

Response Number	Summary	Response Type	Comments
1	Request to acquire the land.	Non Standard	None of the matters raised are pertinent to the disposal of public open space and are matters for the planning process.
2	1)Development would be wholly beneficial to deal with the urgent need for housing in North Cheshire and Knutsford. 2)Road improvements and capacity in nearby primary schools would be required.	Non Standard	None of the matters raised are pertinent to the disposal of public open space and are matters for the planning process.
3	The email appears to be based on the standard form of objection but has been adapted by the respondent. 1) Objects to the development of LPS38 and consequently objects to the disposal of the two strips of land. 2) LPS38 is a natural wilderness / Wildlife area 3) LPS 38 has Ancient woodland which is used by the public & local schools - included with the Neighbourhood plan. 4) The respondent has attached a document entitled 'Protecting and enhancing Knutsford's natural environment'. This report recommends that the corridor network and the whole of this site is identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and protected from development. 5) Residents already have an industrial estate, a household waste recycling centre and a petrol filling station in close proximity so more homes will results in further road improvements being required. 6) Does not believe the new development will create 20 acres of POS. 7) Development of LPS 38 will cause traffic problems. 8) Creating an access through the Blue POS will create a dangerous cross roads. 9) The Green land is owned by the Council , it is a little overgrown but its a haven for insects and birdlife. 10) Local Plan should not of allocated the site if it was landlocked. It is not clear why both pieces of land need to be disposed of - the Green land has a covenant on it which prevents access anyway. The site is not deliverable and should be removed from the local plan. 11) The respondent invites the Portfolio Holder to visit the site of LPS 38 so the portfolio holder can decide if this is the right outcome of this wild oasis.	SFO (3)	1-5 are planning matters and as a result are not for consideration at this stage. 6 This is a matter that will be addressed in the planning process and is presented in the report to indicate to residents the relative benefits of the proposal when considering public open space. Clearly this information is provided prior to and is subject to the planning process. It is noted that the planning process will also insist that any land lost will be replaced within the scheme. 7 - 8 These are matters that would be considered as part of the planning process. 9 The point about wildlife recognised and noted, however loss of public open space designation does not necessarily mean that these features will be affected. This is a matter for the planning process. 10 This point is in part a planning matter, however the reasons the Green land is proposed to be disposed of is set out in the report. The Council was clear in its evidence that was submitted to the examination (and therefore before the Inspector) that that an access into the site may need to be taken over the adjacent area of public open space. This is stated in the Site Selection Final Report: Knutsford, July 2016, available in the Local Plan Strategy Examination Library. The document is referenced PC B014. The Report explains the findings of the Council's site assessment work for the town. Consideration of the Longridge site's availability, achievability and suitability is set out on pages 102 and 104. On page 102 under the Sub-criteria 2.2 'Is the site achievable' the commentary in the final column includes the following statement: 'Some Public Open Space adjacent to the site may be required to enable access to the site. If this land was used a "lift and shift" policy would be applied in order that no loss of Public Open Space occurred. By providing the POS within the development there would be an opportunity to improve facilities in line with suggested modifications to the Plan from Sport England who are keen to see no net loss of playing fields and preferably improvements to facilities.' It is evident, therefore, that this access option was before the Inspector through the public examination process. The following link will take the reader to the relevant document. <a href="http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/library#rhd">http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/library#rhd</a> 11 The point regarding the Portfolio Holder visiting the site of LPS 38 is noted. The Portfolio Holder has confirmed that he has visited the site.
