning permission. The letter relating to the 17 properties on St George's Park was issued on behalf of the Chief Planning Officer on 23 October 1997. There was presumably a similar letter for the properties on Astley Close. As far as we can see, none of these documents (i.e., the original planning permissions or the supplementary 'conditions letters'), are mentioned or referred to in the 2021 Appraisal.</p> <p>6. Given all this history (which spans the 2005 Appraisal), it is rather surprising to read that your consultants now consider the three Crosby closes to be 'out of place' (p47) and 'generally of low or no architectural value' (p39).</p> <p>We would argue that, as a result of all this care and attention, the three Crosby closes are less 'out of place' and have considerably more 'architectural value' than most of the other modern developments in the LRCA such as: Greenacre Close (p25, p37) Leycester Close (p37) Lovat Drive (p37) Fairmead (p14, p22, p37) Molly Potts Close (not referred to in the 2021 Appraisal?), and on the tiny portion of the Old Toft Road (between Croft Lane and Woodvale) (p19),</p> <p>7. We note that it is recommended that all of the above should remain in the LRCA despite their having 'little or no architectural or historic interest' (p37) and 'not preserving its character' (p37). Why therefore should the three Crosby closes be singled out for removal? Particularly</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>when their removal will leave such an awkward boundary with adjacent properties – as opposed to the simple and easily understood triangle of Chelford Road, Goughs Lane and Toft Road we have now? What possible advantages will this change bring?</p> <p>8. To return to our main theme, over the past 25 years the ‘look and feel’ of the three Crosby closes have matured as the numerous trees, bushes and hedges have grown and the building materials have weathered. The street view through the gates of Rutherford Drive is now particularly pleasing and images of it regularly appear in magazine articles about Knutsford - and on TV. For example, Rutherford Drive was featured in the opening title sequence of Police Interceptors (Series 5?) and during an episode of Homes under the Hammer – when the programme was actually about a property on the other side of Goughs Lane (i.e. not in Rutherford Drive or even in the LRCA).</p> <p>9. That is not to say that there have not been challenges to the original design principles for the development. Rutherford Drive, for example, has survived several significant planning applications which, had they succeeded, might have completely changed the ‘look and feel’ of the development. Examples have included:</p> <p>00/2391P – a proposal to build a full height brick wall around the side of a property (along most of the south-western side of Rutherford Drive itself). This was rejected and appealed. The independent inspector’s decision notice (dated 19/6/01) confirmed the rejection saying that, “the main issue is the effect of proposed development on the character and appearance of the LRCA”.</p> <p>16/0692M – a proposal to convert one of the two matching single-storey garages which frame the entrance to Rutherford Drive to add upper-storey living accommodation. Again, this was rejected and appealed. The independent inspector’s decision notice (dated</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>13/12/16) confirmed the rejection, saying that “I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area”. However, please note that the applicant subsequently resubmitted a similar proposal as part of a more comprehensive planning application (under 17/1423M) which was eventually granted - but the double-height garage/accommodation block has not been built.</p> <p>10. Of course by 2016/17 (the date of the second PA mentioned above) there was a much greater emphasis on the ‘street scene’ of the LRCA (i.e., ‘the view in’ for passers-by). In paragraph 8 we’ve illustrated how successful this is as far as Rutherford Drive is concerned, whereas a common theme of the 2021 Appraisal is how much of the street scene is obscured in other parts of the LRCA. It also mentions on how some of the boundary treatments (walls, fences and hedges), pavements and accessways etc within the historic part of the LRCA leave much to be desired (pp 23, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 46 et al). Obviously few if any of these concerns apply to the three Crosby closes.</p> <p>11. To summarise, it seems to us that the LRCA planning rules (settings?) have proved vital to preserving the carefully crafted character and appearance of the three Crosby closes and, amongst other things, we are concerned that their removal might encourage even more extreme proposals. These may not only affect the Crosby closes themselves but may also impact the appearance of the remaining areas of the LRCA. For example, unsympathetic future developments could easily affect the important views from the A537 (Chelford Road) for those travelling in or out of Knutsford (p27).</p> <p>12. The potential dilution of the planning controls is one of two specific issues we have with the current proposals, the other being the potential effect on the value of our property(ies).</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

13. Given the very precise and, in some cases expensive, requirements of MBC for making the three Crosby closes fit in with the LRCA's design ethos, the first and all subsequent owners obviously paid a premium when purchasing their properties. If the CA status is to be removed, then presumably the house values will fall? This seems unjust...

