

## Annex 2A

### Additional Sites Document: Summaries of Representations Received

4,755 comments received: 335 in support; 4,064 objections; and 356 comments.

Development Strategy - Possible Additional Sites Proposed by Developer and Land Interests 65 (made by 62 people) Support Object Comment	The house building options are not a 'strategy' or a 'local plan'. They are a planning application by a development company and nothing more.
	Indefensible not to revisit proposals following AZ announcements; impacts housing requirement and provides a brownfield option; easy route for developers to rip up the Green Belt
	Alderley Park should be included in the sites for further consultation
	No need for additional sites as there are already enough in the DS , no evidence base of need
	Please note the paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires planning policy to be informed by a robust and up to date Needs Assessment.
	The sites identified as part of the consultation should be considered in addition to those sites already identified in the SHLAA and Local Plan to positively deliver additional homes.
	Object to building on greenfield sites. The Borough Council should be concentrating their efforts on securing sustainable development on brownfield land in accordance with the broad principles of the NPPF. Brownfield first
	Should identify lots of small plots to deliver all the homes required and minimise dramatic impact of developing large swathes of land; developing in larger towns results in a density that reduces quality of life and leaves small villages untouched. Need policies to reduce unoccupied homes and reduce single occupancy homes.
	Request that a policy is included in the Local Plan that states the potential for developments to impact upon Network Rail level crossings and that developers will be required to contribute financially to upgrading works to the relevant level crossing impacted,

	in the same way as financial contributions towards highway improvements are required to make developer's schemes acceptable.
	The proximity and accessibility of some of the sites (particularly those in the north of the Borough) to Manchester Airport could be advantageous. Please also note the Aerodrome Safeguarding requirements that would need to be adhered to should development be progressed at any of the proposed sites that are located within Manchester Airport's safeguarded area.
	CEC will need to screen these sites in relation to the Natural England's Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Natural England's comments made on previous DS & EPP consultation should also be considered. Policy should be strengthened re the protection of designated areas and where possible avoiding effects completely or where not possible - mitigation measures. The Habitats Regulations Assessment should be updated to ensure compliancy with Regulation 102 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
	Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council submitted a joint letter in response to the DS consultation. Many of the concerns raised are relevant to the additional site consultation also. Greater restraint should be practised in close proximity of the North Staffordshire border so as not to undermine the regeneration strategy set out in the adopted joint Newcastle under- Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy Sites should be selected, which would not add to the pressure to encourage out migration from both the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme and City of Stoke-on-Trent When reviewing its Green Belt boundary Cheshire East should carefully consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development closer towards the border with North Staffordshire.
	Sites O & P are within the Airport Safeguarding Map and as such Manchester Airport, are statutory consultees.
	Upcast Lane is a suitable site for residential development included as an alternative site in the Development Strategy
	The Core Strategy should allocate sites that plan for compact, sustainable communities, provide sustainable transport choices, protect the unbuilt environment, foster distinctive communities, mix land uses, encourage inclusive communities, create a range of housing opportunities and choice.
	The School Lane site in Bunbury (SHLAA REF 2890) should therefore be considered as being 'strategic' in nature because its development necessary is to help maintain and deliver key services in an important Local Service Centre
	Cheshire East needs to undertake a formal Greenbelt Review
	Need to survey the amount of empty office space in Wilmslow. Need to take account of fact that Internet is replacing shop. Need to do a traffic count in Wilmslow
	when evaluating a site, you should ensure that there is consideration for deliverable and developable for specialist housing for the elderly
	Land at Macclesfield Road, Holmes Chapel is available, sustainable and deliverable and would represent rounding off of settlement. Favourable over other sites particularly as does not involve Green Belt. Request to include it in Local Plan for up to 110 dwellings
	The CEC statement of having no opinion on the additional sites is wrong; there must be some opinion on the need for more

	development sites. By excluding this opinion, even the context of capacity / delivery, the Council diminishes the value and appropriateness of the consultation.
	It is not clear from the consultation document as to how the LPA will use or respond to any comments submitted, and this must be stated clearly. The statement 'the Council has no opinion on the suitability of these sites at present' is therefore likely to be untrue as it is assumed that several of the sites included in this document have been assessed by the LPA, not least in the SHLAA and Call-for-Sites exercises
	In reviewing individual site details, the LPA will need to apply a robust and consistent approach as advocated in NPPF and to make that assessment available for review.
	Transport impact upon neighbouring Greater Manchester need to be considered, i.e increase in commuters travelling from Cheshire East into Manchester
	The Local Transport Plans of Greater Manchester and Cheshire East both aim to reduce congestion, improve the overall efficiency of the highway network, improve access to key services and reduce the need o travel. It is therefore important for local authorities to develop a joint approach the location of development and delivery of infrastructure, within the context of available funding. Development proposals need to be supported by evidence that the impacts on transport infrastructure, both in Cheshire East and Greater Manchester, are acceptable and that any necessary mitigation measures can be delivered.
	Additional development which does not have severe impacts upon the strategic road network is welcomed.
	Query why the Council are only consulting on these additional sites for a four week time period. If these sites have the potential to be included within the Development Strategy they should be subject to equivalent consultation and sustainability appraisals. Concerned that there has been no detailed analysis of site constraints, and that there is the absence of sustainability appraisals for these sites.
	Consider that there is clear evidence that the decisions regarding these sites have been predetermined by the Council
	Request that land to the rear of 481 Crewe Road Winterley be considered at the site allocations stage for conversion to older persons accommodation.
	The overall housing target to be set out within the Local Plan should not be reduced (below the previous target of 27,000) as a result of the latest population projections & a higher figure remains justified. Sites ranging from 95 homes to 2,500 new homes have or currently are being consulted on as "strategic" sites. It is our view that this requires clarification.
	Nowhere is any guidance provided as to what the Council considers to represent a "strategic" site in quantitative terms. It is our view that this requires clarification, and is not helped by the absence of spatial objectives within the Development Strategy
	Land off Chelford Road, Henbury could come forward either a) in isolation, or b) as part of a larger land release as identified in the DMTS (Option J for 700 new homes). Option b) would represent a "strategic" site due to its size & potential significant contribution to housing growth. Site is in a sustainable location; it fulfils fewer of the five purposes of Green Belt than CEC sites
	Land off Blakelow Road - site has excellent potential to come forward for housing. This site should be consulted on now as a "strategic" release. Site is deliverable.

	Our Client has landholdings within Macclesfield. This comprises 12 hectares of land situated to the east of London Road to the south-east of Macclesfield, and which forms part of a larger land parcel bounded by fixed boundaries, notably Macclesfield Canal to the east, and London Road to the west. It was not identified as a strategic site within the Development Strategy published in February. Our Client is therefore disappointed that the site has not been identified for consultation within the latest Additional Sites consultation
	Council needs to include a clear policy framework in the Core Strategy that recognises the need for the release of both strategic and smaller sites early in the plan period to meet the district's market and affordable needs
	An ePetition signed by 548 people requesting that the Green Belt from Stapeley should be extended along the corridor South of Newcastle Road to meet the adjoining Green Belt zone in Chorlton.
	If any of these Possible Additional Sites do come out of this process favourably and are consequently included within the DS, these will need to be thoroughly assessed. If the Council's intention is that the next stage of consultation is a Submission Draft Local Plan (at which point the Council should be consulting on a plan which it believes to be 'sound') they cannot include sites that have been subject to an insufficient level of assessment and meaningful public consultation. We would assert that it would not be appropriate or sound to include any of these additional sites within a Submission Draft prior to them being subject to a further stage of consultation where further details/information and a sustainability appraisal of these sites was provided for comment. Furthermore, the Council should clarify which other sites put forward, including our clients' interests, have been discounted and why.
	CEC has failed to use a robust evidence base and that the approach taken in relation to the Possible Additional Site consultation document is meaningless and of negligible benefit to the plan-making process. This document will not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development contrary to Paragraph 151 of the Framework and Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act and that it will not be found sound upon independent examination. Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans
	Toft Road provides a viable development opportunity which would contribute towards the identified growth target for Knutsford in a sustainable location. CEC has provided no evidence to demonstrate that other options are more suitable for Knutsford.
	Dickens Land in Poynton. This site provides a viable development opportunity in an accessible location which would contribute towards the identified growth target for Poynton. CEC has provided no evidence to demonstrate that other options are more suitable for this settlement.
	Waterloo Road in Poynton. This site provides a viable development opportunity in an accessible location which would contribute towards the identified growth target for Poynton. CEC has provided no evidence to demonstrate that other options are more suitable for this settlement.
	Smaller immediately available sites on the periphery of Handforth such as land to the east of Wilmslow Road on the junction of the A555 and B5358 would assist the Local Authority in demonstrating a 5 year housing land supply but have been overlooked in recent consultation exercises. It is very unlikely the strategic extension would deliver any houses in the next 5 years that will

	materially contribute towards reducing the Council's immediate housing shortfall.
	Site H in the Alsager Town Strategy should be allocated
	There are no sites in Audlem that could be considered 'strategic'. An alternative approach; identify a "broad location" for growth in Audlem (within the Core Strategy), thus allowing the precise sites to be defined as part of the Site Allocations DPD consultation process.
	Land at Moorsfield Avenue, Audlem should be identified for housing growth, as part of a 'broad location' for housing growth in Audlem. Site is in a sustainable location, close to the village centre points with no Green Belt constraints.
	We support the view that no more sites have been raised by developers. We now need to protect green spaces in Somerford from any development in the future. A principal of a green belt separating Somerford from Congleton has to be established.
	It is a travesty of justice not to consider more sites at this stage; no explanation given for this; SHLAA site 2548, 2549, 2550 and 2957 should be included in the Core Strategy for early development and should be excluded from the Green Gap.
	As set out in the SHLAA consultation response that the site (land off Holmes Chapel Road, Middlewich) is a suitable site to deliver homes in a sustainable location in order to meet the residential requirements of Middlewich and the wider Cheshire East area and we would be grateful if this could be noted.
	Re: Land off Church Lane, Wistaston. Totally undesirable for building on. The last remaining meadows in the village / parish. The resulting traffic problems do not bear thinking about
	Unclear if smaller sites outside settlements will be allocated over & above current commitments, windfalls & the final "strategic" allocations. What if a number of excellent 'smaller sites' were to come forward that (cumulatively) would result in the need to delete one or more of the favoured 'strategic sites'? All sites should be considered. Out client's 4 sites should have been included.
	Submission supporting inclusion of land west of Congleton off the A534 Sandbach Road as a strategic site in the Local Plan.
	None of the additional sites should be considered sequentially preferable to any of Muller Property's land holdings
	Consider that this consultation is unhelpful in maximising the participation of Wilmslow residents as it only highlights one single site in Wilmslow.
Site A- White Moss Quarry 89 representations by 88 43 Support 29 Object 17 Comment	Support, if not too much strain on Alsager, and that the road (B5077) is improved between Alsager and Crewe; road must include footpaths and a cycle route. A traveller site must be removed, and the development must be sensitive to the neighbouring estate of Cranberry Moss. The railway crossing at Radway Green must also be removed to reduce pressure on the road infrastructure.
	The at-grade crossing of the Crewe-Alsager railway should be replaced by a bridge.
	Road infrastructure should be improved - B5077 is a well-known accident black spot

	More retail is needed at this point of town and plans shown offered such provision
	Should be a pedestrian link between this site and Close Lane/Nursery road, to link to Alsager & give a safe route to school.
	Provides additional housing without spoiling Alsager
	Alsager is already providing a number of locations for potential residential development.
	Further housing growth will overstretch the existing infrastructure
	Schools are full & school leaving age rises in two years – will make things worse.
	Site currently operated is processing land-fill type materials & was approved for a limited period, to then be restored to 'countryside' – forming a 'green buffer zone' between Alsager and the motorway, and beyond, towards Crewe.
	Environmental issues: freshwater pools are an important habitat for newts; also orchids; adders, foxes & bats.
	Future expansion of M6 would be compromised; improvements to Junction 16 of M6 required.
	Access to M6 should be made at one set of two way traffic lights at the junction of B5077 Crewe Rd/Butterton Lane and Radway Green Rd B5078. (There should NOT be a dogleg or offset junction with three phases.)
	The 1,000 dwellings should count towards the total for Alsager. This would therefore complete the 20-year housing requirement for Alsager, and more, without needing to exceed the already approved 400 homes on the MMU site and without building on the MMU playing fields and undeveloped fields.
	New houses will suffer from noise pollution. An acoustic barrier will be needed beside the motorway.
	Site should be a nature area.
	Good site overall - close to the M6 & amenities; already in use as a sand and peat quarry.
	Site is brownfield now but when restored would be Greenfield & should not be developed.
	Much of the site falls within the blast exclusion zone of the Radway Green armaments factory
	Site should be restored for local amenity purposes.
	The woodland on the south west and north west of the site is virgin, close to an SSSI, ancient woodland and should be preserved.
	Development too dense - 400 properties more suitable
	Maybe best to have employment development in the section nearest the Crewe Road, together with a smaller number of homes.
	Access should be opened up to Crewe Road at two points (one being the current traffic lights), to an extension of Coronation Avenue (the access point and junction with Close Lane already exists) and to a widened Nursery Road. The junction with the traffic lights should be widened to accommodate a lane for traffic in both directions on Crewe Road turning towards the M6, so as not to impede traffic going straight on or onto the new estate
	Current footpaths will need to be retained, and new ones should be created (including maybe a footbridge across the motorway) for recreational purposes.
	Proposal is not sustainable.
	Infrastructure & services cannot cope.