4	See above - same email	SFO (3)	As above
5	1. Are you seeking permission in principle to negotiate the freehold disposal of any of the green and blue land should a planning application be made requiring use of it? 2. Are you seeking to sell the freehold of the blue and green land.? Would this be an open sale or restricted only to the owner or successor in title of the land known as LPS38? When? 3. Are you seeking to confirm a Heads of Agreement or other more binding legal contract with the owner or successor in title , undertaking to sell the freehold when requested subject to conditions. When? 4. Are you looking to so something other than dispose of the freehold, perhaps easements, grant of rights? 5. Whatever the method and timing and amount of disposal, how will you guarantee the benefits / replacement mentioned in the papers proposing the disposal? 6. You state the blue land loss in three ways . 6.6 acres and 4% and strip Could you clarify how much land you would seek to replace the land loss? 7. Is this only for an access road to be defined in an outline planning application or actually intended to enable the final developer total flexibility in their planning application?	Non Standard	1. Cabinet made a decision in October 2017 to dispose of the land subject to the POS process and further work being undertaken with regard to the covenant on the green land. The report is seeking that the Portfolio Holder gives due consideration to the objections and representations received as a result of the statutory process of advertising the Council's intention to dispose of the land referred to in the statutory notices (or any part or parts of that land) and to determine if the Council is to proceed with the proposed disposal of the said land or not.  2. The October 17 Cabinet Decision outlined the Councils intentions in respect of the disposal of this land. Any such disposal would be conditional upon receipt of planning consent for housing with access through land allocated as existing open space within the Green Belt. If planning permission is not granted for any reason the disposal will not proceed.  3. If the decision is made then the next steps would be to agree terms and conditions in respect of the disposal and enter into a contract with the owner of the land.  4. It is likely that easements will be entered into by the parties to facilitate the develoment.  5. Any such disposal would be conditional upon receipt of planning consent for housing.  6. At this stage this is believed to be c4% of the blue land, however the area needed would be defined by the planning process.  7. Yes. In order to minimise the amount of blue land to be lost for public open space, the planning process will be used to determine the extent of the land required. At this stage this is believed to be c4%, however the area needed would be defined by the planning process.

6	<p>1) Dewscope Land is a natural wilderness abundant in Wildlife</p> <p>2) Major development is planned - greenspace is important</p> <p>3) LPS38 is used daily for recreational purposes - dog walking</p> <p>4) LPS38 site is an area of distinctiveness as per the Cheshire Wildlife's Trust report</p> <p>5) Mobberley Road is congested and therefore could not cope with the additional vehicles.</p> <p>6) Creating an access through the POS will create a dangerous cross roads.</p> <p>7) The Council has a duty to maintain the green strip.</p> <p>8) The land should not be included within the local plan if it is landlocked. It is too important ecologically and should be protected from development.</p>	SFO	<p>1 - 6 are matters that relate to the planning process and these would be tested at that stage, should the Council decide to dispose of the lands in question.</p> <p>7 The land in question is currently in the ownership of the Council and as a result this is a correct statement.</p> <p>8 This is a planning matter.</p>
7	As above	SFO	As above
8	As above	SFO	As above
9	As above	SFO	As above
10	As above	SFO	As above
11	<p>As above</p> <p>In addition to this the respondent notes that they walk over here frequently.</p>	SFO	<p>As above</p> <p>It is not clear from the note which area they are referring to, be this LPS 38 the Green Land or the Blue Land. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of dog walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.</p>
12	<p>As above</p> <p>The respondent has also made note that they use the area twice a day for dog walking.</p>	SFO	<p>As above</p> <p>It is not clear from the note which area they are referring to, be this LPS 38 the Green Land or the Blue Land. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of dog walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.</p>
13	As above	SFO	As above
14	As above	SFO	As above
15	As above	SFO	As above
16	As above	SFO	As above
17	As above	SFO	As above
18	As above	SFO	As above
19	As above	SFO	As above
20	As above	SFO	As above
21	<p>As above</p> <p>In addition to this the respondent noted that they use this area 2x a day to walk their dog and recreation.</p>	SFO	<p>As above</p> <p>It is not clear form the note which area they are referring to, be this LPS 38 the Green Land or the Blue Land. Disposal would not prevent the continuation of dog walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.</p>
22	As above	SFO	As above
23	<p>As above</p> <p>The respondent has indicated in a note at the foot of the standard letter that they use the area regularly for walking and wildlife observation.</p>	SFO	<p>As above</p> <p>It is not clear form the note which area they are referring to, be this LPS 38 the Green Land or the Blue Land. Disposal would not prevent the continuation of dog walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity.</p>