Concluding Remarks/Summary

We will be very disappointed if the proposal to remove the 3 Crosby closes from the LRCA goes ahead.

They were always intended to be part of the LRCA - and meticulously planned (by MBC and the developers) to fit in with it.

25 years on they have matured nicely – and are arguably one of the best features of their particular part of the LRCA.

As owners/residents who actively sought out a property in the LRCA we are concerned about the potential loss of CA planning protections, and the effect on property values if the proposals are adopted.

It seems strange that some other modern developments within the LRCA which would appear to have even less architectural or historic interest than ours are being recommended to remain.

And, despite reading the 2021 Appraisal several times, we're struggling to understand what possible benefits Cheshire East Council (CEC) or Knutsford Town Council (who have commissioned and paid for this report) will see by making the change. The new boundary will presumably be awkward to manage and the reduced level of planning control in the 3 Crosby closes could easily lead to them having a negative impact upon the adjacent LRCA.

Overall, it seems unnecessary and inappropriate to declassify these three Crosby closes at this point - and after all this time.

We therefore wish to object to this proposed change.

<p>I write with regards to the consultation of the above area</p> <p>We live on Leycester Road and we use Homeguard Security to protect both our property and ourselves</p> <p>Under the proposal I believe we would potentially not be able to display their security shields which give us a high amount of confidence and also a huge deterrent to potential criminals</p> <p>Please kindly consider this</p>	<p>Document has been amended to reflect residents needs for security signage</p>	<p>x</p>		
<p>Issues raised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the procedure and timetable for this consultation- please post this on the webpage with the consultation documents. - Sanctuary Moor- concerned about building on the land. In Knutsford Plan for 10 houses. Will taking Lilybrook Dv out of the CA make the permission easier. Owner has been doing engineering works and concerned residents ask if this has planning permission - what is the need for open fences/gates and views into the gardens – ‘nosey parker charter’ - what about security - it is subjective as to who allows development to be considered in keeping or not- unfair - can we keep Goughs Lane in for symmetry reasons it is a natural boundary to the conservation area if remove it then would there be more encroachment with the next layer of housing on the edge of the CA? - will Goughs Lane become a rat run if it is out of the CA, will there be street lighting and pavements added? - who is maintaining the footways and roads- poor management know and ‘we pay high taxes for this’ 	<p>Document amended to reflect residents comments, boundary will remain as it currently is.</p>	<p>x</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - please can someone amend the document to format it adequately. For it to be a useable document it should be paragraphed numerical with sub paragraph references as well. - please can the references to Design and Access Statement requirements AND Heritage Statement requirements be clarified and detailed. - question why 2 properties near section 2 of the map (area to be deleted) included as they are of the same development which is being deleted - question why the properties on Woodvale Road which are large pleasant detached of some quality are not inc in the CA extension 				
<p>As a resident at 33 Goughs lane, I would like to register my concern in relation to the southern boundary change of the LRCA as proposed in the recent appraisal.</p> <p>It is a privilege to live in the LRCA which is a significant heritage asset to the town of Knutsford. The present boundary formed by Goughs Lane between Toft Road and Chelford Road forms a natural coherent enclosure containing the major assets and attributes of a conservation area. Clearly not everything within the boundary has the same degree of merit, particularly in comparison with the century-old properties on Legh Road. But Goughs Lane is by no means an outlier: there seems to be little logic in singling out the eastern section of Goughs Lane as an anomaly warranting exclusion.</p> <p>My strong preference would be to retain the clear and obvious boundary of the entire south side of Goughs Lane and ensure that future developments are more consistent with the conservation area ethos than past ones have been. Rather than make boundary changes to accommodate historical failings in planning, wouldn't it be preferable to maintain the boundary and focus on future enhancements?</p>	<p>Noted, document has been amended as per comments above.</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>I have a Knutsford Home Guard sign. It is helpful as a security feature, and so people know who to contact if my alarm goes off. I disagree with the plan to ban these.</p> <p>I agree with the problems caused by builders vans parking on the verges, these cause recurrent damage. Can this be made a parking offence?</p> <p>We need speed humps and a speed camera on Legh Road. Most traffic breaks the 30mph limit, often by a considerable amount.</p>	<p>Document amended on this point of signage</p>	<p>x</p>		