	Not a suitable site for development
	Use brownfield sites at Twyfords and Hassall Road instead.
	Twyfords & MMU sites should be enough housing sites for Alsager.
	Building on this land should not put the surrounding greenfield land at risk of development – could join up to Alsager.
	Site is preferable as it is near to employment and also the M6
	Housing in Alsager would be on a scale that is disproportionate to its current size and proportionately excessive compared to other larger towns.
	Need to preserve as much farmland/ green gap/ playing and sport provision as possible.
	Development of site would enable the restriction of the housing on the MMU site to the brownfield footprint and so remove the necessity to destroy publicly funded playing fields
	Housing is preferable to the disruption and pollution that residents currently suffer.
	Currently issues with heavy lorries and if the developers contribute to highway improvements this seems to be an excellent proposal
	Could be a sustainable self contained development with minimum visual intrusion, if planned correctly
	This development should take priority over the Duchy of Lancaster's Green Belt Proposal in Barthomley and the green field sites in Alsager.
	Cheshire East's policy Brown field sites first
	A tree line corridor between Alsager and Crewe should be kept.
	A country park/green spaces should be incorporated
	Constraints: contaminated land; landfill ;noise; vibration; air quality - require Air Quality Impact Assessments for all developments; require developments to incorporate a low emission approach; Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties; Individual Travel Plans etc.
	Need bridge over railway
	A proper-sized supermarket & petrol station are urgently needed somewhere in/on edge of Alsager to avoid increasing dormitory town effect & reduce travel.
	Some archaeological research already done. Any planning application would need to demonstrate that any surviving peat and associated deposits did not require further analysis or was not worthy of preservation on palaeoecological grounds.
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on United Utilities existing infrastructure.
	Development may help to provide finance to replace the railway level crossing with a bridge and improve the adjacent road system.
	Site is not brownfield - it has an agreed restoration plan to open countryside
	The application area for the proposal is much larger than the quarry and includes a very large adjacent greenfield which has

	always been used for agriculture.
	Local people will be disappointed as they think that if this site is developed, it will mean less housing in Alsager but is closer to Barthomley, so is likely to mean less housing there.
	Site is not in Green belt, so is better than sites that are.
	Well placed for transport links.
	Due to the site's peat moss origins it requires a full wildlife assessment to be carried out to determine whether some or all of the site should be retained to allow this threatened habitat to recover. Any areas considered to have no current or potential wildlife habitat value might then be appropriately developed.
Site B Land North of Beech Rd, Alderley Edge 240 representations by 238 13 Support 219 Object 8 Comment	No to building in Green Belt, It is an important barrier between Alderley Edge and Wilmslow which should remain separate
	No special circumstances apply to justify building on this Green Belt site.
	This proposal is worsened by the proposed removal of the Royal London land from the Green Belt - which is within 20 metres of this proposed site on the opposite side of the A34. There would effectively be no separation of the two towns. Especially when viewed from the railway line and A34.
	Major loss of publicly accessible amenity land
	Support the building of decent homes here,
	The site has good access to amenities and the A34 bypass and the station.
	Preferable to build here than other sites
	Other sites are preferable to this one based on sustainability criteria
	Little merit for the local economy. Demand will decrease with the loss of AZ. This is not meeting a local need.
	More pressure on local infrastructure. Inadequate infrastructure in local area to accommodate any more significant housing development
	There is a brook ( river) running through the site which is a valuable wildlife habitat
	Use brownfield first. Brownfield available at Alderley Park
	No additional sites should be considered however they could be an alternative to Handforth East



	I would like to know if any Council member has any link with the developers either in an unpaid or paid capacity.
	Access from Heyes La to London Rd already congested.
	The access point would be about half a mile outside Alderley into the greenbelt, therefore the visual effect on the remaining green belt would be great. This access point would mean that additional green belt land between the proposed access road and the village would also be developed in the future- creating additional sprawl.
	The proposed country park may not happen
	Only acceptable if the number of houses proposed at White Moss counts towards Alsager's allocation of 1200 houses in the Local Plan.
	Will the homes be affordable?
	There are no pedestrian pathways on Heyes Lane plus there is no available land to construct such a pathway. Pedestrians would risk their lives using the A34.
	Access to village and major roads will be through an existing estate and minor roads unsuitable for additional traffic, roads merge onto village road network at unsuitable and dangerous junctions.
	Much of the site is in flood zone 3. If built on this could potentially cause flooding problems not only to new but also existing housing. The land is frequently water logged. The land that has been subsiding over the past 50 years (Black Pit) and now floods regularly making it totally unsuitable for high density. Sequential and Exception Tests would need to be carried out. Any proposed built development in FZ 3 is likely to require compensatory flood storage to be provided. A site-specific FRA will be required as part of any development.
	Altering the very fabric of the village in the few shorts years
	Sufficient brown field sites, including Astra Zeneca to meet the needs of Wilmslow and Alderly Edge especially when the need for homes is greatly reduced as a result of the Astra Zeneca announcement.
	Contaminated Land: -The site is within 250m of two landfill sites to the north -There are some former ponds on the southern boundary which may have been filled and could present localised contamination and ground gas risks. -Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Noise: Parts of the site may be close to the WCML(Rail) and as such a transport noise assessment will be required with any development proposal.
	WCML requires transport noise assessment; AQA required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.
	Archaeology work to date: No work to date

	Work advised or likely to be advised: Nothing previously advised. The size of the site probably merits a desk-based assessment.
	A lot of the site is in Wilmslow. This site straddles the boundary between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge. None of this was made clear in the documentation. Thus making the exercise invalid.
Site C Sandbach Road North Alsager 48 representations by 48 4 Support 35 Object 9 Comment	The entrance to Sandbach Road North would be dangerous in view of the road width and proximity to the entrance/exit to a public house.
	This site should not be included. It has been refused by Cheshire East for good and sound reasons. Cheshire East is fighting the appeal and it would make no sense to include it now. A full suite of technical documents can be found in the planning application (12/4872C). The reason for rejection will not go away, it is in open countryside, supporting lots of wildlife on a very dangerous country lane, close to the Salt Line Leisure Walk and the Centre of Alsager is already at its limit from a Highways point of view.
	Unnecessary to build on greenfields when there are so many brownfield sites available in the area.
	A good site that due to being relatively small would be manageable in terms of impact on existing infrastructure
	Not part of Alsager Local Plan. Green field site and not needed.
	Other sites such as White Moss, Twyfords and MMU Hassall Road make more sense and provide sufficient housing supply
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed. However if these sites are to be considered, it should be as an alternative to say Handforth East.
	Increased traffic congestion and traffic safety issues
	This site has limited access to good transport links and, hence, is not preferred for development relative to many of the other potential sites presented in this document.
	Local infrastructure cannot cope with increased development
	Loss of wildlife
	Loss of amenity and recreational value, adjacent to the Salt Line
	Loss of agricultural land
	Subject to flooding from a brook which will be made worse by development
	Contaminated Land: The site is bounded to the northwest by a former landfill which has the potential to impact the site. Part of Site C is already in the planning process and we are aware that site investigations have been undertaken, and a gas monitoring programme is underway. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for

	its proposed use
	Air Quality Management Area required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.
	Archaeology work advised or likely to be advised: A targeted programme of mitigation was recommended for this site with reference to 2012 application, with the work secured by condition.
	Not more than 1000 houses should be built in Alsager up to 2030. Building in excess of this will be contrary to potteries regeneration in North Staffordshire.
	Destruction of village character
	An ordinary watercourse runs along the northern boundary of this site. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect land adjacent to the watercourse, although indicative only. This site has been subject to pre-development enquiries and a site-specific FRA has been carried out.
	The site should not be considered “strategic”
	The site is located in a sustainable location however it is unknown whether the site is developable
<b>Site D Land at Audlem Road, Audlem</b> 50 representations by 50 8 Support 32 Object 10 Comment	Proposal is out of proportion with the settlement
	Not sustainably located
	Infrastructure (such as sewage) in the village cannot cope
	No access to employment opportunities
	Village has poor access to surrounding centres
	Lack of public transport provision
	Demand will be met in other locations in Cheshire East
	There is no market for this proposal
	Traffic generation concerns
	This land is farmed designated Open Countryside with Public Right of Way
	Natural wildlife habitat / ancient trees
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed

	Brownfield sites first
	The site is too large
	A good site for development which is close enough to amenities and not too large to cause problems
	Support this proposal; providing that the environmental impact is kept to a minimum and no further housing developments take place
	Extends Audlem from a nuclear village development into an over-extended ribbon development
	Damages village character
	Any application would require a contaminated land assessment
	Any application would require Air Quality Impact Assessments
	Should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology)</li> <li>- Individual Travel Plans</li> <li>- Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure</li> <li>- Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc)</li> </ul>
	Site design and layout is crucial to avoid incompatible uses being placed in close proximity and the potential for loss of amenity caused by noise / vibration. All internal habitable rooms achieve the "Good" standard in accordance with BS 8233:1999 and all external areas achieve the WHO Guideline Noise Levels
	This site is likely to require a The Cheshire Historic Environment Record desk-based assessment which is being produced but has not yet been submitted for consideration. No work has previously been advised on this site. It is fairly limited in extent and further mitigation will need to take account of the desk based assessment
	No account of the needs of the village of Audlem (as expressed in the Village Design Statement)
	This is a speculative money-making venture
	This is not a planned development born of diligent investigation into managed growth and should be refused on this basis
	Development will have potential landscape and visual impact on River Weaver and Canal corridor north of the village
	No heritage assets and distant from setting of Audlem Conservation Area
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in the Water Frame Directive status of watercourses
	In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements. This site is within

	Flood Zone 1 as the site is greater than 1 hectare in size a site-specific FRA is required as part of any planning application
	An application has now been submitted and is awaiting validation
	Two petitions submitted with 315 signatures (paper = 107; e-petition = 208 signatures). 'We strongly oppose any speculative development proposal for Audlem put forward before Cheshire East Council issues its Local Plan. In particular, we oppose the recent Gladman proposal for a large development on land at Little Heath, Audlem. This proposal does not comply with the Village Design Statement (a document outlining Audlem's needs in terms of sustainable development for housing and employment), is not even listed in the SHLAA* and does not take into account the infrastructure or general ambience of the village. We strongly urge Cheshire East Council to stop this land grab across South Cheshire by refusing plans for large scale developments until their Local Plan is in place for guidance. * (SHLAA-Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.- the contents of this have not been debated with the Parish Council or residents)
	It is difficult to justify how this site is large enough to be considered strategic in the Local Plan
	No information is known about the site; therefore, the deliverability remains questionable
Site E- Land Off University Way, Crewe 86 Representatives 83 28 Support 49 Object 9 Comment	Loss of prime employment land – should remain as employment use.
	Land is available and a natural extension to Crewe
	Houses may make site look better
	If combined with other additional sites nearby (Site F and Site K), it would result in the complete filling-up of the Green Gap between Crewe and Haslington.
	Not a suitable site for housing development - should remain as employment – need more employment land, as town is due to expand.
	Other suitable sites.
	Need to retain green space around Crewe
	A good, unintrusive area to develop.
	A good site that would further enhance the gateway to Crewe. Development should be focused on the Crewe gateway area.

	Support this proposal providing it isn't part of a larger plan to extend into neighbouring villages
	infrastructure will not cope with this development
	It will create significant traffic disruption
	It destroys the natural flora and fauna of the area
	Adjacent to other industrial sites - it is unsuited to residential use.
	Could result in complaints from new residents re noise from businesses.
	Close to good rail and road networks for transport and not far from local amenities.
	A good use of redundant land.
	Need to ensure that the environmental impact is kept to a minimum and the development is sustainable
	Good transport links to the area.
	Site should not be developed for anything, being adjacent to an SSSI and outside the built-up boundaries of Crewe
	During the enquiry prior to building University Way, the council committed to NEVER developing east of that road. The council has already broken that promise on Orion Way and should not do so again.
	Traffic congestion will get worse – especially Crewe Green roundabout.
	Proposal is not sustainable.
	Infrastructure cannot cope.
	Royal Mail cannot cope now
	Leighton hospital will not cope
	Schools cannot cope now
	Who will buy these houses/want to live there? Will they lie empty?
	Where are the jobs for all these people?
	Possibility of flooding from Valley Brook?
	Residential here would complete the development along this route and a number of industrial units remain un-let so the only current demand would be residential.
	HS2 station should be confirmed and the railway station should also be developed further, that way the town can support the housing planned
	Constraints: Contaminated Land - former pond on the north east of the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use; noise issues; Air Quality Assessment will be required
	Archaeology: negative results of previous work suggest nothing further likely to be required
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on existing United Utilities infrastructure

	Will increase pressure on the Valley Brook/Englesea Brook corridors and watercourses, both of which are of high known wildlife value. Prefer industrial development because can be buffered against watercourses, and is unlikely to have same pressures on wildlife (e.g. disturbance, domestic pets, garden refuse etc.) Development design should include segregation from and the protection of Valley Brook and Englesea Brook.
	An early driver for the Cheshire East Local Plan was the All Change for Crewe strategy, which envisages major growth in employment for the greater Crewe area, that will require the sites along University Way to be available for employment, they should not be sacrificed for the short term profit of speculative housing development
	In preference to Site K - development affecting character of village.
	Need conclusive evidence that the transport and infrastructure links are to be improved before developments can take place
	- Within setting of Crewe Hall Registered Park, and Crewe Green Conservation Area, including Listed Buildings (estate village). Crewe Hall Park and Garden is on the English Heritage "Heritage at Risk Register". The Heritage at Risk Register states that the setting of the park and garden has been harmed by adjoining development. Therefore, any further development would be considered detrimental to its setting. There will need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to the landscape setting of the conservation area. If this area does make an important contribution to its setting, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered acceptable
	Former estate land (it contains a copse of mature trees that were clearly planted by the estate) that ideally should be restored to countryside in order to help restore essential setting of significant national heritage assets
	Development will enhance the visual aspect and provide needed housing.
	120 houses may be more than required, a figure closer to 60 would be suitable.
	Site is unusable and often frequented by illegal motorbike activity.
	Lack of commitment to any high quality public transport provision
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. This site is significantly affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3, some Environment Agency modelled, some indicative only. Watercourses to north and east of the site are "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. Less vulnerable uses should be within areas of flood risk, preferably open space. Any proposed built development in FZ 3 is likely to require compensatory flood storage to be provided
	Petition with 36 signatures. These houses are not required the infrastructure in this area will not cope with any more houses.
	We do not need additional sites and object to any being considered for development
	Site is in a sustainable location
	The site is not well related to the settlement of Crewe or to local services and facilities; it should not be considered sequentially preferable to the sustainable urban extensions on the edge of Crewe.