24	As above	SFO	As above
25	As above	SFO	As above
26	As above	SFO	As above
27	As above	SFO	As above

28	As above	SFO	As above
29	As above	SFO	As above
30	As above	SFO	As above
31	As above	SFO	As above
32	<p>1) Believes all parties who are potential beneficiaries are known.</p> <p>2) Believes it would be sensible to let Knutsford Town Council work with those parties and parties interested in developing the adjoining land and defer the decision until the covenant is set aside or they have failed.</p>	Non Standard	<p>Cabinet resolved that further work should be undertaken on this. As such, a review of the covenant affecting the Green Land was then carried out with internal and external legal advisers.</p> <p>This work examined whether access across the Green Land was feasible given the restriction on the use of the Green Land. This exercise concluded that crossing the Green Land for this purpose is not feasible as the covenant restricting the use of the Green Land is enforceable such that there is no realistic chance of achieving a principal means of access across this land. In summary the issues with gaining access over the Green Land are;</p> <p>1. The covenant in question is recent, the original contracting parties exist and the Council as a land owner has no powers to compel those that may have an interest in the covenant to come to an agreement.</p> <p>2. Should the Council continue with investigating this matter there would be significant additional costs at a time of severe financial strain on Council resources. There is no available budget for this work and, given the external legal advice already received, such expenditure would be incurred in the knowledge that there is no meaningful prospect of success.</p> <p>3. For the reasons set out above, such an exercise is also likely to take considerable time and this delay will have a direct impact on both Council resources and the delivery of Local Plan objectives, again in the context of no meaningful prospect of success even after such work had been undertaken.</p>
33	<p>1) Noted the need for more Affordable housing in the area.</p> <p>2) Access road will be close to the junction of Higher Downs - will this be a roundabout?</p> <p>3) Believe that traffic from the new development may progress down the Higher Downs Route and not exiting onto the Mobberley Road</p> <p>3) Shame that the access cannot cross the green land which is in the centre of the proposed development.</p> <p>4) What was the reason for the Covenant this has not been made clear - there must have been a purpose behind it, which may be of significance and has not been made clear. Shouldn't it be investigated further.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1 -2 These are matters that relate to the planning process and should be tested at that stage.</p> <p>3 - 4 The covenant relating to the green land has been further tested and the outcome of this work has been reported as part of the documentation relating to this matter.</p>
34	<p>1) Undervalue the loss of POS</p> <p>2) Green belt and Local Wildlife area</p> <p>3) Used regularly for recreation</p> <p>4) access road will make it less safe for children to use</p> <p>5) Should discharge the covenants.</p> <p>6) Planning should determine access requirements and not disposal process.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. The Council takes seriously the potential loss of Public Open Space. The Council has also followed the process relating to the loss of public open space.</p> <p>2. This is a matter that relates to planning and should be tested at that stage.</p> <p>3. This point has been considered in the reporting.</p> <p>4. This is a matter that relates to planning and should be tested at that stage.</p> <p>5. The covenants relating to the Green land have been tested as part of the reporting for this matter and this is not possible.</p> <p>6. In order to minimise the loss of Blue Land, the planning process will define the exact area of land that will be lost in order to cross the Blue Land.</p>
35	<p>1) Land not surplus to requirements as it is used regularly for recreation.</p> <p>2) Undervalue the loss of POS.</p> <p>3) Should discharge the covenants.</p> <p>4) Planning should determine access requirements and not disposal process.</p> <p>5) Cheshire East Council are clearly not prepared to listen to the public and are happy to risk their reputation.</p> <p>6) There is a request to obtain a quote for professional services to progress discharging the covenant and evaluating the risks and to reject the request to dispose of the public open space at this time.</p>	SFO (2)	<p>1. It is noted that the respondent objects to the disposal of the public open space.</p> <p>2. The Council takes seriously the potential loss of Public Open Space. The Council has also followed the process relating to the loss of public open space</p> <p>3. The Council has already undertaken this work, evaluated the risks and the outcome of this work is presented in the decision papers.</p> <p>4. In the proposal the extent of the blue land to be lost as public open space will be determined by the planning process.</p> <p>5. This is not the case. The Council has following the statutory public open space process and undertaken a further period of consultation.</p> <p>6. The Council has already undertaken this work, evaluated the risks and the outcome of this work is presented in the decision papers.</p>