<p>We are writing as a resident of Rutherford Drive regarding the consultation regarding the Legh Road Conservation Area. We have not had enough time to read through the proposals in full detail, but have skimmed it.</p> <p>On page 39, you mention "It is recommended, therefore, that the northern and eastern side of Gough's Lane, as far west as the Legh Road properties, be removed from the Legh Road Conservation Area and the boundary re-drawn."</p> <p>We are writing to register a strong protest against this recommendation and we oppose it in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>1) From our reading of the document, the thrust appears to be preventing a loss of character afforded by buildings of architectural value and for nature conservation. It makes no sense at all to us how reducing the boundaries will contribute to this. If anything, it will encourage and permit the exact opposite behaviour on the boundary of the proposed new conservation area. This does nothing whatsoever to enhance, protect or maintain the philosophy of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Document amendment to retain the areas suggested for removal</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>2) If the developments in question do lack architectural value as you claim, this was a decision for the council back in 1998 when you gave permission for their development. How can you possibly consider punishing present owners of properties in these developments who bought in the knowledge that they were buying into the Conservation area? At the time the developers would have made whatever efforts and concessions were necessary to achieve permission. It is outrageous to now move the goal posts.</p> <p>Although we appreciate the fascinating and thorough detail of history of the area, we are really quite surprised at how poorly thought out this recommendation is and that there is no logical explanation for it.</p>				
<p>Knutsford Town Council supports the Legh Road Conservation Area appraisal along with the proposed boundary changes and is committed to supporting Cheshire East Council in the application of the management plan document.</p>				x
<p>I have no real problem with the suggested changes to the conservation area (though I could query why, when allowing the building of the Lillybrook development, the developers had to go to great trouble to maintain the facade on Brook St but are now being taken out of the conservation area because of what the other side looks like)</p> <p>My real query was about where my residence is in Sparrow Lane. I note that the buildings of 1 to 8 Sparrow Lane are within the red line but are not on the list in the appendix. This small development was built as estate and farm workers cottages on a plot of land bought by Peter Legh in 1848, they were built in 1851 along with and connected to 1-3 Mobberley Road which was part of the same development. I am not sure if you would want to update the appendix or the drawing but I would be happy to walk you around the site (it's not very big) to show</p>	Document amended		x	

<p>how it was built and the few changes that have since been made so that you could decide.</p>				
<p>My concerns are about demolition of a conservation area impact on (private) road during the build of the new houses. E.g Crains Lorries, Vans etc. impact (private) road - entrance and access after the build e.g. residents, visitors, deliveries... Extra volume of traffic using traffic lights at end of road when houses are occupied Diversion of the River Lilly. Impact on wildlife</p>	<p>No changes made – noted comments and are reflected in the document</p>			<p>x</p>
<p>Firstly, I am pleased that the Town has over the years protected its heritage in the manner expressed in yours and previous appraisals. This in the face of ever demanding housing needs and is testimony to the planning authorities along with residents of the town who choose to make the effort to protect its heritage.</p> <p>The Conservation Area has seen many changes in the last ten years, particularly to the area of Legh Road directly affected by house building, removing an existing house, and replacing it with larger properties.</p> <p>I would not like to see the boundary area changed. I think currently it expresses the present demand for housing at the same time as protecting the look and feel and character. My only concern is that of fencing which has seen a variety of fencing and gates applied which are often not in keeping with the area and choosing to be more of an expression of the architect.</p>		<p>x</p>		