	Deliverability is questionable.
Site F – Junction of A534 and Sydney Road Crewe 100 representations by 93 13 Support 78 Object 9 Comment	Site is in Green Gap & Strategic Open Gap, so why consult on it? Policy is about permanence
	A very prominent site in Green Gap; separate communities of Crewe and Haslington must be maintained & not merged into one large conurbation; it will adversely affect the visual character of the landscape.
	The towns and villages of Crewe, Shavington, Haslington and Weston would be merged into a Greater Crewe
	Too much housing land already committed around Crewe
	Roads already congested. Will increase traffic congestion at the roundabout where Eardley's garage is and routes in and out of Crewe are already congested enough at peak times as it is
	M6 J16 & 17 should be improved
	Site should be used to build bungalows
	If combined with other additional sites nearby (Site E and Site K), it would result in the complete filling-up of the Green Gap between Crewe and Haslington.
	Other sites already in the draft Local Plan provide enough land for any development in and around Crewe
	No proven need for so many new houses in the South Cheshire area.
	In Crewe and surrounding areas there is a decline in the terraced stock - this will be made worse & reduce house prices in the town.
	This is prime agricultural land, MAFF 2, priority should be given to growth of crops
	It will not satisfy required sustainability criteria
	Some of this land is required for road improvement around Crewe Green roundabout junction - housing here would just make the traffic situation very much worse
	Close to good rail and road networks and not far from local amenities.
	Outside the built-up boundaries of Crewe, and remote from most of its services
	Greenfield site & should not be built on



	Redevelop housing within Crewe centre
	Development could easily be absorbed if a small number of houses were to be built in each of the areas of the borough.
	Where are the jobs for the people who occupy these houses?
	Infrastructure ie roads; Royal Mail; Leighton Hospital; dentists; schools cannot cope
	Development will result in more urban sprawl.
	Use brownfield sites first & regenerate areas
	Constraints: Contaminated Land - There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. The north of the site is within 250m of a former landfill. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use; road traffic noise; Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area
	Development should be done based on a properly-formed democratic plan, rather than piecemeal based on proposals by developers.
	Unlikely to attract a recommendation for archaeological work
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on United Utilities existing infrastructure
	Site lies either partly or wholly within the Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board's formal Consultation Areas. If any development is proposed within these sites, it is a statutory requirement for the Board to be formally consulted
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. This site is within Flood Zone 1; as the site is greater than 1 hectare in size a site-specific FRA is required as part of any planning application.
	Should refer to Crewe Green Conservation Area 50 metres to the southeast and the various listed buildings included in it. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its conservation areas including their setting, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to the landscape setting of the conservation area. If this area does make an important contribution to its setting, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered acceptable. The site's proximity to listed buildings will require development proposals for the site to demonstrate to English Heritage that they conserve those elements that contribute to their significance and setting
	Our Client remains committed to delivering their land interests, as our submission documents in October 2012 and February 2013, both outline. We want to work with the Council and the community, to explore the sustainable development of the Duchy land, to help Cheshire East deliver the All Change for Crewe Vision. We believe that our Client's land is integral to this objective.
	Petition with 36 signatures. This area is Green Gap and would join Crewe to Haslington. Local infrastructure could not cope from Sydney bridge to Crewe island, in the emerging Local Plan this is in the blue area.
	Site deliverability is questionable

Site G – Land off Newcastle Road Willaston 83 representations by 80 5 Support 66 Object 12 Comment	Traffic generation concerns and concerns over impact on surrounding road network
	Green Gap to be retained at all cost
	Prime agricultural land (MAFF 2) - priority should be given to growth of crops
	Infrastructure will not cope
	An excellent site for development, good road connections for transport and not too large
	No evidence of need for this proposal
	A linear site, bound by the A500; I think this is a good site for a service station, hotel and emergency service depot
	Negative impact on the local environment / wildlife
	This is a residential area and commercial use is inappropriate
	It is completely outside the built-up boundaries of Willaston, and remote from most of its services
	Would provide local employment
	Not an appropriate location for a hotel
	Development will result in more urban sprawl
	Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Noise assessment required for mixed employment / commercial use (plant/deliveries etc)
	Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area
	All sites will need EMP for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment
	Should include: - Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology) - Individual Travel Plans - Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure - Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc)
	Archaeological impacts assessed as part of the Crewe southern bypass desk based assessment. No work previously advised on this

	site and in view of absence of remains during watching brief during construction of bypass immediately to the north, further mitigation probably not justified
	We do not need any more service stations
	It would damage character of the local area
	Attracting further freight to use the A500 and A51 will only serve to compound an already serious traffic volume problem on these roads
	The addition of hotel beds will add to business tourism in South Cheshire.
	Development south of the A500 would breach the strong southern edge of existing development in this area formed by the dual carriageway and could have a damaging visual impact on the approach to Nantwich, which effectively begins beyond the Cheerbrook Roundabout
	The site is crossed by several ditches, which may be of biodiversity value and are potentially important wildlife corridors
	No heritage assets and potentially sufficiently separated by from Manor Farm Grade II Listed Building
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses
	The document needs to include reference to the Manor Farmhouse (Grade II) to the north of the site on the opposite side of the A500 in its description of surrounding uses. This is clearly visible from the proposed site
	In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect a significant part of the site, although indicative only. The watercourse that runs through the western part of site is "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. An ordinary watercourse runs through the central part of site. Any proposed built development in Flood Zone 3 is likely to require compensatory flood storage to be provided. Sequential and Exception Tests are to be carried out. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required as part of any planning application
	Within the third most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links
	HS2 Impacts
	The site should not be considered sequentially preferable to the sustainable urban extensions on the edge of Crewe. The site should continue to be allocated for employment / commercial purposes, including a road side service station, a travel hotel and an emergency sub depot
	No information is known about the site; therefore, the deliverability remains questionable.

Site H Land off Wistaston Green Road Wistaston 574 representations by 553 2 Support 559 Object 13 Comment	Intrusion into open countryside.
	The landscaping along Wistaston Brook gives a defensible boundary to the built up area.
	The provision of safe highway access onto the already substandard Wistaston Green Road must be doubtful; and any further traffic generated would have an adverse impact on the road's junction with Middlewich Road – the notorious spot by the Rising Sun. Middlewich Road is one of the busiest and most dangerous roads in the County - a "High Risk Collision Route". Need a proper plan to improve road infrastructure of Crewe.
	Too much housing already committed or available around urban Crewe.
	Infrastructure is already overloaded e.g. schools are full; hospital , medical centres, Royal Mail, gas, electricity, water & drains can't cope. Sewers already overflow into the brook at peak times.
	Roads e.g. Middlewich Road already congested
	Site is unsustainable
	Unwarranted intrusion on the green gap between Crewe and Nantwich with a detrimental effect on the health/well-being of residents. Land separates Crewe from Nantwich and it is important to retain this separation of the two towns. The Council (Michael Jones and others) has pledged to maintain and strengthen the strategic green gaps between the villages in the area. The area should be kept as part of the wider Strategic Open Gap
	Build on brownfield sites first
	Must protect green spaces and the character of the area.
	Where will these people work?
	Site is a mix of arable and grazing land; it is prime agricultural land, MAFF Grade 2, priority should be given to growth of crops. UK grown food will produce jobs and reduce balance of payments deficit.
	It will destroy the rural amenity of the area.
	It will destroy the natural flora and fauna of the area
	Wistaston is already fully developed; it is a small village, to increase the size by 50% would destroy its character

	Plenty of houses for sale in this area including many which are classed as affordable
	Ecological issue – development would have a massive impact on the green corridor around Joey the Swan & reduce amount of wildlife present eg kingfishers, newts, bats etc.
	The fields are home to all sorts of wildlife which will be completely eroded/erased if development is allowed to go ahead
	This is an important area for the local community & is well used as a recreational & dog walking area. The footpath along Wistaston Brook to Valley Brook is one of the remaining quiet areas where one can walk. It is part of the newly opened Connect 2 cycle & foot path link between Crewe and Nantwich. There is already a lack of green space in Wistaston. Adverse impact on health & well-being.
	A good site for development, not too large and close enough to local amenities
	Concerns re overhead cables/pylons – issues of effect on health due to electromagnetic radiation
	Too much pressure for development in Wistaston already – need to retain village character
	Greenfield site – should not be built on
	Remote from services.
	Site not justified
	Why is the majority of development around Crewe and surrounding area – it should be shared equally across the whole of Cheshire East to help minimise impact on our towns and villages.
	Out of character with local area – mainly bungalows, not two storey houses
	Threat to TPO trees
	The housing market in Crewe, Nantwich and Wistaston is saturated & stagnant
	Use empty properties
	Site is highly visible – new houses will change views, character and skyline – current views across site to Bickerton Hills.
	This area should be reclassified as a Green Belt area in order to secure the boundaries of Wistaston.
	Constraints: Contaminated Land & Landfill Buffer Constraint - a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There is a former landfill 10m south east of the site boundary which has the potential to impact the site from ground gas risks. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use; road traffic noise from A530; Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area.
	Archaeology work to date: Desk Based Assessment under way
	Land floods after heavy rainfall - flooding not only of Valley Brook but will also discharge both the foul and surface water drainage systems.
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on United Utilities existing infrastructure

	There is almost no public transport in the area
	Scale of development too large
	Localism is completely a farce if this is allowed to happen
	This site, together with the conservation area at Old Gorse Covert, golf course and park provide a green lung to the town offering open space and access to open countryside. Development of this site would close access and urbanise the area to the detriment of local residents
	Object to urban sprawl by infilling strategic open gaps in Wistaston Parish.
	There are large swathes of nearby Stoke on Trent, which could be used for additional housing for the South Cheshire/North Staff area. Most of these sites are brown field and in dire need of redevelopment.
	The 5 year supply has been fulfilled.
	The plans are unfavourably skewed towards the poorer areas. For example in Wilmslow, which has a lot of open green land and could accommodate a lot more people, there are only a proposed 174 homes which is considerably less than the 1,700 in the outskirts of Crewe
	The procedure that you have adopted to gain access to planning related sites is far from clear and misleading. This does appear to have been done on purpose in an effort to frustrate would be objectors
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect the north/eastern boundary of site; modelled data is available for this location. The watercourse to the north/eastern boundary is "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. A site-specific FRA will be required by the Environment Agency as part of any planning application.
	Will result in increased crime rates.
	It is not needed. We have sufficient development over the next 15 years to satisfy Government requirements.
	Should refer to West End Farmhouse (Grade II*) on the opposite side of Wistaston Green Road. The NPPF designates Grade II* listed buildings to be of the highest significance. Therefore, any substantial harm to or loss of these designated assets should be wholly exceptional. As the site is adjacent to a Grade II* listed building, any development proposals for the site will require a need to demonstrate to English Heritage that they conserve those elements that contribute to its significance and setting.
	Site would appear to be of a relatively acceptable scale, being only 240 homes, is adjacent to the established settlement and therefore much more sustainable.
<b>Site I (i) - Village A Duchy Sites, South East Crewe 230 representations by</b>	The pressure on local infrastructure would be devastating as would be the impact on local businesses

<b>223</b> <b>9 Support</b>	
	The site is also on open countryside, Green Gap and Green Belt land which must be retained.
	Strain on local infrastructure and services
	Impact on Crewe Hall - its views, vista, setting and surroundings
	There are numerous brownfield sites prime for employment and residential development in Stoke On Trent and allocated land throughout Cheshire East.
	This site is far too large
	Prime agricultural land - MAFF 2, priority should be given to growth of crops to ensure food security
	Due to its size and position it is not sustainable unless the developer provides its own infrastructure including shops, schools and most importantly a very large play area for the children with at least two football pitches and other amenity space
	Traffic congestion concerns
	Development should be focused on the Crewe gateway area
	Destroy the rural amenity of the area
	The site is close to good road networks and the railway for transport
	Impact on the character and identity of the local area
	I would like there to be large green corridors, pedestrian and bike access through this land if developed to enhance the living environment
	Severe environmental (on ecology and biodiversity) impact
	Represents urban sprawl
	Excessive over supply of housing
	The motorway link roads do not have enough capacity
	Contaminated Land: there are a number of former ponds and a former sand pit on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There may be localised contamination issues associated with Carters Green Farm. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Noise impact assessment of commercial / employment use at Crewe Hall Enterprise Park Railway noise and vibration
	Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area
	In order to mitigate the potential effects of increased transport emissions we would look for the developments to incorporate a low emission approach such that all developers consider the likely increase in emissions, and propose measures which are aimed at reducing those increases. Such measures could be;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology)</li> <li>- Individual Travel Plans for each new householder/commercial travel plans - focusing away from private vehicle use</li> <li>- Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure to reduce the need for private vehicles</li> <li>- Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc)</li> </ul>
	All sites will need EMP for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment
	Site design and layout is crucial to avoid incompatible uses being placed in close proximity and the potential for loss of amenity caused by noise / vibration. Commercial / industrial uses in close proximity to residential properties for example have the potential to cause issues at the detailed planning stage and may require expensive extensive mitigation / redesign which could be avoided by careful early consideration. Presently that all internal habitable rooms should achieve the "Good" standard in accordance with BS 8233:1999 and all external areas achieve the WHO Guideline Noise Levels. Environmental Noise Directive: National mapping exercise has identified 'Important Areas' and 'First Priority Locations' where exposure to road noise is considered greatest. Noise action plans are to be proposed in these areas. Any new development proposals will need to consider if new exposures are being introduced, if they may impact on existing areas and if mitigation measures may be appropriate for existing areas
	Archaeology work to date: nothing specific has been done with regard to any of these sites but, given their size, they include areas considered in numerous earlier Desk Based Assessments. It is probable that development within the sections of the parcel adjacent to and within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Crewe Hall (i.e. the section north of the railway line) would cause substantive and significant harm to a number of nationally designated heritage assets and their settings. This section of the northern parcel should be excluded
	This development when viewed along the Basford East development will clearly cause continuous urban sprawl. It will connect Stowford to Crewe without a break, and Weston to Crewe by all but one small field
	The Basford East proposal already includes a large number of houses, and the Village A / Crewe Hall proposal should be viewed with the Basford East development in mind
	If greenfield sites need to be developed, this is a preferred site owing to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail services & HS2. There is also good access to Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands & Birmingham Airports via the motorway network and direct rail services from Crewe to Manchester International Airport & Birmingham Airport
	On the 17th of May 2013 BBC Breakfast Television showed a map of Great Britain. The map had been broken into regional areas which had been colour coded with regard to a scale running from house price % increase to % decrease. This area was indicated as having decrease in house prices
	UK grown food will produce jobs and reduce balance of payments deficit
	Englesea Brook is a small hamlet in a rural setting, with a historic Primitive Methodist Museum in its midst.
	Conservation Area