36	<p>1) Opposed to the sale of any of the Blue Land (greenbelt land) for access.</p> <p>2) Prefer no housing but prepared to accept that and the covenant being broken without consultation of beneficiaries (is that legal?)</p> <p>3) 4% 'subject to detailed design process' is far too vague. The respondent is sure this amount of land can be found elsewhere.</p> <p>4) GREEN BELT should 'enhance land...give opportunities for sport' not accommodate an access road.</p> <p>5) Planning should determine access requirements and not disposal process.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. The process that the Council is dealing with is the Public Open Space Notice process and not planning. If the Council does decide to dispose of the land then it would be subject to planning and any residents concerns regarding the green belt could be addressed at that stage.</p> <p>2. The Council is not able to progress down the route suggested for the reason indicated by the respondent. Taking this approach would expose the Council to risk of litigation.</p> <p>3. In order to minimise the amount of blue land to be lost for public open space, the planning process will be used to determine the extent of the land required. At this stage this is believed to be c4%, however the area needed would be defined by the planning process.</p> <p>4. This is a matter for the planning process.</p> <p>5. The planning process will determine the extent of the land that will be lost and will also ensure that any land lost will be replaced within the scheme.</p>
37	See no 35	SFO (2)	See no 35
38	See no 35	SFO (2)	See no 35
39	<p>1) Land not surplus to requirements as it is used regularly for recreation. Disposal should not even be considered.</p> <p>2) The Council should obtain a quote for professional services to progress discharging the covenant and evaluating the risks and reject the request to dispose of this land at this stage</p> <p>3) Land if required for a road should be detailed through the planning process and not by this method of disposal.</p> <p>4) A concern was made that the Council is bypassing planning protection policy and possibly prejudicing its own decision making.</p> <p>5) The Council should act more for the public interest and protect our assets and not support private developers in maximising their profit.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. It is noted that the respondent objects to the disposal of the public open space.</p> <p>2. The Council has already undertaken this work, evaluated the risks and the outcome of this work is presented in the decision papers.</p> <p>3. In the proposal the extent of the blue land to be lost as public open space will be determined by the planning process.</p> <p>4. This is not the case. The Public Open Space notice process is separate and independent of any future planning process.</p> <p>5. This point does not relate to the POS process.</p>
40	<p>1) CEC should not be sell this green space which has been in existence since the estate was built.</p> <p>2) Selling land against the wishes of local residents.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1 &amp;2. The Council takes the loss of public open space lands seriously. It does hove the powers however to dispose of public open space land. The objection to the loss of public open space land is noted.</p>
41	<p>See no 35.</p> <p>An additional paragraph has been added to this standard form of objection confirming that the land is used on a daily basis by the respondent and their spouse and requests that it remains public open space.</p>	SFO (2)	<p>See no 35</p> <p>Noted request for land to remain public open space. Noted that the respondent uses the land on a daily basis.</p>
42	As above	SFO (2)	As above
43	<p>1) The exact detail of the requested decision is unclear.</p> <p>2) Decision to dispose of the land in advance of a planning application is unwise and against the public interest.</p> <p>3) Council reputational risk – legal work required to secure planning conditions.</p> <p>4) Cabinet Oct 2017 required Officers to carry out further work on the covenant – no evidence provided and reliance on 'external legal advisers' requires scrutiny.</p> <p>5)Capital receipt for sale &amp; the inclusion of LPS38 in CECLPS.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. Cabinet made a decision in October 2017 to dispose of the land subject to the POS process and further work being undertaken with regard to the covenant on the green land. The report is seeking that the Portfolio Holder gives due consideration to the objections and representations received as a result of the statutory process of advertising the Council's intention to dispose of the land referred to in the statutory notices (or any part or parts of that land) and to determine if the Council is to proceed with the proposed disposal of the said land or not.</p> <p>2. This is not the case. Any such disposal would be conditional upon receipt of planning consent for housing with access through land allocated as existing open space within the Green Belt. If planning permission is not granted for any reason the disposal will not proceed.</p> <p>3. This point does not relate to the POS process. The approach taken in the proposal was to minimise the extent of land that would be taken. The extent of the blue land to be taken will be dictated by the planning process.</p> <p>4. The Council has obtained its own internal and external legal advice on this matter. Although the Council does not publish legal advice that it has obtained, the culmination of this legal advice is captured in the reporting. It should also be noted that the Council's legal team also input into any reports where legal advice is required and have their own section of the report.</p> <p>5. Noted, the Council will receive a capital receipt for disposing of this land.</p>
44	1)Loss of playing fields that have and continue to be used on a regular basis.	Non Standard	1. Objection to the loss of public open space is noted.