<p>Also, The present poor state of the Legh road surface and verges do not reflect the heritage value that the houses express.</p> <p>Dairy Field Farm has a special significant place in the heritage of the town. The aesthetics of the town are improved along with the protection of cottages that have served and continue to serve the neighbourhood. These cottages are clearly expressed in the Appraisal and date back to the 18th and early 19th Century and need to be protected and remain in the Conservation Area. Dairy Farm Field also accommodates the river Lily with its rich diverse wildlife and fauna along with the magnificent tree line which protects the river.</p> <p>The A50 falls with the LRCA. Whilst speed falls outside of the appraisal remit it is worth adding that if the heritage properties of Dairy Farm Field and other heritage properties are valued and to be protected, reducing the speed limit would assist the protection of foundations which must be affected the more vehicles and heavy vehicles at that use the road.</p>				
<p>My husband and I are the owners of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] We fully support the recommendation to include numbers 29-47 Chelford Road within the boundary of the conservation area.</p>	Noted			x
<p>It is of concern that the field (open space) south of Woodvale Road is not in the LRCA as Dairy Farm Field is. As the views from Toft Road across it to 'The Terraces' of Legh Road are identified in the Appraisal, Figure 5 and section 6.4.5 where the view is identified as "one of the most significant in the conservation area". 6.4.5 goes on to say "the fact that there has been so much development to the east of Toft Road that has left very little opportunity to see this designed and planned relationship; this view now has much greater importance as a result of development elsewhere".</p>	Noted	x		

<p>Surely inclusion in the LRCA would offer greater protection and guard against the loss of this key element of the conservation area.</p>				
<p>I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the draft document of the “Knutsford Legh Road Conversation Area Appraisal 2021” and specifically Point 9.2 "Security Signs and Advertising".</p> <p>As a local business based in Knutsford, we have provided a valued security service to the residents, schools and businesses in the area since 1987. As such, we are acutely aware of the strong feeling the homeowners in the Legh Road area have regarding their vulnerability and the need for a robust level of protection and need to feel safe whilst in their own home, our shields help to reinforce that feeling of safety and security.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of our shields is not to "Advertise" our business commercially, instead they are a deterrent to warn any potential perpetrator that if they break into that property, as soon as the alarm activates, our staff based in Knutsford will attend immediately.</p> <p>As the owner of this company, I am deeply concerned regarding the safety of my staff who would potentially be put at risk of physical danger should an Intruder not be warned of our imminent arrival at the property. Therefore, it is vital that our shields warn anyone entering the perimeter of a property that this is a live 24 hour service, linked to all aspects of the Intruder alarm system and to expect our immediate attendance.</p>	<p>Document has been amended/wording changed regarding security signage</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>These signs have been actively requested by our clients as a deterrent from the threat of Intruder's, which can be a life changing, traumatic experience and not as an advertisement for my business.</p> <p>Our shields have also acted as a reference point for both the local Police and Fire Service, as they give details of our 24-hour contact number should there be an issue at that property. This has enabled us to liaise and assist the emergency services on many occasions, especially when the owner of a property is away and there is only our shield as a point of contact.</p> <p>The suggestion of a successful neighbourhood watch scheme, given the type of housing and demographics of the Legh road area, is in my opinion, totally unrealistic and misguided.</p> <p>What is the Council's view on Intruder alarm boxes which are fixed to the front of practically every property in the conservation area, which similarly have the name of the provider and a contact number in case of a problem or issue? Are these also just advertising signs, or do they provide practical information which could be useful?</p> <p>What is the Council's view on C.C.T.V signs which are fixed to the front of properties in the conservation area, which similarly have the name of the provider and a contact number in case of a problem or issue? Are these also just advertising signs, or do they provide practical information which could be useful?</p> <p>Our shields have been used as a deterrent for over 15 years in the area and have never previously been objected to by anyone.</p> <p>For the reasons given, I strongly object to the proposal for the removal these signs, especially regarding the safety of my clients and staff.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the draft document of the “Knutsford Legh Road Conversation Area Appraisal 2021” and specifically Point 9.2 "Security Signs and Advertising".</p> <p>As a local business based in Knutsford, we have provided a valued security service to the residents, schools and businesses in the area since 1987. As such, we are acutely aware of the strong feeling the homeowners in the Legh Road area have regarding their vulnerability and the need for a robust level of protection and need to feel safe whilst in their own home, our shields help to reinforce that feeling of safety and security.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of our shields is not to "Advertise" our business commercially, instead they are a deterrent to warn any potential perpetrator that if they break into that property, as soon as the alarm activates, our staff based in Knutsford will attend immediately.</p> <p>As the owner of this company, I am deeply concerned regarding the safety of my staff who would potentially be put at risk of physical danger should an Intruder not be warned of our imminent arrival at the property. Therefore, it is vital that our shields warn anyone entering the perimeter of a property that this is a live 24 hour service, linked to all aspects of the Intruder alarm system and to expect our immediate attendance.</p> <p>These signs have been actively requested by our clients as a deterrent from the threat of Intruder's, which can be a life changing, traumatic experience and not as an advertisement for my business.</p> <p>Our shields have also acted as a reference point for both the local Police and Fire Service, as they give details of our 24-hour contact</p>	<p>Document has been amended to reflect these concerns.</p>	<p>x</p>		
---	---	----------	--	--