	All these housing proposals for the South East quadrant equate to approximately 1/3rd of ALL the proposed additional sites for the whole of Cheshire East
	There are currently no major employment prospects in the area that can justify this level of anticipated provision; certainly not around Crewe and the HS2 if ever constructed will merely serve to transport people to major centres of commerce, away from this area
	The Parish of Weston has already taken a large hit in housing terms with the development of the Wychwood Park and Wychwood Village. The village already has seen an increase in housing from 400 to over 1000 dwellings in the last fifteen years, and is earmarked for an additional 1000 dwellings as part of the Basford East development. In essence the area is already facing a fivefold increase in housing over a twenty year period without any significant investment in infrastructure
	Duty to co-operate issues with the Potteries. The proposals impact adversely on the Potteries redevelopment plan. There are plenty of brownfield sites available in the Crewe area which would benefit from development which is the sensible approach being taken by Stoke on Trent. Further allocations of this nature would have an additional and significant adverse impact on the regeneration and sustainability of North Staffordshire
	Of the sites put forward by the Duchy; this site would have the least direct impact on Alsager Infrastructure
	<p>The northern site is problematic as it would impact on the setting of the Historic Park &amp; Garden for Crewe Hall. The area of the site includes a significant number of Listed Buildings including Hollyhedge Farmhouse which is Listed Grade II*, which is located within the centre of this proposed development, and is surrounded by the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Within Crewe Hall Park which is a listed Grade II Park and Garden exists the Hall itself which is Grade I, the Stables Grade II*, and four other Grade II buildings / structures.</li> <li>- Crewe Hall Farmhouse is Grade II listed as well as the two converted Farm Buildings.</li> <li>- At Stowford there are a further nine Grade II listed buildings. Crewe Hall Farmhouse and the listed buildings at Stowford lie immediately adjacent to the site</li> </ul>
	The proposal covers an area of land which formed part of the 1643-4 AD Civil War Sieges (Battles) of Crewe Hall, before and after the Battle of Nantwich, January 1644AD. 17th Century Musket Shot has been recovered in the area. An archaeological assessment, evaluation and investigation are advised
	A large pond with associated habitat (possibly water voles (protected by law) and dragonfly species) exists to the rear of Hollyhedge Farm which marks the original course of Stowford Brook. This brook exists in drains and as a surface feature to the north side of the Railway, and flows through Crewe Park, to the Rookery Wood Roundabout and onwards into Basford Brook, on the south side of the Railway
	There are areas of localised peat deposits within the site, often recorded on historic mapping as mosses, or shown on geological drift mapping
	If your Vision for Crewe is for it to be a city, then surely Crewe needs a ring road all the way around, like Shrewsbury
	Provide a park and ride option for people who commute to Crewe to work

	Devastating impact on flora and fauna
	This site may well be prejudicial to the development of Basford East
	Any proposal to revise the Green Belt boundaries should be supported by a comprehensive Green Belt Review Process which follows an approved methodology to establish the nature and purpose of the existing Green Belt and its future purpose. There is no evidence of such a process in this case, nor is there any evidence of any public consultation on the subject.
	In proposing any changes the Borough Council would need to prepare a credible evidence base justifying proposed development, and supporting a case that the development cannot be accommodated on a more sustainable site outside the Green Belt. In the absence of such evidence the allocation and the Development Strategy document itself would be flawed and unsound
	The sites I I-V (Duchy land near Barthomley and Crewe) seem preferable of the sites near Nantwich currently under consideration although careful thought would need to be given to ensuring good road access, sufficient school places and health services to support such a development
	No market demand for such a development
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. If it is thought that any deterioration could be caused, then the developer has to put in place suitable mitigation measures. As part of any significant development we may also require a WFD assessment to be undertaken
	In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect a relatively small area of the north-eastern part of the site. This is unlikely to have any significant effects on any proposed development. The watercourses along the north-eastern boundary of the site are "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. As a majority of site is Flood Zone 1 any development greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken
	The document fails to clearly state that this site contains part of the Crewe Hall Park & Garden (Grade II) and Holly Hedge Farmhouse (Grade II*). It also is adjacent to the curtilages of a large number of listed buildings. The NPPF designates Grade II* listed buildings to be of the highest significance. Therefore, any substantial harm to or loss of these designated assets should be wholly exceptional. The NPPF considers that any substantial harm to a Grade II Listed Building or Registered Park and Garden should be exceptional. Any development proposals for the site will need to demonstrate that they conserve those elements that contribute to the significance of the listed buildings and their settings. The site includes part of a Registered Park and Garden which is on the Heritage at Risk Register. When originally designated, these areas were considered an important part of its special

	character and contribute towards its significance. Therefore, it is assumed that any loss or subsequent development would result in substantial harm to its setting and the elements that contribute towards its significance. It is therefore considered that any development should be avoided. Any development proposals that are put forward will need to explain why this loss and subsequent development is considered acceptable.
	Cheshire East Council should adopt a bold development strategy which involves the creation of two new settlements (Village A and Village B). Appropriate infrastructure and community facilities would be designed into these settlements. This is a far better solution than trying to 'bolt on' development to existing settlements via urban extensions as many of the settlements would simply not be able to cope with the pressure that would be placed on them by such a massive increase in development, resulting in a massive decrease in quality of life for a very significant number of residents in Cheshire East
	Scale of development will destroy the local village character
	Englesea Brook Chapel and Museum of Primitive Methodism is a fully accredited museum of national importance, being one of the four Key Methodist museums in England and indeed the only one devoted to Primitive Methodism
	The Duchy sites are ideally placed to take advantage of existing (A500 & M6) and proposed (A500 improvements and HS2) transport infrastructure and the proposed location of the two villages is considered to be sustainable as they will also be in close proximity to the nearby employment sites which are also being promoted by the Duchy. It is understood that significant areas of the land earmarked for development is low grade agricultural land. In light of this, the benefits that would accrue from the development of the Duchy sites far outweighs any potential impacts on agricultural land and future food production. It is considered that Village A would not have any significant adverse effects on the setting of Crewe Hall Registered Park and Garden
	Stoke On Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils therefore wish to maintain their original objection to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor and furthermore consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. The Councils consider that insufficient information is included with these alternative site options to justify why these sites should offer more sustainable sites and be taken forward. In particular the sites have not been the subject of a sustainability appraisal, which the Councils consider to be an important part of the evidence. Furthermore without this information it is impossible to assess the potential economic and social impact on the North Staffordshire Conurbation, including its Travel to Work Areas. The City and Borough Councils trust the issues outlined above regarding the location of development to the South and South East of Crewe will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the pre-submission version of the Cheshire East Local Plan alongside the comments made by the Councils in respect of the Cheshire East Local Plan Draft Development Strategy earlier this year
	There has been no change to the position that these Duchy sites should be promoted and included within the Council's Preferred Option in the Draft Development Strategy. We maintain that our proposals will be subject to extensive public consultation and discussions with all stakeholders before they are finalised
	Too much emphasis and focus is being given to housing provision to the South East of Crewe and that there is a need for a more even distribution of growth within the Borough

	According to the Councils Sustainability Appraisal the site is outside the Council's recommended distances for the majority of key services and facilities, open space and public transport
	Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield
	Of the 1986 responses to the Crewe Town Strategy consultation over 90% of them Disagreed with the development of the Green Gap site 'D1' yet this is the only Green Gap site from that consultation to be taken forward (as part of Village 'A')
	Given their size they are not available to become self contained settlements as such they will become commuter settlements and result in increased trips for work, retail and leisure facilities
	No information is known about the site and therefore its deliverability remains questionable
<b>Site I(ii) - Village B Duchy Sites, near Barthomley 193 (made by 187 people) 10 Support 171 Object 12 Comment</b>	Council do not need to be held to ransom by the Duchy of Lancaster for land to dual the A500
	Negative impact on local infrastructure and service provision
	Numerous brownfield sites available
	Negative impact on Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire
	Prime Agricultural Land - MAFF 2, priority should be given to growth of crops and food production
	Poor road access, road safety and traffic generation concerns
	As the Duchy cannot have Compulsory Purchase Orders made against it, one has to question the probity of proposing such a huge development at a time when the proposed dualling of the Barthomley Link requires a release of Duchy land.
	Destroy rural amenity of the area
	This development will lead to excessive over supply of new housing which is not required
	The development looks too dense
	This is a very large site, but is again served by a good road and railway system for transport, so would be suitable as a site to develop
	Negative environmental, wildlife and ecological impact
	Existing roads are in already poor state of repair
	This corridor is already at saturation level with regular extensive queues along the A500, the A5020 and on the new Crewe Green

	Link Road at peak hours
	Sufficient sites have already been identified in the Cheshire Local Plan and that additional site is clearly not required
	Crewe is already segregated by the lack of railway crossing points and each one causing delays in traffic, the motorway link roads don't have enough capacity and the roads and services in the rest of the town are poor
	The proposed developments are simply not in keeping with the current landscape or use of the area which is predominately agriculture and supporting businesses.
	There is little factual proof for demand of higher value properties, in greater volumes in this area. Given the long term economic forecast there will be little financial support for the purchase of new houses for many years to come
	Alternative sites should be promoted first
	Contaminated Land: There are a number of former landfills both on site and within 250m of the site, which have the potential to impact the site. There are a number of former ponds and pits on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There are former brick fields and a former mill on the site which would require assessment, and in addition there may be localised contamination issues associated with the farms within the site boundary. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Railway noise and vibration/ road traffic noise will have to be investigated
	Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area. Any development has the potential to cause adverse effects on local air quality as a result of increased transport emissions. In turn this can lead to negative health impacts where exposure to such pollutants occurs. We would require Air Quality Impact Assessments for all developments, which consider the impact of not only that development, but the effect of all other developments (proposed or likely) in the area. The assessment would need scoping prior to completion
	All sites will need EMP (Environmental Management Plans) for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment.
	<p>In order to mitigate the potential effects of increased transport emissions we would look for the developments to incorporate a low emission approach. Such measures could be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology)</li> <li>- Individual Travel Plans for each new householder/commercial travel plans - focusing away from private vehicle use</li> <li>- Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure to reduce the need for private vehicles</li> <li>- Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc). For information, it may be that by the time these developments come along Cheshire East has a formally adopted a Low Emission Strategy and possible SPD's.</li> </ul>
	Site design and layout is crucial to avoid incompatible uses being placed in close proximity and the potential for loss of amenity caused by noise / vibration. Commercial / industrial uses in close proximity to residential properties for example have the potential to cause issues at the detailed planning stage and may require expensive extensive mitigation / redesign which could be avoided by careful early consideration. Presently we would look that all internal habitable rooms achieve the "Good" standard in

	accordance with BS 8233:1999 and all external areas achieve the WHO Guideline Noise Levels
	Environmental Noise Directive: National mapping exercise has identified 'Important Areas' and 'First Priority Locations' where exposure to road noise is considered greatest. Noise action plans are to be proposed in these areas. Any new development proposals will need to consider if new exposures are being introduced, if they may impact on existing areas and if mitigation measures may be appropriate for existing areas
	Archaeology work to date: Nothing specific has been done with regard to any of these sites but, given their size, they include areas considered in numerous earlier Desk Based Assessments
	Disagree with building on Green Belt, but one major site in this area would be good, being big enough to generate its own infrastructure in terms of connectivity, schools, community buildings and space.
	If greenfield sites need to be developed, this is a preferred site owing to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail services & HS2. There is also good access to Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands & Birmingham Airports via the motorway network and direct rail services from Crewe to Manchester International Airport & Birmingham Airport
	We note the recent report from "The State of Nature" conservation group who have cited urban sprawl and development of the countryside as the major candidates for the decline in U.K wildlife in the last 50 years. The area in selected supports a variety of flora and fauna which will no doubt be lost should this development proceed. We therefore bring into question the environmental sustainability criteria for the Village B plans. This type of land for wildlife is finite not infinite
	If the entire extended Village B site were developed it would remove the need for a Village A in the Weston/Crewe Hall area. It would enable greater separation of development between Crewe and Alsager and allow for more efficient provision of new services
	For an increase of 1604 houses the developer will need to increase their S106 payment to provide, extra capacity in the on site schools (ages 5 -18), nurseries, doctors, dentists, supermarket, community club (hall/gym/pub), village green. A settlement of this size needs employment zones. Everything should be within walking distance to encourage sustainable transport
	Should this development go ahead it will undermine the regeneration of Crewe
	This is an opportunistic and unwelcome proposal to 'land bank' a vast area for a large scale village
	The proposal is unsustainable, requiring total private car dependence
	This area is of high landscape value and is likely to be of high biodiversity value - it is bisected by Valley Brook, an important local watercourse and wildlife corridor with some wooded banks
	All of the above proposals would be contrary to the Borough Council's own policy on Best Use of Natural Resources
	The Borough Council has expressed the view that development should only be allowed where it is consistent with its setting, appropriate in scale and character, and supported by adequate infrastructure. Rural areas are therefore not an appropriate location for large scale development which could be accommodated in or adjacent to existing urban areas. For these reasons the proposed sites identified above are unsustainable
	The Parish Council strongly supports the principle expressed in Policy CO1 (Sustainable Travel and Transport) of the Development