45	<p>1) The current proposal to dispose of c4% of the blue land is an improvement.</p> <p>2) The Council is using some of the benefits that will be realised through the planning process to demonstrate that the outcomes it expects to achieve but at the same time is rejecting matters relating to planning as part of this process.</p> <p>3) Believes that the matter is a catch 22. The POS process needs to be progressed to then address the planning matters and this will inform the extend of the land to be disposed.</p> <p>4) The covenant on the green strip of land is written to prevent the development of LPS 38. Therefore there is a risk that the interested parties would sue the Council.</p> <p>5) The proposal is in breach of local planning conditions. A principal concern is a single access / exit from the site.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. It is noted that the respondent acknowledges that the propsal is to dispose of c4% is an improvement.</p> <p>2. The Public Open Space notice process is separate and independent of any future planning process. However, In order to minimise the loss of Blue Land, the planning process will define the exact area of land that will be lost in order to cross the Blue Land.</p> <p>3. Noted. The approach taken in the proposal was to minimise the extent of land that would be taken. The extent of the blue land to be taken will be dictated by the planning process.</p> <p>4. The Council has obtained its own internal and external legal advice on this matter. Although the Council does not publish legal advice that it has obtained, the culmination of this legal advice is captured in the reporting. It should also be noted that the Council's legal team also input into any reports where legal advice is required and have their own section of the report.</p> <p>5. This is a planning matter.</p>

46	<p>1) Land not surplus to requirements as it is used regularly for recreation.</p> <p>2) Undervalue the loss of POS</p> <p>3) Should discharge the covenants.</p> <p>4) Planning should determine access requirements and not disposal process.</p> <p>5) Cheshire East Council are clearly not prepared to listen to the public and are happy to risk their reputation.</p> <p>6) There is a request to obtain a quote for professional services to progress discharging the covenant and evaluating the risks and to reject the request to dispose of the public open space at this time.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. It is noted that the respondent objects to the disposal of the public open space.</p> <p>2. The Council takes seriously the potential loss of Public Open Space. The Council has also followed the process relating to the loss of public open space</p> <p>3. The Council has already undertaken this work, evaluated the risks and the outcome of this work is presented in the decision papers.</p> <p>4. In the proposal the extent of the blue land to be lost as public open space will be determined by the planning process.</p> <p>5. This is not the case. The Council has following the statutory public open space process and undertaken a further period of consultation.</p> <p>6. The Council has already undertaken this work, evaluated the risks and the outcome of this work is presented in the decision papers.</p>
47	<p>1) The Town Council remains strongly opposed to the proposed disposal of the public open space on Longridge/North Downs delineated blue on plans.</p> <p>2) The assertion that disposing of only 4% of the land is acceptable is dismissed by the Town Council. As a matter of principle, we remain strongly opposed to any disposal of this public open space when it has not been proven that the covenant cannot be set aside.</p> <p>3) The Town Council believe that it is misleading to say that the benefiting land is not identified.</p> <p>4) The Town Council have obtained HMLR information on the Longridge Estate and Believe that Manchester City Council, Great Places and 110 other owners have an interest in the land. They believe that the majority of the other owners are owner occupiers, with some residing elsewhere in Knutsford and some owned by companies or landlords from outside the area.</p> <p>5) The Town Council implores you to undertake thorough exploratory work on the covenant to seek its discharge. The Town Council offers its support in doing this, in organising meetings and engaging with the beneficiaries.</p> <p>6) The Town Council supports the development of LPS 38 and the disposal of the Green Land as they believe that this has great potential to provide community benefit in the surrounding area.</p> <p>7) A request for a meeting prior to a decision.</p> <p>8) The Cheshire East Design guide sets out a requirement for multiple accesses and this would not be met by a single access over the playing fields.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. The objection to the disposal of the land edged blue is noted.</p> <p>2 - 5. The matter of the covenant has been tested and the result of this is presented in the reporting.</p> <p>6) Support for the disposal of the Green Land is noted.</p> <p>7) The portfolio holder is not able to meet any groups or individuals in advance of the decision. All comments received will be provided to the Portfolio Holder for consideration as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>8) This is a planning matter.</p>
48	<p>1) Dewscope Land is a natural wilderness abundant in Wildlife</p> <p>2) Major development is planned - greenspace is important</p> <p>3) LPS38 is used daily for recreational purposes - dog walking</p> <p>4) LPS38 site is an area of distinctiveness as per the Cheshire Wildlife's Trust report</p> <p>5) Mobberley Road is congested and therefore could not cope with the additional vehicles.</p> <p>6) Creating an access through the POS will create a dangerous cross roads.</p> <p>7) The Council has a duty to maintain the green strip.</p> <p>8) The land should not be included within the local plan if it is landlocked. It is too important ecologically and should be protected from development.</p> <p>In addition to these comments the respondent notes that they use the area for walking regularly and will be sad to see it destroyed.</p>	SFO	<p>1 - 6 are matters that relate to the planning process and these would be tested at that stage, should the Council decide to dispose of the lands in question.</p> <p>7 The land in question is currently in the ownership of the Council and as a result this is a correct statement.</p> <p>8 This is a planning matter.</p> <p>In relation to the hand written note it is not clear if the comment relates to the Blue Land or LPS38.</p>
49	As above	SFO	As above
50	As above	SFO	As above
51	As above	SFO	As above
52	As above	SFO	As above
53	As above	SFO	As above
54	As above	SFO	As above
55	As above	SFO	As above
56	As above	SFO	As above
57	As above	SFO	As above

58	As above The respondent also notes at the foot of their letter that they walk their dogs on this field, the road is busy enough as it is. I have 3 disabled children and regularly take them for walks over here and fly our kites.	SFO	As above The comments at the foot of the email is evidence of use of the land as public open space. It is noted that it is proposed that c4% of the blue land would be disposed of, subject to the planning process. As a result it is not anticipated that the uses described would be prevented by the proposals. The reference to traffic is a planning and highways matter.