<p>number should there be an issue at that property. This has enabled us to liaise and assist the emergency services on many occasions, especially when the owner of a property is away and there is only our shield as a point of contact.</p> <p>The suggestion of a successful neighbourhood watch scheme, given the type of housing and demographics of the Legh road area, is in my opinion, totally unrealistic and misguided.</p> <p>What is the Council's view on Intruder alarm boxes which are fixed to the front of practically every property in the conservation area, which similarly have the name of the provider and a contact number in case of a problem or issue? Are these also just advertising signs, or do they provide practical information which could be useful?</p> <p>What is the Council's view on C.C.T.V signs which are fixed to the front of properties in the conservation area, which similarly have the name of the provider and a contact number in case of a problem or issue? Are these also just advertising signs, or do they provide practical information which could be useful?</p> <p>Our shields have been used as a deterrent for over 15 years in the area and have never previously been objected to by anyone.</p> <p>For the reasons given, I strongly object to the proposal for the removal these signs, especially regarding the safety of my clients and staff.</p>				
<p>I am contacting you regarding the proposed changes to the Legh Road Conservation area. I live at The Firs on Parkfield Road listed in your plans as a "positive" building, and have lived here for 10 years. All the work we have done on the house in that time has been to support the look of the area and to be in keeping with the area.</p>	<p>Document has been amended regarding security signage and residents concerns to retain</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>Whilst I support the continued conservation of the area, I am writing to object to the removal of the security signs eg Homeguard. These security signs act a deterrent to burglars. This crime is on the increase in the neighbourhood – we ourselves were burgled a few years ago, with the thieves smashing through a window at the rear of the property.</p> <p>The signs not only act as a security deterrent, they give 24 hour keyholding contact numbers in the event of an issue, so they are in no means an advertisement as the plan seems to suggest.</p> <p>Is there a design that could, perhaps, be used instead of the existing ones? This may be a compromise as whilst the historic feel of the area needs to be preserved, I do feel that it also needs to move with the times – nothing stands still – our ancestors certainly didn't.</p>				
<p>I write to seek assurance that the sanctuary moor is kept within the conservation area and is not built on.</p> <p>The sanctuary was bought by Daffyd Studdard a couple of years ago and he has drained what was once a bog by building a trench / waterway down the side of the area. This caused a lot of silt together with branches twigs and leaves to flow downriver. The river Lilly behind our house was thick with silt for about a year until it resumed its normal colour. Although I cleared my culvert and drain of silt and rubbish it flowed into the knutsford drainage system and blocked up all the drains along Holford crescent and Brook Lane. The river Lilly stopped flowing and became a stagnant soup! I managed to get CEC to clear these drains but it took two consecutive visits before the river was running again. If any more digging is planned for sanctuary moor please be aware that this will cause blockage downstream again and another clearance at great cost to the council.</p> <p>I'm not aware if planning was received for the digging of the trench but Daffyd has since built a raised pathway from the end of sanctuary moor to Lillybrook drive , whether to gain access to the drive or merely as a</p>	<p>Noted document amendment removal of parts of the CA not actioned.</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>pretty walk I do not know. But I don't think his intention is to build houses, but to protect the moor. I would not like to see this land disturbed again as it greatly affects the river Lilly. I seek reassurance that this land will stay within the conservation area.</p>				
<p>I do not support the removal of the southern section (i.e. north of Goughs Lane) as I consider the CA constraints are of use in maintaining the adjoin properties, whilst I do understand the comments regarding the individual properties within the proposed exclusion - particularly the cul de sacs, which may not have been accepted by a different planner, at a different time.</p> <p>I consider the document, overall, to be an excellent piece of work and agree that the materials and boundary treatment are critical to this conservation area.</p>	<p>Document amended as comments above</p>	<p>x</p>		
<p>I have read through the proposed review of the LRCA and I have a concern about the proposal to prevent all security signage at the frontage of properties in the area</p> <p>Personally, I think that these signs give an extra "layer" of security to the property concerned, as it is clear that there is 24 hour security on the premises and is a disincentive to opportunistic thieves and burglars. It also provides a phone number for someone to call if there is a problem at the property and the alarm has not gone off.</p> <p>I would not have an objection if the number of signs outside any one property were restricted to one, as long as it can still be made clear that the property is protected professionally.</p>	<p>Document has been amended to reflect concerns regarding the security signage</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>We have been advised that Cheshire East are considering banning the use of security signs on properties in the Legh Road Conservation Area. We are strongly opposed to this proposal.</p> <p>It is a citizens responsibility to look after their own security. We have appointed a security firm to monitor our property and look after our safety and at our request they have affixed a sign to our gatepost to inform potential thieves that our property is monitored.</p> <p>This sign is an integral part of our safety precautions and must remain in place.</p> <p>Any attempts to remove the sign will be strongly opposed.</p>		x		
<p>I am writing to express my concern that in the draft document of the “Knutsford Legh Road Conversation Area Appraisal 2021”, the security signage in front of my property demonstrating that my house has a 24 hours security surveillance is regarding by council as an advertisement!</p> <p>As you are aware we frequently have household security issues and break-ins at the Legh Road conservation area and removal of these would simply encourage those who intend to commit a crime to do so. It is known that surveillance can reduce crime rate by over 50%. I would be interested to know if the council takes the decision that these signages will have to be removed, will the council then take the responsibility of the financial loss due to increase the crime rate?</p>	Document has been amended regarding security signage	x		