	Strategy document 'Shaping Our Future' policy, in particular the view that development should be directed to "sustainable and accessible locations"
	The Parish Council has practical concerns that the proposal is located on an area of open countryside with poor existing infrastructure, and there is no clarity as to how or whether infrastructure can be provided to service the development. In particular the Council does not feel that an allocation can be made in such an area without a very clear description of how the allocation can be serviced by road access and the provision of essential services
	No evidence has been supplied to justify ignoring these alternatives in favour of more distant allocations
	Any proposal to revise the Green Belt boundaries should be supported by a comprehensive Green Belt Review Process which follows an approved methodology to establish the nature and purpose of the existing Green Belt and its future purpose
	I also feel that the council should consider developing new villages as an alternative to just adding more and more to the Nantwich Town outskirts with the drain on resources and impact on traffic and other infrastructure that this brings
	In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information. The watercourses through the northern and eastern parts of site are "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect land adjacent to these, although indicative only. Any proposed built development in FZ 3 is likely to require Sequential and Exception Tests and also compensatory flood storage. The remainder of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. If it is thought that any deterioration could be caused, then the developer has to put in place suitable mitigation measures. As part of any significant development we may also require a WFD assessment to be undertaken
	The Alsager Chronicle has 6 pages of houses for sale; the Crewe Chronicle has 5 pages of houses for sale. People are struggling to sell
	Development in this location has no regard for the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation and policies currently contained within the North West and West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategies which urge Local Authorities to practice development restraint on the borders of North Staffordshire in order to help the regeneration of the area
	The site description should include reference to Mill House Farm (Grade II) within the site and Bridge House Farm (Grade II) on the boundary
	Cheshire East Council should adopt a bold development strategy which involves the creation of two new settlements (Village A

	and Village B). Appropriate infrastructure and community facilities would be designed into these settlements. This is a far better solution than trying to 'bolt on' development to existing settlements via urban extensions as many of the settlements would simply not be able to cope with the pressure that would be placed on them by such a massive increase in development, resulting in a massive decrease in quality of life for a very significant number of residents in Cheshire East
	The Duchy sites are ideally placed to take advantage of existing (A500 & M6) and proposed (A500 improvements and HS2) transport infrastructure and the proposed location of the two villages is considered to be sustainable as they will also be in close proximity to the nearby employment sites which are also being promoted by the Duchy
	This collection of sites cannot adequately be assessed in view of the scant detail available; therefore the consultation cannot be considered appropriate to the level of planning, nor transparent and accessible, as undertaken in the Cheshire East Statement of Community Involvement paragraph 2.1
	May have an impact upon Radway Green and Oakhanger level crossings
	Maintain the original objection to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor and furthermore consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. The Councils, Stoke On Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils, consider that insufficient information is included with these alternative site options to justify why these sites should offer more sustainable sites and be taken forward. In particular the sites have not been the subject of a sustainability appraisal, which the Councils consider to be an important part of the evidence. Furthermore without this information it is impossible to assess the potential economic and social impact on the North Staffordshire Conurbation, including its Travel to Work Areas. The City and Borough Councils trust the issues outlined above regarding the location of development to the South and South East of Crewe will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the pre-submission version of the Cheshire East Local Plan alongside the comments made by the Councils in respect of the Cheshire East Local Plan Draft Development Strategy earlier this year
	It is worthy of note that our Parish Plan achieved a 41% response rate and traffic/highway issues were the number 1 priority (75% of those who responded). Most of the rural roads within the parish are multi-functional in that in addition to traffic they cater for horse riders, cyclists and walkers. A recently opened long distance footpath 'Two Saints Way' runs W to E across the parish utilizing minor roads
	There has been no change to the position that the Duchy sites should be promoted and included within the Council's Preferred Option in the Draft Development Strategy. Our submissions made to the Development Strategy Preferred Option showed detailed boundaries for Strategic Sites supporting a new settlement comprised of 2 residential villages on the Duchy's Crewe Estate, totalling 4,250 homes between them and up to 124 hectares of employment land at Junction 16 of the M6. We maintain that our proposals will be subject to extensive public consultation and discussions with all stakeholders before they are finalised. The Duchy will continue to work closely with the Council to deliver a plan that will be for the benefit of the Town and meet the needs of the local community as a whole
	The response to both the Crewe Town Strategy Consultation and the Development Strategy and Emerging Policy Principles



	Consultation showed an overwhelming support for the retention of Green Belt, Green Gap and Open Countryside. The majority of Village 'B' is in Green Belt and is either grade 2 or 3 agricultural land that forms the Cheshire Countryside. This proposal will totally destroy the character of this area by ignoring Green Belt and Open Countryside policies by encouraging urban sprawl and increase the traffic on inadequate road infrastructure.
	This direction of expansion is contrary to the view expressed at a previous EIP which stated "The Secretary of State supports the retention of open countryside between Crewe and the M6 and between the M6 and the Potteries, and considers it desirable to direct expansion away from the south east quadrant of the District".
	Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield
	No information is known about the site, therefore its deliverability remains questionable
<b>Site I(iii)</b> <b>Employment</b> <b>Parcel A Duchy</b> Site, between Barthomley + the M6 128 reps by 120 12 Support 103 Object 13 Comment	There are sufficient brownfield sites
	The site is Green Belt land and should not be developed on
	The impact on the local infrastructure would be too significant and for what benefit?
	This is prime agricultural land; MAFF 2; priority should be given to growth of crops
	I feel this area is too large. I can see benefit to this but would prefer to see employment land nearer to where people live so they do not require a car
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed
	A good site supported by excellent roads for transport
	Could increase traffic on the nearby over crowded roads, particularly on the A500 from Crewe towards the Junction 16 of the M6 and destroy the local environment
	Brand new development in the middle of nowhere, a new industrial site where none is needed
	It would put major additional traffic on the single carriageway stretch of the A500 (which is already highly congested) and the M6 Junction 16 roundabout. The only way in which this could be alleviated without a full cloverleaf junction (which would be prohibitively expensive to build) would create an additional roundabout on the A500 which would create congestion due to

	proximity to the M6 J16 roundabout, increase pollution by causing traffic to slow, idle and accelerate again, and provide no benefit whatsoever for users of the single-carriageway section of the A500.
	Jobs should be created before houses are built
	Access, traffic generation and road network concerns - the town is already segregated by the lack of railway crossing points and each one causing delays in traffic, the motorway link roads don't have enough capacity and the roads and services in the rest of the town are poor
	Contaminated Land: There is a former landfill adjacent to Cherrytree Farm which has the potential to impact the site and a petrol filling station on the south of the site. There are a number of former ponds and pits on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There may be localised contamination issues associated with the farms within the site boundary. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Noise: Property adjacent to nearby M6 defined as 'Important Area' as part of the Environmental Noise Directive assessment of road noise exposure
	Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area. Any development has the potential to cause adverse effects on local air quality as a result of increased transport emissions. In turn this can lead to negative health impacts where exposure to such pollutants occurs. We would require Air Quality Impact Assessments for all developments, which consider the impact of not only that development, but the effect of all other developments (proposed or likely) in the area. The assessment would need scoping prior to completion
	All sites will need EMP ( Environmental Management Plan )for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment
	<p>In order to mitigate the potential effects of increased transport emissions we would look for the developments to incorporate a low emission approach such that all developers consider the likely increase in emissions, and propose measures which are aimed at reducing those increases. Such measures could be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology)</li> <li>- Individual Travel Plans for each new householder/commercial travel plans - focusing away from private vehicle use</li> <li>- Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure to reduce the need for private vehicles</li> <li>- Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc)</li> </ul> <p>For information, it may be that by the time these developments come along Cheshire East has a formally adopted a Low Emission Strategy and possible SPD's</p>
	Noise, Vibration: Site design and layout is crucial to avoid incompatible uses being placed in close proximity and the potential for loss of amenity caused by noise / vibration. Commercial / industrial uses in close proximity to residential properties for example have the potential to cause issues at the detailed planning stage and may require expensive extensive mitigation / redesign which could be avoided by careful early consideration. Presently we would look that all internal habitable rooms achieve the "Good"

	standard in accordance with BS 8233:1999 and all external areas achieve the WHO Guideline Noise Levels. Environmental Noise Directive: National mapping exercise has identified 'Important Areas' and 'First Priority Locations' where exposure to road noise is considered greatest. Noise action plans are to be proposed in these areas. Any new development proposals will need to consider if new exposures are being introduced, if they may impact on existing areas and if mitigation measures may be appropriate for existing areas
	Wildlife, ecological and biodiversity impacts
	Archaeology work to date: Nothing specific has been done with regard to any of these sites but, given their size, they include areas considered in numerous earlier Desk Based Assessments
	Negative impacts on local character and amenity
	In the event of an emergency on either the roads or the employment village sorting it out will be made more complicated by placing the site right by the M6 and junction 16
	Disagree with building on Green Belt, but one major site in this area would be good, being big enough to generate its own infrastructure in terms of connectivity, schools, community buildings and space
	If greenfield sites need to be developed, this is a preferred site owing to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail services & HS2. There is also good access to Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands & Birmingham Airports via the motorway network and direct rail services from Crewe to Manchester International Airport & Birmingham Airport
	The plans will result in a continuous urban sprawl; linking Weston to Crewe. The whole character of Weston village will be destroyed and lost forever
	The proposed employment and residential 'villages' would be in open countryside, with poor access to local facilities. This would lead to a reliance on private car use which is contrary to national and local planning policies
	There are other more appropriate sites available around Crewe which would minimise traffic growth, allow better access by public transport, cycling and walking, and avoid building on the Green Belt
	Employment zones need to include nurseries, gyms, swimming pools, safe jogging routes and a supermarket - centrally located so that employees can walk to the facilities during their lunch breaks or after work
	Development in this location has no regard for the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation and policies currently contained within the North West and West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategies which urge Local Authorities to practice development restraint on the borders of North Staffordshire in order to help the regeneration of the area. The latter policy has been adopted and practised in the latest versions of the Local Plans for both Staffordshire Moorlands and Stafford Borough
	Employment villages in the Junction 16 area will also directly compete with those at Crewe and any developments proposed at Basford East and West
	Stoke on Trent and North Staffordshire have substantial 'employment' zones currently underemployed and with numerous vacant premises
	Once brownfield sites are fully exploited, this site should be considered owing to its good proximity to major roads, the M6

	Motorway & national rail links
	The proposed location of this development would destroy the unique character of Barthomley village and well as destroy valuable agricultural land for both milk and food crops
	No demand exists for this development
	Development should be low-rise, aesthetic and with maintenance of green screening and sympathetic landscaping incorporating green space, but such development should be avoided if at all possible
	BAE Systems intend to promote the redevelopment of surplus land at the Radway Green site in the short term. Therefore, the company do have some concerns about the level of employment land (sites referred to above) being considered at adjacent sites and should these opportunities be considered suitable by the Local Planning Authority, the manner in which they are phased. BAE Systems' landholdings at Radway Green present an opportunity to redevelop an area of previously developed land for employment use. When considered together with the neighbouring land at Radway Green Business Centre it is a significant existing area of employment land. Given there is a significant previously developed site available in the short to medium term, BAE Systems believe the Local Planning Authority should apply a degree of caution to the development of greenfield sites and in particular their phasing in this area of the Borough
	The sites continue to meet the five purposes of Green Belt. There is no case for their release from Green Belt. If these sites come forward they would undermine the accessibility and viability of Radway Green Business Centre. There are ample more sustainable employment sites elsewhere and in less sensitive locations. The release of this land for employment is not required
	Research shows that exposure to high levels of freshly emitted particulate matter from near motorways has been credited to serious poor health in humans. (Brugge et al, 2007; Zhu et al 2004; Selix et al 2012). We would propose that the general location is not conducive to a healthy work environment
	We note the recent report from "The State of Nature" conservation group who have cited urban sprawl and development of the countryside as the major candidates for the decline in U.K wildlife in the last 50 years. The area in selected supports a variety of flora and fauna which will no doubt suffer and almost certainly be lost should this development proceed
	All of the above proposals would be contrary to the Borough Council's own policy on Best Use of Natural Resources. As these sites are distant from access to services they are contrary to this principle
	Strongly support the principle expressed in Policy COI (Sustainable Travel and Transport) of the Development Strategy document 'Shaping Our Future' policy, in particular the view that development should be directed to "sustainable and accessible locations". The Parish Council is of the view that the sites listed are likely to be even with the use of private motoring access to Crewe, Alsager and the Potteries would require use of substandard and/or already congested routes involving such pinch points as Junction 16 of the M6; the A5020 on Weston Road, Crewe; Gresty Road, Crewe; and the Crewe Arms/ Crewe Green roundabouts. As such this would be contrary to paragraph 30 of the NPPF which requires that development should "support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion".
	The sites I i-v (Duchy land near Barthomley and Crewe) seem preferable of the sites near Nantwich currently under consideration

	although careful thought would need to be given to ensuring good road access, sufficient school places and health services to support such a development.
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. If it is thought that any deterioration could be caused, then the developer has to put in place suitable mitigation measures. As part of any significant development we may also require a WFD assessment to be undertaken.
	In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information. The watercourse along the (relatively short) northern boundary of site is "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect land adjacent to this watercourse, although indicative only. This is unlikely to have any significant effects on any proposed development. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken.
	Development in this location has no regard for the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation and policies currently contained within the North West and West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategies which urge Local Authorities to practice development restraint on the borders of North Staffordshire in order to help the regeneration of the area. The latter policy has been adopted and practiced in the latest versions of the Local Plans for both Staffordshire Moorlands and Stafford Borough. Employment villages in the junction 16 area will also directly compete with those at Crewe and any developments proposed at Basford East and West.
	A Listed Building, Cherry Tree Farm (Grade II) is within the site. The document in its description of the site's surroundings should also refer to Bartholmley Conservation Area and the various listed buildings within it to the southeast of the proposed site
	Appropriate infrastructure and community facilities would be designed into these settlements. This is a far better solution than trying to 'bolt on' development to existing settlements via urban extensions as many of the settlements would simply not be able to cope with the pressure that would be placed on them by such a massive increase in development, resulting in a massive decrease in quality of life for a very significant number of residents in Cheshire East
	The Duchy sites are ideally placed to take advantage of existing (A500 & M6) and proposed (A500 improvements and HS2) transport infrastructure and the proposed location of the two villages is considered to be sustainable as they will also be in close proximity to the nearby employment sites which are also being promoted by the Duchy
	Even for the purpose of a SHLAA, this collection of sites cannot adequately be assessed in view of the scant detail available
	Maintain the original objection to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor and

	furthermore consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. The Councils, Stoke On Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils, consider that insufficient information is included with these alternative site options to justify why these sites should offer more sustainable sites and be taken forward. In particular the sites have not been the subject of a sustainability appraisal, which the Councils consider to be an important part of the evidence. Furthermore without this information it is impossible to assess the potential economic and social impact on the North Staffordshire Conurbation, including its Travel to Work Areas. The City and Borough Councils trust the issues outlined above regarding the location of development to the South and South East of Crewe will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the pre-submission version of the Cheshire East Local Plan alongside the comments made by the Councils in respect of the Cheshire East Local Plan Draft Development Strategy earlier this year
	This site could compromise the deliverability of Basford West
	There has been no change to the position that the Duchy sites should be promoted and included within the Council's Preferred Option in the Draft Development Strategy. We maintain that our proposals will be subject to extensive public consultation and discussions with all stakeholders before they are finalised.
	This direction of expansion is contrary to the view expressed at a previous EIP which stated "The Secretary of State supports the retention of open countryside between Crewe and the M6 and between the M6 and the Potteries, and considers it desirable to direct expansion away from the south east quadrant of the District"
	No information is known about the site; therefore, the deliverability remains questionable
	Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield
Site I(iv) Employment Parcel B Duchy Site South West of Radway Green  111representations by 109 13 Support 86 Object 12 Comment	Land is Green Belt - 'Exceptional circumstances' have not been proven to build on this Greenbelt.
	Major impact on infrastructure
	Use brownfield sites instead