59	As above	SFO	As above
60	As above	SFO	As above
61	As above	SFO	As above
62	As above	SFO	As above
63	As above	SFO	As above
64	As above	SFO	As above
65	As above	SFO	As above
66	As above	SFO	As above
67	As above	SFO	As above
68	As above An additional note has been made by the respondent, indicating that they use this area to take the Children out to see the nature.	SFO	As above It is not clear which piece of land is referred to. It is noted that that the letter objects to the development of LPS 38 and accordingly the sale of the two adjoining strips of land.
69	As above	SFO	As above
70	As above	SFO	As above
71	As above The Respondent also indicates by way of a note at the foot of the letter that they walk dogs in the area.	SFO	As above It is not clear which piece of land is referred to. It is noted that that the letter objects to the development of LPS 38 and accordingly the sale of the two adjoining strips of land. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of dog walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.
72	As above	SFO	As above
73	As above	SFO	As above
74	As above	SFO	As above
75	As above	SFO	As above
76	As above	SFO	As above
77	As above	SFO	As above

78	<p>1) Objects to the development of LPS 38 and the sale of the two parcels of adjacent land.</p> <p>2) Saddened that the council plans to sell part of the football pitch and break a legal covenant in selling the strip of land opposite the Longridge estate.</p> <p>3) The local authority has failed to actively maintain the playing field.</p> <p>4) A further housing development in this area will put further strain on local infrastructure and facilities.</p> <p>5) Believes its disingenuous not to have explicitly outlined the implications of this development in the Local plan on the Green and Blue Land.</p> <p>6) Believes that the main beneficiary of the proposal will be the owner of LPS38. Understands that the owners father purchased the land many years ago.</p> <p>7) Agrees with the need for more affordable housing in the town. Does not want this to be at the expense of existing communities.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. The comment is noted however objection or not to LPS 38 being brought forward is not a matter for this process, but is a matter for the planning process.</p> <p>2. The point regarding the loss of public open space is noted, however the respondent is not correct in terms of disposal of land and covenants. There is no prohibition on disposing of land with a covenant in place.</p> <p>3. This is a matter relating to maintenance and not the potential loss of public open space.</p> <p>4. This is a planning matter and should be considered at that stage should the disposal of public open space be agreed.</p> <p>5. This is a planning matter and not related to the loss of open space: The following advice has been obtained from the Council's planning team.</p> <p><i>The Council was clear in its evidence that was submitted to the examination (and therefore before the Inspector) that that an access into the site may need to be taken over the adjacent area of public open space. This is stated in the Site Selection Final Report: Knutsford, July 2016, available in the Local Plan Strategy Examination Library. The document is referenced PC B014. The Report explains the findings of the Council's site assessment work for the town. Consideration of the Longridge site's availability, achievability and suitability is set out on pages 102 and 104. On page 102 under the Sub-criteria 2.2 'Is the site achievable' the commentary in the final column includes the following statement:</i></p> <p><i>'Some Public Open Space adjacent to the site may be required to enable access to the site. If this land was used a "lift and shift" policy would be applied in order that no loss of Public Open Space occurred. By providing the POS within the development there would be an opportunity to improve facilities in line with suggested modifications to the Plan from Sport England who are keen to see no net loss of playing fields and preferably improvements to facilities.'</i></p> <p><i>It is evident, therefore, that this access option was before the Inspector through the public examination process.</i></p> <p>The following link will take the reader to the relevant document.  <a href="http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/library#rhd">http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/library#rhd</a></p> <p>6. We can confirm that the owner of the land forming LPS 38 is not the Council.</p> <p>7. Position regarding affordable housing is noted.</p>
79	<p>1) Dewscope Land is a natural wilderness abundant in Wildlife</p> <p>2) Major development is planned - greenspace is important</p> <p>3) LPS38 is used daily for recreational purposes - dog walking</p> <p>4) LPS38 site is an area of distinctiveness as per the Cheshire Wildlife's Trust report</p> <p>5) Mobberley Road is congested and therefore could not cope with the additional vehicles.</p> <p>6) Creating an access through the POS will create a dangerous cross roads.</p> <p>7) The Council has a duty to maintain the green strip.</p> <p>8) The land should not be included within the local plan if it is landlocked. It is too important ecologically and should be protected from development.</p> <p>9) The area is an asset to the surrounding housing</p>	SFO	<p>1 - 6 are matters that relate to the planning process and these would be tested at that stage, should the Council decide to dispose of the lands in question.</p> <p>7 The land in question is currently in the ownership of the Council and as a result this is a correct statement.</p> <p>8 This is a planning matter.</p> <p>9. This point is noted.</p>