2. Holmes Chapel

Holmes Chapel Consultation Responses				
Comments	Actions/Proposed/Taken	Object	Neutral	Support

<p>1. The proposed extension to the Conservation Area boundary on Macclesfield Road will now directly affect my home. I want to understand what this will mean going forward. I also struggle to understand why my house has been chosen to be included in this area. It is (to my understanding and eye) of neither special architectural nor historical merit, nor does it form part of the centre of Holmes Chapel. As a long-term resident of the village, I understand the desire to protect the character of its centre, but the inclusion of my residency in the proposed boundary revision (so far from the village centre) seems nothing more than arbitrary line-drawing on the map.</p> <p>2. I am also a local business owner in the village. We own our premises (not rent) which have a shop front on Middlewich Road. I am very concerned about some of the proposals outlined in the report, and note that our premises have been singled out for special attention (with photographs). We have come up against the conservation regulations before, which again seem rigid, arbitrary, and frankly unsupportive of local businesses. Again, we understand the need to protect the character of the village, but with little flexibility from the local authority in terms of energy efficiency, sound proofing, and general renovation, you can understand my concern (and that of my fellow local business owners). Many of us have invested significant sums in restoring these buildings - in our case literally saving it from rack and ruin - yet we come up against inflexibility and lack of compromise at every turn.</p>	<p>Re looked at wording regarding local businesses and changes to reflect both protection of the heritage asset and also the consideration to the emerging needs of climate change /reference to Historic England Guidance on Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings .</p>		x	
<p>As a local business we have already spent tens of thousands trying to bring a property up to standard, whilst still trying to follow the current guidelines. This has involved thousands on specialist secondary glazing – like that is used in recording studios. This was in order to not change the windows. The offices were absolutely freezing and the road noise on Macclesfield Road rendered the front two offices unusable.</p>	<p>Re looked at wording regarding local businesses and changes to reflect both protection of the heritage asset and</p>		x	