	Stop building on countryside
	Question the access for large lorries to the M6 along a small lane and the locality of the new housing (if approved) would make this site inaccessible at peak times. Extra pressure on Junction 16 of M6. Both J16 & J17 should be upgraded.
	Unsustainable development - remote from all services
	Prime agricultural land, MAFF 2, priority should be given to growth of crops – proposals would see the loss of 7 working farms.
	Will destroy the rural amenity of the area
	On the East side adjacent to Radway Green Industrial estate this would be an excellent place for extension of industrial use.
	Looks the best of the sites for industrial development.
	Few people live near here – would prefer to see development and employment near the towns e.g. Crewe
	A good site supported by excellent roads for transport.
	Environmental impact must be kept to a minimum
	People of Radway Green and Alsager must be fully consulted on any proposals.
	Country lanes will become a rat run for speeding traffic.
	The traffic light junction between the B5078 and Crewe Road should be widened to accommodate a lane for traffic in both directions on Crewe Road turning towards the M6, so as not to impede traffic going straight on.
	To increase the traffic on the B5078 to this extent will require a bridge to be built over the railway.
	Site is not required.
	No evidence that this employment area is required or could be filled. Radway Green factory site should be developed to its full potential; sufficient allocated employment land in Cheshire East and surrounding areas of Warrington and Stoke - there are 100's of warehouses across the Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire area that are un-used, why do we need more !
	Development will result in more urban sprawl.
	Railway crossings currently cause congestion at peak times – will only get worse.
	Constraints: Contaminated Land - There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There may be localised contamination issues associated with Foxley Farm. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use. Noise - Property adjacent to nearby M6 defined as 'Important Area' as part of the Environmental Noise Directive assessment of road noise exposure. Air Quality - Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area
	Archaeology work to date: Nothing specific. Work advised or likely to be advised: The Cheshire Historic Landscape

	<p>Characterisation records significant area of historic landscape (Ancient Field Systems) within the eastern half of each of these proposed areas. The size of these parcels should therefore be reduced to exclude these areas of Ancient Field Systems in order to maintain the cohesive historic landscape character of the wider area of Ancient Field Systems to the east.</p> <p>Previous consultations have advised the preparation of an overarching Desk Based Assessment to consider all of the remaining individual Duchy parcels proposed for development. This advice is applicable to all of the present sites. It seems certain, given the size of the sites, that further evaluation and mitigation will be required.</p>
	A flyover, so that A500 through traffic did not have to use the roundabout, would make it less objectionable
	Impact on health of reduced air quality due to increased vehicle emissions.
	Site would require detailed ecological surveys; it is in a local area known as the drumbles, a gorse unspoilt area which is rich with nature. The loss of wildlife and natural beauty would be tragic
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on United Utilities existing infrastructure
	Site would not help the regeneration of Crewe.
	Concerned over this development – Stoke on Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils have funding for regeneration of their own brownfield sites.
	Site in good location to access M6; airports and Crewe railway station
	There are other more appropriate sites available around Crewe which would be more sustainable
	Employment sites should include a nursery, gym, swimming pool, safe jogging paths, a supermarket, good bus links to the site and safe pavements/cycleways
	Too close to the ordnance factory – issues re safety and security
	Will adversely impact on adjoining properties.
	No land is required from the Duchy to widen the A500
	Employment villages in the junction 16 area will directly compete with those at Crewe and any developments proposed at Basford East and West.
	Need employment land for the increased population of Alsager.
	Must contribute to funding of J16, A500 improvements and local road safety requirements.
	Strongly object to Radway Green- detrimental impact on the estate's accessibility & will undermine any potential for investment in Radway Green & in turn its attractiveness & viability.
	Strongly object.
	Any proposal to revise the Green Belt boundaries should be supported by a comprehensive Green Belt Review Process – no evidence of this.
	Development should be directed to "sustainable and accessible locations". Public transport provision is weak & site is distant from



	the facilities of Crewe.
	Object - adverse impact on the parishes of Betley, Balterley & Wrinehill through increased traffic levels on the A531 and B5500.
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. The watercourses to the north-western and south-western parts of site are "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect land adjacent to these watercourses, although indicative only. These are unlikely to have any significant effects on any proposed development. Some ordinary watercourses run through parts of the site. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken.
	Insufficient evidence provided to suggest that the Duchy plans for unsustainable remote settlements and employment villages meet any of the criteria stated by the NPPF to allow building on such a scale on Green Belt land.
	The development to fund the A500 dualling does not need to come from the South East Crewe Growth Corridor.
	Existing dwellings will be either lost or devalued.
	The sites cannot adequately be assessed in view of the scant detail available; therefore the consultation cannot be considered appropriate to the level of planning, nor transparent and accessible, as undertaken in the Cheshire East Statement of Community Involvement paragraph 2.1.
	It would change the character of the entire local landscape and especially tiny villages like Barthomley and other small settlements.
	Object to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor & consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. The sites have not been the subject of a sustainability appraisal – need to assess the potential economic and social impact on the North Staffordshire Conurbation and Stoke On Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils, including its Travel to Work Areas.
	Loss of character, features and identity to small rural communities.
	Strongly object - of the 27 sites out for consultation, 1/3 of the total number of sites are within the Parish of Weston & Basford. None of the proposals are compatible with the size of a rural village.
	Such development proposals would directly conflict with existing allocated employment sites including the Basford West site & undermine its ability to come forward; no links to existing settlements, where the workforce would be located which will exacerbate car borne travel; it would conflict with the overall Development Strategy for Cheshire East and the deliverability of All Change for Crewe; no over-riding economic need for employment uses of the scale envisaged; there are other better placed sites

	to meet identified employment needs that are not within the green belt; it will prevent the spin off benefits of employment development being realised for Crewe residents. If the sites are developed, they should be phased so that they can not come forward until Basford West is substantially completed.
	This direction of expansion is contrary to the view expressed at a previous EIP which stated “The Secretary of State supports the retention of open countryside between Crewe and the M6 and between the M6 and the Potteries, and considers it desirable to direct expansion away from the south east quadrant of the District”.
	Deliverability is questionable.
Site I(v) Employment Parcel C Duchy Site between Barthomley and Radway Green 125 representations by 120 12 Support	No evidence that this employment area is required or could be filled. Radway Green factory site should be developed to its full potential; sufficient allocated employment land in Cheshire East and surrounding areas of Warrington and Stoke - there are 100's of warehouses across the Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire area that are un-used, why do we need more !
	To increase the traffic on the B5078 to this extent will require a bridge to be built over the railway.
	Site is not required.
	Development will result in more urban sprawl.
	Railway crossings currently cause congestion at peak times – will only get worse.
	A flyover, so that A500 through traffic did not have to use the roundabout, that would make it less objectionable
	Impact on health of reduced air quality due to increased vehicle emissions.
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on United Utilities existing infrastructure
	Site would not help the regeneration of Crewe.
	Concerned over this development – Stoke on Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils have funding for regeneration of their own brownfield sites.
	Site in good location to access M6; airports and Crewe railway station
	There are other more appropriate sites available around Crewe which would be more sustainable
	Barthomley PC - strongly object.
	Any proposal to revise the Green Belt boundaries should be supported by a comprehensive Green Belt Review Process – no

	evidence of this.
	Development should be directed to "sustainable and accessible locations". Public transport provision is weak & site is distant from the facilities of Crewe.
	Object - adverse impact on the Betley, Balterley & Wrinehill Parish through increased traffic levels on the A531 and B5500.
	Insufficient evidence provided to suggest that the Duchy plans for unsustainable remote settlements and employment villages meet any of the criteria stated by the NPPF to allow building on such a scale on Green Belt land.
	The development to fund the A500 dualling does not need to come from the South East Crewe Growth Corridor.
	Existing dwellings will be either lost or devalued.
	The sites cannot adequately be assessed in view of the scant detail available; therefore the consultation cannot be considered appropriate to the level of planning, nor transparent and accessible, as undertaken in the Cheshire East Statement of Community Involvement paragraph 2.1.
	It would change the character of the entire local landscape and especially tiny villages like Barthomley and other small settlements.
	Too close to other proposed employment site
	Increase traffic on local roads – cause gridlock
	Will destroy character of area
	A good site supported by excellent road network for transport.
	Will lead to excessive over supply of new housing
	Land is Green Belt - 'Exceptional circumstances' have not been proven to build on this Greenbelt land.
	Major impact on infrastructure – it is overloaded & cannot cope
	Use brownfield sites instead
	Unsustainable development - remote from all services
	Prime agricultural land, MAFF 2, priority should be given to growth of crops – proposals would see the loss of 7 working farms.
	Will destroy the rural amenity of the area
	<p>Constraints: Contaminated Land - There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There may be localised contamination issues associated with Flash House Farm. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use.</p> <p>Noise - Property adjacent to nearby M6 defined as 'Important Area' as part of the Environmental Noise Directive assessment of road noise exposure.</p> <p>Air Quality - Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area.</p>

	Archaeology work to date: Nothing specific. Work advised or likely to be advised: The Cheshire Historic Landscape Characterisation records significant area of historic landscape (Ancient Field Systems) within the eastern half of each of these proposed areas. The size of these parcels should therefore be reduced to exclude these areas of Ancient Field Systems in order to maintain the cohesive historic landscape character of the wider area of Ancient Field Systems to the east. Previous consultations have advised the preparation of an overarching Desk Based Assessment to consider all of the remaining individual Duchy parcels proposed for development. This advice is applicable to all of the present sites. It seems certain, given the size of the sites, that further evaluation and mitigation will be required
	There is a joint venture between the RSPB and Defra here for a Lapwing breeding area; these birds should be protected and their habitat retained
	Development of this site, together with adjacent Parcel C, would effectively result in continuous development from the M6 motorway to Alsager which would be contrary to the general policy of the draft plan to maintain separation between communities.
	Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 79 and 80
	Support – site is in an accessible location
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. The watercourse just north of the northern boundary of the site is "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. Flood Zones 2 and 3 (indicative only) affect land adjacent to this watercourse, although possibly not the site. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken.
	The proposed siting of the industrial development is far too close to Barthomley, a classic example of a quintessential English village. The setting of Barthomley should be protected and enhanced.
	The Duchy's proposals will be subject to extensive public consultation and discussions with all stakeholders before they are finalised
	Use brownfield sites instead
	Stop building on countryside
	Question the access for large lorries to the M6 along a small lane and the locality of the new housing (if approved) would make this site inaccessible at peak times. Extra pressure on Junction 16 of M6. Both J16 & J17 should be upgraded.
	A good site supported by excellent roads for transport.
	Environmental impact must be kept to a minimum
	Country lanes will become a rat run for speeding traffic.

	Will adversely impact on adjoining properties.
	No land is required from the Duchy to widen the A500
	Employment villages in the junction 16 area will directly compete with those at Crewe and any developments proposed at Basford East and West.
	Need employment land for the increased population of SE Cheshire.
	Must contribute to funding of J16, A500 improvements and local road safety requirements.
	Strongly object - detrimental impact on the estate's accessibility & will undermine any potential for investment in Radway Green & in turn its attractiveness & viability.
	Object to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor & consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. The sites have not been the subject of a sustainability appraisal – need to assess the potential economic and social impact on the North Staffordshire Conurbation, including its Travel to Work Areas.
	Loss of character, features and identity to small rural communities eg Barthomley.
	Strongly object - of the 27 sites out for consultation, 1/3 of the total number of sites are within the Weston & Basford Parish. None of the proposals are compatible with the size of a rural village.
	Such development proposals would directly conflict with existing allocated employment sites including the Basford West site & undermine its ability to come forward; no links to existing settlements, where the workforce would be located which will exacerbate car borne travel; it would conflict with the overall Development Strategy for Cheshire East and the deliverability of All Change for Crewe; no over-riding economic need for employment uses of the scale envisaged; there are other better placed sites to meet identified employment needs that are not within the green belt; it will prevent the spin off benefits of employment development being realised for Crewe residents. If the sites are developed, they should be phased so that they can not come forward until Basford West is substantially completed.
	This direction of expansion is contrary to the view expressed at a previous EIP which stated “The Secretary of State supports the retention of open countryside between Crewe and the M6 and between the M6 and the Potteries, and considers it desirable to direct expansion away from the south east quadrant of the District”.
	Deliverability is questionable.
Site J - Gorsty Hill Golf Course, Weston 620 representations by 601 9 Support 601 Object	Gorstyhill Golf Club was part of the original design brief for the area & part of the planning permission for Wychwood Village & Wychwood Park. The whole design was to centre housing within a country park and golf course, lessening the impact on the surroundings, offering an environment and landscape so unique in south Cheshire, where house owners would feel safe and gain a sense of open countryside.