80	As above	SFO	As above
81	<p>As above</p> <p>In addition a note is added that the respondent walk the dogs and use it as a camera club.</p>	SFO	<p>As above</p> <p>It is not clear which piece of land is referred to. It is noted that that the letter objects to the development of LPS 38 and accordingly the sale of the two adjoining strips of land.</p>
82	As above	SFO	As above
83	As above	SFO	As above
84	As above	SFO	As above
85	As above	SFO	As above
86	As above	SFO	As above
87	As above	SFO	As above
88	As above	SFO	As above
89	<p>As above</p> <p>In addition to this the respondent noted that they use the fields for nature walks with their Grandchildren.</p>	SFO	<p>As above</p> <p>It is not clear which fields are referred to in the note at the foot of the letter. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.</p>

90	As above	SFO	As above
91	As above	SFO	As above
92	As above	SFO	As above
93	As above	SFO	As above
94	As above The respondent has also noted on the foot of the letter that they walk the dog all week.	SFO	As above It is not clear which area is referred to in the note at the foot of the letter. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of dog walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.
95	As above	SFO	As above
96	As above	SFO	As above
97	As above	SFO	As above
98	As above	SFO	As above
99	<p>1. We repeat our request that we would appreciate a meeting with you before you decide on the (unclear) proposal. This could not now be before September 10th.</p> <p>2. We ask that you do not agree to dispose of this land at this time, as there is considerable reputational, legal &amp; financial risk to Cheshire East Council. As we have questioned the Officers reports we ask that you consider whether it is appropriate for you to take this decision as an individual without further scrutiny.</p> <p>3. Unwritten, uncredited, external advice is not good enough. We ask that you seek a quote for the engagement of professional services to formally start the process of discharging the covenant and request payment of this by the party requesting access. This would remove the report writers stated barrier to CEC re such action.</p> <p>4. We ask that you question the summary of representation and responses given in the report, where mention of a letter from the Open Spaces society was not explicitly declared and the tone dismisses public representation by continuing to understate the community value and overstate the benefits of disposing of the land. This land (since 1969) is playing field, recreational amenity land in the green belt adjacent to a local wildlife site as per the Local plan evidence papers and this has implications for future planning.</p> <p>5. We ask that you consider that it would be in the Knutsford public interest to alternatively take this request for access forward entirely via the planning process.</p> <p>6. To show good faith we also request a review of the Asset of Community Value decision which was recently refused following the assets team involvement.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. The Council has noted the date and proposes not to undertake the decision meeting before the 10th September.</p> <p>2. The points raised in this comment do not relate to the loss of open space decision.</p> <p>3. It is presumed that the point relates to Legal Advice. The Council has obtained its own internal and external legal advice on this matter. Although the Council does not publish legal advice that it has obtained, the culmination of this legal advice is captured in the reporting. It should also be noted that the Council's legal team also input into any reports where legal advice is required and have their own section of the report.</p> <p>4. It is not disputed that the land in question (both the Blue and Green land) is not public open space.</p> <p>5. The approach taken in the proposal was to minimise the extent of land that would be taken. The extent of the blue land to be taken will be dictated by the planning process.</p> <p>6. This is a separate process and not related to the current decision before the portfolio holder.</p>
100	<p>1) Objects to the proposal.</p> <p>2) Strongly objects to the disposal of the Green Land. The land as is enhances the respondent and Longridge residents environment by a number of ways, including visual amenity. The strip of land also acts as wildlife corridor.</p> <p>3) Development will increase traffic / cause parking issues. Concern that new roundabout arrangements on the Mobberley Road and Park Gate Junction will also present issues for residents, pushing traffic onto Longridge.</p> <p>4) Increasing the size of Longridge area will have a detrimental effect on residents, reducing the sense of belonging.</p> <p>5) No evidence that the new development will provide regenerative benefits.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1 and 2. The objection to the disposal of both parcels of land is noted.</p> <p>3 - 4. This is a matter for the planning process.</p> <p>5. The report stated that the disposal of the Green Land provides an opportunity to remove a barrier between the proposed development and the Longridge Estate as this would enable the opportunities that could be created by this to be explored at the planning stage and incorporated in the development of LPS38.</p>