<p>I am less worried about the proposals than I am about no mention of the two “elephant in the room” issues. I both work on Middlewich Road and live above the offices on Middlewich Road. Personally, we have to rely on street parking which has pretty much become non-existent in the village without upsetting other residents! Added to that is the impossibility of our clients finding anywhere to park when they try to visit us. The outcome is, even though we now have lovely offices, we end up driving to see clients at their home or office! We used to run seminars from the office but the parking has made that a non-starter now.</p> <p>My last HUGE concern is that the speed and weight and volume of passing traffic shakes our 1870 building to the most unbelievable extent. I honestly believe I will wake up in a pile of rubble one morning – hopefully alive! Middlewich Road is an absolute nightmare. Surely there are some traffic calming measures can be introduced? I don’t know if any noise monitoring has been done but it would be fascinating over a 7 day, 24 hour period. Lorries should be using Sandbach and the new roads now but don’t. The speed vehicles whizz round the roundabout on the blind bend onto Middlewich Road – straight into a pedestrian crossing point followed by the crazy Sainsbury/Costa carpark is just dangerous. I would love to know how this all got passed.</p> <p>Anything that can be done to improve these issues should also be included. A full road survey. There isn’t going to be anything left worth saving!! Businesses will go bust unless parking is improved.</p>	<p>also the consideration to the emerging needs of climate change /reference to Historic England Guidance on Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings .</p> <p>To include as part of the wider management plan for the area, consideration given to issues around traffic management.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

3. Gawsworth

Gawsworth Consultation Comments				
Comments	Actions/Proposed/Taken	Object	Neutral	Support
<p>We have studied the documents pertaining to the extension of the conservation area.</p> <p>We note that the trees forming the approach to the hall which are identified with a circle do not include any of the trees in our garden. We are pleased to see that they are not identified as part of the approach as they are not of the same species and were planted much later.</p> <p>What we are quite concerned about is the fact that the boundary of the extended conservation area appears to take in all of our front garden and terminates almost at the front wall of the house.</p> <p>Please can you explain why the extended boundary does not end with our front boundary hedge and what the ramifications are, of having the extended area intrude so far onto our garden.</p> <p>Please note that we would ask that this is amended and that the extended conservation area only goes as far as our legal boundary with Church Lane.</p>	<p>Boundary has been made clearer and will not terminate at the brook as the species of trees changes beyond this point from the designed intent of the estate approach.</p>		x	
<p>The change in boundary line to the south around New Hall Barnes needs better definition to fix to the existing boundary treatment</p>	<p>Completed</p>			x

4. Bollin Hill, Wilmslow

Bollin Hill Consultation Comments
--

Comments	Actions/Proposed /Taken	Object	Neutral	Support
<p>I am generally in agreement with the proposals but would like consideration to be given to the following:</p> <p>Section 8 - Management Proposals</p> <p>P68, Section 8.5, Objective 5 It should not be necessary for a restriction on PD rights through Article 4 directions.</p> <p>Section 9 - Design Guidance</p> <p>P80 - 9.6 - Windows UPVC windows should not be excluded from consideration. UPVC windows are available which are specifically designed for Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, for example the Residence 9 Collection (www.residencecollection.co.uk). These have a far superior U-value than wooden frames, which is often a requirement to meet the latest insulation regulations.</p> <p>P81 -9.8- Rooflights The restriction of rooflights should be limited to road facing roof slopes.</p>	<p>Changes made to the document</p> <p>Upvc windows are not accepted in conservation areas which is consistent with Historic England Guidance. Where possible the council will stive to enhance the conservation area with appropriate windows which can replace upvc.</p> <p>Article 4 directions are a positive tool to protect historic glazing and other features within the conservation area which currently are permitted to be removed outside the formal planning process. Article 4 Directions are considered by the</p>			<p>x</p>

	LPA to be an appropriate consideration in the future. Further assessment will be done to establish this.			
--	--	--	--	--