10 Comment	
	Section 106 Agreement in place - clearly states that across both sides of Wychwood (Village and Park), no more than 725 dwellings can be built. There are currently 390 on Wychwood Park and once finished, 326 on Wychwood Village, leaving just 9 available to build across both sites. This is what residents were told when they bought their houses. The Section 106 Agreement also states that no building work on the golf course that results in loss of light is possible, which would be the case here. Also contrary to the restrictive covenant running with the land - restricts the development to 725 dwellings. Section 106 agreement and restrictive covenants should be enforced, by not allowing further building here.
	Adverse impact on house values – residents will suffer financial hardship.
	Adverse impact on residents' quality of life; community spirit; character of local area; adjacent country park; & environment.
	Damage to wildlife, flora & fauna – variety of species on the site, including some protected.
	Road infrastructure already strained, within Wychwood Park & especially on the A531 and A500. Traffic noise is significant & would have a damaging impact on the environment. Small, local village roads are already "rat runs" & there are 2 mile queues on the A500 towards the M6 at peak times – this will get worse.
	Site is not needed as there are already sufficient housing allocations in the Local Plan.
	Site is not sustainable – limited bus service, without a public footpath to the bus stop; local roads not safe for pedestrians; would encourage travel by car; no services on site & only limited services proposed – contrary to NPPF.
	Loss of a key sporting amenity for residents, many of whom live here to be next to a golf course.
	Loss of open countryside.
	Flood risk - The golf course floods constantly; the sewage system isn't able to cope with the current demand, and the sewage pumps are constantly having to be maintained and fixed.
	Land is of high agricultural value and should be used for food production/ extended country park/woodland if its use has to change.
	Broadband is poor due to the poor BT exchange in Betley
	No demand for more houses in this area – new houses are for sale for long periods of time.
	No demand/interest in retail on this site. Further amenities on the site would take trade away from existing businesses nearby.
	Noise and disturbance to local residents if building work takes place
	Golf course has been intentionally poorly managed, closed & left to become overgrown, with the intention of building houses on the site.
	Michael Jones stated "This is not going to happen. If you don't want it, the Council will back you 100%." and reject the proposed development.

	Retail development will lead to anti social behaviour with youths buying alcohol and then taking it onto the country park.
	Would be a blight on the currently undulating local landscape; the beauty of the countryside will be destroyed.
	Those needing houses would not be able to afford ones that would be built here.
	There is no proven case that this number of additional houses are needed at this location; large number of houses currently for sale in the area.
	The number of already agreed new houses in the Crewe area is sufficient to satisfy the apparent demand.
	If site is developed, any proposals for additional facilities won't be delivered as they won't be viable and more houses will be built.
	There is no real employment in the area and the population already here often has to commute long distances to find work.
	Use brownfield sites & refurbish existing dwellings in Crewe instead – it needs regeneration
	Development will impact on other neighbouring villages with a massive increase in traffic flow through Weston and Betley.
	The Crewe gateway area needs further development.
	Currently a small-feel Village in the heart of the Cheshire countryside with views out to the Welsh hills - the development would destroy this
	Development would create a huge burden on local facilities (schools, GP's etc) - already stretched – need for a doctor's and new schools on site?.
	Some of the presumptions made in the local plan for housing needs between now and 2030 have been based upon growth projections which we have consistently failed to meet as a nation and local area – development could be left half built if properties don't sell.
	Concerns re safety of children on a building site & on a site that will have more traffic; be much busier & bigger.
	If affordable housing built here – the occupants would not be able to afford to travel to work; use facilities etc.
	The south of Cheshire, especially the Weston area is being hammered by countless speculative developers and Gorstyhill is a true example of this
	If Gorstyhill is no longer viable as a golf course, then the council, with the assistance of the surrounding community should look to compulsory purchase and run as a golf club.
	Adverse impact on lives of local residents
	Support - Development of this site for housing would be putting an old golf course to good use. Good surrounding roads for transport.
	Has there been a Health Impact Assessment completed on this site?
	Dark night sky would be lost with light pollution
	Adverse impact on the character of Weston village – it would join up with Wychwood Village.
	Would set a precedent for development of the nearby golf course at Wychwood Park.

	Site does not easily link with either of the two existing communities of Crewe or Nantwich
	<p>Constraints: Contaminated Land - there are a number of former ponds and sand pits on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use</p> <p>Noise - Road traffic noise impact assessment</p> <p>Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area.</p>
	Golf course was a source of employment in the village
	Adverse impact on country park & its flora & fauna e.g. moths, butterflies, wild flowers
	Concerned that further developments at Wychwood Park will adversely affect the water table locally. Since the original developments, the water flow in Tan House brook has reduced - this feeds the important wetland of Betley Mere, a SSSI.
	Loss of an important recreational facility - Gorsty Hill Golf Course is for the middle to high handicappers and was an excellent facility (built to PGA standard); it does not duplicate the nearby golf course at Wychwood Park which is for golfers of a higher standard. It was popular & should be retained as part of the 'Olympic legacy'.
	The country park currently is a well used area, enjoyed by many - the proposed development would surround it & it would no longer be countryside.
	Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework section 74 - "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on..."
	Adverse impact on health and well-being.
	A highly valuable development site due to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail services and HS2.
	Building work still taking place on this site (it has taken 10 years to build the current 326 properties, a further 900 would take many more years to complete) – it is dangerous & should end when the site with permission is completed & not be allowed to continue on this site.
	The character of the village is an 'open' theme (reinforced by withdrawing permitted development rights from properties) – this development would be contrary to this
	When residents purchased properties they were assured that no further development would take place here, due to the covenant and S106 Agreement.
	Local residents should be compensated for reduced house values.
	Village is family friendly at present – a new development of this size would not be safe for families & children – building work; increased crime rate & anti-social behaviour
	A number of potential sites encircle Weston village – the Council should protect the identity of the village which would be eroded by these proposals.
	Good use of a brownfield site (golf course); if all facilities are provided it would be a sustainable site.



	There has to be some conclusive evidence that the transport and infrastructure links are to be improved before developments can take place. This does not include the addition of bypasses and major link roads.
	The land is also of limited agricultural value
	Development on the site is against the Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council local plan.
	Site is shown as non deliverable in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
	A more even distribution of growth within the Borough is needed – should not all be in this area
	Residents have set up a facebook page and strongly object; residents have also set up the 'Wychwood Village CW2 Community Group'
	Object & concerned re lack of sustainability of site with Barthomley Parish a poor bus service
	Object – concern re adverse impact on the regeneration and sustainability of North Staffordshire; increased traffic
	This site is in Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken. Some ordinary watercourses run through parts of the site. As part of any significant development we may also require a Water Framework Directive assessment to be undertaken.
	Many young people have already left Weston village due to lack of employment opportunities
	Site is a Golf Course. Sport England will object to any site allocation that results in the loss of a sports facility unless it conforms to paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Sport England's planning policy objectives
	Maintain the original objection from Stoke On Trent and Newcastle Borough Councils to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor and furthermore consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. Insufficient information to allow full consideration of sites; no Sustainability Appraisal
	Of the 27 sites out for consultation, 1/3 of the total number of sites are within the Parish of Weston & Basford – the PC strongly objects
	Deliverability is questionable
<b>Site K - Poole Meadows Road, Haslington 109 representations by 104 6 Support 91 Object 12 Comment</b>	This area is of natural green land and serves as a boundary between Crewe and Haslington

	This area is Green Gap and should not be developed
	Traffic impacts especially on Crewe Green Roundabout
	Impact on local infrastructure is too much
	The village of Haslington is totally distinct from the town of Crewe and should remain so.
	This proposal is directly adjacent to the proposed development of land at site F (at the junction of Sydney Road and the A534) meaning the two areas would merge, only to be separated by the A534
	Access to the site is problematic and unsuitable for such a proposal
	This development would affect a number of public footpaths which are currently across the land. These are used as a public amenity for walkers
	The number of already agreed new houses in the Crewe area is sufficient to satisfy the apparent demand
	This land provides huge spaces for a diverse ecology ranging from water birds, birds of prey, ground animals and flora & fauna
	There are insufficient public services within Haslington to accommodate these extra properties, i.e. school places, doctors surgery and leisure facilities.
	Object to development in the Green Belt
	There is no proven need
	Numerous brownfield sites for employment / residential in Stoke On Trent
	It will not satisfy required sustainability criteria
	The viability of this as a development is dubious
	It is vital for the village to retain its own, unique identity
	There is no capacity in the village of Haslington for further population growth
	Prime agricultural land.
	Brownfield sites should be developed with high density housing before any open space/green sites are developed.
	It will destroy vital natural habitats for local wildlife
	Are there really requirements for these new houses to be built on this land? When there are already plenty of local houses available for sale which are not selling
	The site is too close to the Bypass, which would make it a very unpleasant place to live, being subject to constant traffic noise.
	Contaminated Land: There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There is a former landfill 10 metres northwest of the site boundary which has the potential to impact the site. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use.
	Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area. Any development has the potential to cause adverse effects on local air quality as a result of increased transport emissions. In turn this

	can lead to negative health impacts where exposure to such pollutants occurs. We would require Air Quality Impact Assessments for all developments, which consider the impact of not only that development, but the effect of all other developments (proposed or likely) in the area. The assessment would need scoping prior to completion
	All sites will need EMP for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment.
	<p>In order to mitigate the potential effects of increased transport emissions we would look for the developments to incorporate a low emission approach such that all developers consider the likely increase in emissions, and propose measures which are aimed at reducing those increases. Such measures could be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology)</li> <li>- Individual Travel Plans for each new householder/commercial travel plans - focusing away from private vehicle use</li> <li>- Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure to reduce the need for private vehicles</li> <li>- Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc)</li> </ul> <p>For information, it may be that by the time these developments come along Cheshire East has a formally adopted a Low Emission Strategy and possible SPD's.</p>
	Noise, Vibration: Site design and layout is crucial to avoid incompatible uses being placed in close proximity and the potential for loss of amenity caused by noise / vibration. Commercial / industrial uses in close proximity to residential properties for example have the potential to cause issues at the detailed planning stage and may require expensive extensive mitigation / redesign which could be avoided by careful early consideration. Presently we would look that all internal habitable rooms achieve the "Good" standard in accordance with BS 8233:1999 and all external areas achieve the WHO Guideline Noise Levels. Environmental Noise Directive: National mapping exercise has identified 'Important Areas' and 'First Priority Locations' where exposure to road noise is considered greatest. Noise action plans are to be proposed in these areas. Any new development proposals will need to consider if new exposures are being introduced, if they may impact on existing areas and if mitigation measures may be appropriate for existing areas.
	The Council would be better focusing on the dilapidated town centre
	Archaeology: No previous work on this site. The size of the site probably merits the preparation and submission of a Desk Based Assessment in support of any application, in order to establish the need, if any, for further evaluation and mitigation.
	The curse of the Bypass strikes again - It happens all the time - villages fight for a bypass to reduce traffic noise and to keep the area as a nice community to live in. The bypass creates small pockets of land prime for development; they get built on thus creating an urban sprawl
	Site within Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board consultation area; is a statutory requirement to consult with the Board regarding foundation requirements at planning permission and building regulations stages. Whilst this is normally done as part of application process, the Board welcomes pre-application discussions with developers to ensure smooth passage at the formal consultation stage.

	Pool Meadows is ancient right off way/un adopted bridleway and adjoining land owners will have specific ownership and way leave rights.
	An integrated Travel infrastructure Plan is required
	We were told by the power supply company that there is only just sufficient electric supply to the existing houses. There had been frequent power cuts to houses off and along Primrose Avenue.
	There are present / former ponds on the site
	Running sand caused problems when the By-Pass was built and is believed to be on other parts of this site
	Does Crewe need to grow further – where is the market / demand for this growth
	More jobs first rather than housing
	UK grown food will assist in the fight for global warming
	Haslington Parish Council has repeatedly made their position very clear in they do not support any development in the existing Green Gap between Haslington, Crewe Green and urban Crewe.
	This parcel of land is effectively useless for economic agricultural purposes and provision of housing would remove development pressures from other sites
	Overall noise would increase. Bypass traffic noise is already too noticeable either through volume (commercial or otherwise) or via motorcycles thrashing along in the early hours of the morning.
	Likely to affect setting of Crewe Green (estate village) Conservation Area
	The site is similar to SHLAA site 2945 that Cheshire East Council has considered “Not Suitable”, “Not currently developable”.
	The access to the site has not been identified; local residential roads can not support more traffic safely. The entire site is within the existing Green Gap, and some of it is within the proposed Strategic Open Gap - though the boundaries are not as yet fully defined.
	Could add to congestion at Crewe Green roundabout.
	No heritage assets and distant from setting of Crewe Green Conservation Area.
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. If it is thought that any deterioration could be caused, then the developer has to put in place suitable mitigation measures. As part of any significant development we may also require a WFD assessment to be undertaken.
	In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information