101	<p>1) Consider that it is most beneficial to both the existing residents of Longridge and those of any proposed development; that if any development is to proceed, that the Council work with those included within the covenant to secure the ‘green land’ as access to the site with an active frontage along Longridge.</p> <p>2) The objection centres on the loss of public open space, potential missed opportunities that could derive from a central entrance between the existing and allocated site if any development were to go ahead, and the impact that this will have on existing residents and businesses in Longridge given that there is another way of progressing any potential development through an alternative access. Were access to be taken through the existing open space, isolated communities would be created.</p> <p>3) Great Places consider that the loss of this open space would have a significant, negative impact upon the existing residents of Longridge and the North Downs area.</p> <p>4) It is well reported that public open space contributes to social wellbeing and therefore, continued, safe access to this space must be protected before, during and after any construction on the neighbouring site for existing residents including children and vulnerable residents.</p> <p>5) Any loss of green field land inevitably results in a loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>6) The ‘blue land’ falls within the defined Green Belt boundary. The purposes of the Green Belt as identified within the NPPF (2018) include preventing areas merging into one another and preventing the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.</p>	Non Standard	<p>1. The Council has carefully considered the issues related to the covenant and the outcome of this is articulated in the reporting on this matter.</p> <p>2. This is a matter that relates to planning issues and should be addressed at that stage of the process, subject to a decision made on the loss of public open space.</p> <p>3. The Council has worked hard to minimise the loss of public open space and in the documents relating to this matter set out the way it is proposed to minimise the loss of public open space.</p> <p>4. This is a general point relating to loss of public open space. The Council takes the issue of loss of public open space seriously and does not propose to take decisions around loss of public open space lightly.</p> <p>5. It is not clear if this is a comment relating to loss of public open space or is a general comment relating to development in general. This is a planning matter.</p> <p>6. This point does not relate to the loss of public open space and is a planning matter.</p>
102	Enquiry if an email had been sent to continue to object to the disposal of the North Downs playing field. The email identifies the date of the end of the submission period and notes that it is important that CEC believe that eyes are still upon them. It then sets out Standard Form of Objection 2.	SFO (2)	See response no 35 for a response.
103	<p>1) Dewscope Land is a natural wilderness abundant in Wildlife</p> <p>2) Major development is planned - greenspace is important</p> <p>3) LPS38 is used daily for recreational purposes - dog walking</p> <p>4) LPS38 site is an area of distinctiveness as per the Cheshire Wildlife's Trust report</p> <p>5) Mobberley Road is congested and therefore could not cope with the additional vehicles.</p> <p>6) Creating an access through the POS will create a dangerous cross roads.</p> <p>7) The Council has a duty to maintain the green strip.</p> <p>8) The land should not be included within the local plan if it is landlocked. It is too important ecologically and should be protected from development.</p> <p>The respondent has also noted on the foot of the letter that they use this area for walking on a regular basis.</p>	SFO	<p>1 - 6 are matters that relate to the planning process and these would be tested at that stage, should the Council decide to dispose of the lands in question.</p> <p>7 The land in question is currently in the ownership of the Council and as a result this is a correct statement.</p> <p>8 This is a planning matter.</p> <p>It is not clear which fields are referred to in the note at the foot of the letter. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.</p>
104	As above	SFO	As above.
105	<p>As above</p> <p>The respondent has also noted on the foot of the letter that their family use this area.</p>	SFO	<p>As above.</p> <p>It is not clear which fields are referred to in the note at the foot of the letter. Disposal of the blue land would not prevent the continuation of walking on the remainder of the public open space at The Downs without the activity being materially restricted.</p>
106	As above	SFO	As above.
107	As above	SFO	As above.
108	As above	SFO	As above.
109	As above	SFO	As above.
110	As above	SFO	As above.
111	As above	SFO	As above.
112	As above	SFO	As above.