	This site is in Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken.
	<p>We do not wish to repeat our previous detailed comments in respect of CEC's current failure to demonstrate a minimum 5.25 years (reflecting 20% buffer) future housing land supply, or our reasons for regarding the methodology on which the adopted Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment / Housing Land Supply as flawed and unsound. It seems sufficient to comment, that our opinion in respect of these matters, as stated in our February 2013 representation, remain substantially the same. Indeed, having had the benefit of considering the content of the 20 May 2013 Housebuilders Consortium representations in respect of CEC's current housing land supply position, undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, we understand that this very recent and impressively robust analysis of CEC's current land supply position, concludes that, even on the most optimistic interpretation of the figures, CEC is unable to demonstrate anything more than a 3.28 years deliverable housing land supply at the present time. By any measure therefore there is a critical shortfall of housing land within Cheshire East that must be addressed as a matter of urgency. The Council is urged to address this shortfall rather than seek to hide the position through the adoption of a fundamentally flawed SHLAA.</p>
	<p>Our clients own the freehold of a large area of land to the western side of the A34 By-pass, (known as Land Adj to Bradeley Hall Farm, Haslington). The site is suitable to support some 450-500 approx dwellings on some 47 approx net developable acres. Other adjacent land owners are also willing in principle to explore the possible inclusion of their land ownerships to form an even larger strategic land opportunity. It would offer a comprehensive mixed development for housing; formal leisure and recreation facilities; informal POS; extension of the public footpath network to open up public access/etc; ecological benefits; the establishment of a far more functional reconfigured "Green Gap" wholly within public ownership/control etc. it may also afford an opportunity to bring forward a substantial improvement to the general highway network to the north and east of Crewe.</p>
	<p>Following review of the open space, sports and recreational facilities in the general eastern Crewe/Haslington areas, undertaken by our clients' specialist consultants, JPC Strategic Planning and Leisure Ltd, in 2008, a significant undersupply of sports pitches, formal parks and recreational facilities was found to exist. We understand that this position is unlikely to have improved. We have recommended that this assessment is updated, to include a review of developments in the area since this date and a specific review of CEC's own Open Space Assessment, and which we anticipate will be advanced by our clients shortly. As previously referenced, the opportunity to make a very valuable contribution to local leisure and recreational facilities is substantial with a strategic development proposal of this nature, as well as opening up significant parts of the site for general public access via public footpath/cycle links etc and general improvements to the quality and functionality of the Green Gap, in terms of still safeguarding the separation of eastern Crewe with the distinctive settlement of Haslington, and enhancing landscaping/ecological features etc.</p>
	<p>Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield</p>
	<p>No information is known about this site; therefore, the deliverability remains questionable.</p>
	<p>While this site is admittedly larger than our client's site off Clay Lane, Haslington, we suggest that our client's site (which could accommodate around 45 houses) could reasonably be deemed to be 'strategic' when considered against the context / size of the</p>

	settlement of Haslington. Crucially, our client's site (see the star on the aerial image attached) is not located within the Strategic Green Gap, whereas development of Site K is (marked with red boundary attached) would fundamentally erode the purpose of the Green Gap. We object accordingly to Site K, and contend that it should remain undeveloped and should continue to form part of the Green Gap.
	While your document suggests that Site K could accommodate around 120 houses (with no explanation), that does seem to be underplaying a site of 11.5ha (we note that other objectors have made this same point). Ordinarily a site of that size would be expected to achieve around 330 units (possibly even up towards 400 units). So why is a figure of only 120 being presented? Is that realistic?
Site L - Booths Hall Estate, Knutsford 107 representations by 106 33 Support 57 Object 17 comment	Land of Toft cricket club should be safeguarded and views of the original Booths Hall building. Cricket club is a valuable asset.
	Ideal site with excellent road infrastructure, site is hidden, no impact on views of neighbouring properties, access established
	Knutsford Rugby Club and Toft CC could share a new state of the art club house, two pitches each and the site could provide open space and public realm
	Possible development site as it is poor wetland - ground conditions too poor for farming
	Could a car parking scheme be incorporated and a small business development for start up firms?
	Mixed use sites preferable as long as in keeping with the local area
	Any development must be in keeping with the rural character
	Sensible site that will not result in an unacceptable loss of countryside
	Development sites in the north and east are badly needed – focus in the south of the county is unsustainable
	Across the borough land allocated to business remains undeveloped. This site should be considered for mixed use development – sustainable development balancing housing and employment with mix of housing to match employment profile (serviced meeting rooms etc for home based professionals).
	Will need to demonstrate “very special circumstances” however this site is less visible than other green belt locations at Knutsford
	Must be considered part of the 400 houses for Knutsford
	North Knutsford Community Group: support as an additional site limited to 50 to 100 houses within the 400 for Knutsford, include protection of recreational grounds, and maintain protected open space. Undertake a comprehensive traffic assessment and implement a traffic management plan and parking solution for Knutsford. Create green corridors and protect the ecology

	Need to protect the historic parkland, the scheduled ancient monument, the two areas of biological importance, the mere/wetland and the mature trees
	Loss of local supply of milk/ a sustainable business
	Need for road and infrastructure improvements
	If necessary, a small housing development would be appropriate and could be used to round off the green belt boundary. Do not believe there is a requirement for additional employment space
	Brownfield sites and conversion of buildings in Knutsford should be considered first but if demonstrated that those are not enough then residential and employment uses only with sensitive planning.
	Limit number of houses to 50
	Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group (KCHG): supports development at Booths Hall Estate only if there is evidenced need exceeding that which can be met at non-Green Belt sites and through building adaptations in Knutsford and adjacent to the edge of Knutsford (at Parkgate) – providing no development would compromise the existing setting and character of Booths Hall or Scheduled Ancient Monument, nor of long-distance views of them; - Toft Cricket Club facilities to remain, including to enhance the environmental quality of the locality; - additional development to be screened if necessary from existing dwellings nearby; - appropriate protection of wildlife and vegetation.
	The site could be used as a way to spread the load of expected development around Knutsford.
	CE Employment Land Review appears to provide evidence for including this site for mixed development or housing for specific market eg older residents
	On the basis that there are sufficient and valid exceptional circumstances to warrant developing Green Belt, which we do not believe there are, we would support the inclusion of this site in the Core Strategy.
	Former pond and area of disturbed ground - contaminated land assessment required. Assessment of road noise exposure required; AQA required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.
	The site contains a Scheduled Monument; Norbury Booths Hall Moated Site, fishponds and connecting channels. In describing surrounding uses, the document should refer to the Scheduled Monument, St Johns Church and surrounding burial ground, 100 metres to the north of the site.
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact on United Utilities until the Council has confirmed its suitability, scale and delivery programme
	The watercourse, along the eastern boundary of site is "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA.
	Archaeology: Likely to need full DBA due to the size & presence of the statutorily-designated Booths Hall moat Scheduled Monument. Area is categorised as Ornamental Park. Development would cause substantive & significant harm to the historic landscape. Impact of development on the Scheduled Monument and historic landscape needs to be assessed in the DBA

	Within the third most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links
	Lyme Walk is protected and has a Tree Preservation Order.
	Traffic is a major problem; additional traffic will be intolerable and may require a bypass.
	The transport network requires improving before further significant developments can be made
	Spring Wood is a valuable nature area and must be protected. Booths Mere must remain
	Site is unsustainable – access to community services, impact on community infrastructure that is at capacity already (schools, health, sports and roads), loss of important recreational space, loss of land important for milk production delivered locally, adverse impact on open environment. Less than ideal location for road and national rail links. Traffic would have to cross Knutsford to get to M6 and M1A.
	Area between hall and Chelford Rd bounded by lake, hall and house would be good infill if there is a need for development. But greenfield; prime farmland; Green Belt; margin by lake should be parkland. All other areas encroach into countryside and make Knutsford an absurd shape.
	Room for development in western section but lake area is SSSI and south east of the site has exception landscape value thus would need top of the range housing with aesthetic considerations. Issues with accessibility; traffic issues - would need a Knutsford bypass.
	Site does not meet the requirements in the Sustainability Appraisal. It will not promote economic prosperity.
	Development here will not benefit or support Knutsford shops nor schools. Resources are already overstretched. People will use their cars rather than walk
	Object to the Eastern part – keep woodland and stream as green belt
	Priority must be brown field sites – green belt land must remain
	Site constrained by flood risk, ecology issues, nature conservation priority area, 2 sites of nature conservation importance, historic parkland, Booths Hall, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, woodland, recreational/sport facility, local infrastructure capacity
	Conflicts with CE Sustainable Community Strategy – making the most of heritage and natural assets. No evidence of proper landscape character assessment to assess the suitability of any potential sites given the established Green Belt boundary
	Site falls within the statutory definition of playing field, therefore needs to conform to Sport England's Playing Fields Policy (para 74) – appropriate mitigation required for any loss of playing field
	Object because site includes 2 local Wildlife Sites and an Ancient Woodland Site, all of which could be negatively impacted by adjacent development. Sets a precedent for further development of this edge of the town Weakens strong urban edge.
	Site already being reoccupied for industrial use
	Site should remain as Business Park – excellent location for employment uses
	Would negate the constraints defined in the Booths Hall Estate Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document.
	Development would impact on the character of the town



	Development would generate too much congestion and pollution
Site M - Glebe Farm, Middlewich (extended site 39 representations by 38 5 Support 26 Object 8 Comment	Support the site but need traffic improvements to Booth Lane and Long Lane South and keep environmental impact to a minimum
	The local amenities wont cope
	The roads will not support it
	Not a strategic site
	None of the additional sites should be considered as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed. However if these sites are to be considered it should be as an alternative to Handforth East
	Object, green field outside the built up area remote form services. Middlewich is already lopsided
	Brownfield first
	Former ponds – contaminated. Land assessment required. Road noise exposure assessment required. AQA required. All developments ; air quality travel measures, noise and vibration important.
	The site is incorrectly designated as Middlewich when it is in Moston, designated as a strategic open gap in the original draft Local Plan. Inappropriate greenfield development
	The impact of this plan coupled with the extension of Middlewich 4 ( Warmington Lane) would have a major impact on Warmington Lane
	The site may merit some limited mitigation in view of proximity to Tetton Hall Roman site. Development would effectively separate two sizable and good quality areas of Medieval Townfield as categorised in the HCL. Impact of development on historic landscape needs to be assessed in the DBA
	Site within Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board Consultation area. Statutory requirement to consult with the Board regarding foundation requirements at planning stage.
	The site has relatively poor connectivity to the wide range of transport links available to other sites in the consultation
	Damage to rural character and way of life and ecology
	Unsuitable urban sprawl
	The site is in Flood Zone 1 any proposal greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site specific FRA to be undertaken
	The site should be allocated as a Strategic Site as it is sustainably located on the edge of Middlewich ( a Key Service Centre) There

	are no physical or political constraints. It is suitable available achievable
	Within the forth most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links
Site N - Land to the North West of Booth Lane, Middlewich 49 representations by 47 12 Support 22 Object 15 Comment	There is an opportunity, using the canal as an existing asset, to develop an improvement to this area of Middlewich. The site would be suitable for a marina.
	The impact on the Trent & Mersey Canal should be fully considered and mitigated if this site is taken forward for mixed use development. Canals and Rivers Trust must be kept informed
	The road infrastructure is not capable of handling any more traffic. Redevelopment would have to be subject entirely to completing the eastern bypass as the centre of Middlewich cannot accommodate any more traffic.
	Sustainable transport should be encouraged by providing few parking spaces and providing shuttle buses between the town and pedestrian priority on site.
	Infrastructure in Middlewich could support a development of this size and the road network would not cope
	Already part industrial and will adjoin J18 Pochin Industrial Park
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed. However if these sites are to be considered, it should be as an alternative to say Handforth East.
	This area is suitable for development as it is close to other similar sites.
	A good location, providing that only sustainable development is built in the area and the environmental impact is kept to a minimum.
	This area is much more suitable than other sites as it has large areas of old works that are unused already. Site suitable for a mixed use development as part of it is derelict land and an eyesore which should be developed!
	A much smaller development solely on the brownfield areas of this proposal would be acceptable with conditions, if the Middlewich by-pass is completed & extensions to school capacities are achieved. Developers should contribute funding to both schemes.
	Object to loss of green fields, no justification
	Object to building on green fields, would damage to rural way of life and ecology.
	outside of built-up boundary; remote from services; Middlewich is already lopsided and this would make it worse

	Brownfield sites should be developed with high density housing before any open space/green sites are developed.
	Not a suitable site for development
	Contaminated land, There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been in filled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues.
	Landfill buffer; Part of the site has a current and former industrial use and there is a former landfill within 250m of the site boundary which has the potential to impact the site. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use.
	Noise issues; AQA required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.
	This site is incorrectly designated as Middlewich. In fact the site is in the Parish of Moston
	The area between Middlewich and Sandbach i.e. Moston was proposed as a Strategic Open Gap in the original Draft Local Plan.
	Archaeology work to date: Much of area already covered by DBAs. Development west of A533 and east of railway line would harm historic landscape (Medieval Townfield). These areas should be excluded. If remainder of area comes forward, an overarching DBA advised to identify areas with min archaeological impact, where mitigation can be specified & where more info is needed.
	Possible flood risk that could be caused by development on this site. Any changes to the water level in Sanderson's Brook will cause flooding in the Parishes of Bradwall and Sproston. Careful planning of drainage and groundwater run-off must be included in the detailed planning process.
	This site has limited access to good transport links and, hence, is not preferred for development relative to many of the other potential sites presented in this document.
	Object to retail development on this site which is of a scale which could prejudice retail growth and success in Crewe Town Centre.
	Should not be developed owing to weight of already proposed development, the need to access the M6 by passing through either Middlewich or Sandbach and the absence of a railway station
	Retain green corridor through the western part of the site and enhance canal side GI PDL is suitable for redevelopment but pipeline corridor should provide a strong eastern boundary.
	Middlewich getting more than its share
	The Town Council recommends that the proposal for mixed use development on this site (including employment, retail, leisure, tourism, hotel and residential) is not supported as this would be a change of use from the use identified in the Draft Middlewich Town Strategy;
	As part of any significant development we may also require a WFD assessment to be undertaken. A relatively small area is Flood

	Zone 2 affecting the south-eastern part of the site. This is unlikely to have any significant effects on any proposed development. Ordinary watercourses run through parts of the site, some in culvert. The site has been the subject of planning proposals with a FRA carried out.
	The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area runs through the middle of the two southern parcels. This includes two mileposts and a lock all of which are Grade II listed. There are also various cottages adjacent to and within the site that are possibly historically linked to the canal and may be of local significance.
	The site contains land that falls within the statutory definition of playing field. For that reason any proposal that affects those sites will need to conform to Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 74 of the NPPF.
	Land adjacent to railway inc old sidings
	Within the third most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links
	The site is located on the edge of Middlesbrough in a sustainable location. Middlesbrough has good access to a range of public transport and certain key services and facilities
Site O - Ilfords, Ilford Way, Mobberley 73 representations by 72 19 Support 35 Object 19 comment	Excellent choice of land for developing and regenerating – brown field site which would benefit from both new housing and mixed use development, close to amenities and other housing
	Support: Brown field sites should take preference over Greenfield sites
	Retain public footpath and tree screening
	Traffic created will create a serious safety issue
	New infrastructure will be required – new school, retail units, health care
	Housing numbers proposed seem high
	Will impact on Knutford's infrastructure – roads, health, schools are already pressurised.
	Road congestion is a particular issue
	Site identified in the SHLAA as available for housing development – suitable, achievable, deliverable for part of the site within next 1-5 years. Employment land Review – site has limited appeal as an employment site. Adjacent SBI would not be affected
	Any development should be more sympathetic than the previous high density development, should enhance the village with open spaces, landscaping and community facilities
	The site immediately abuts the Mobberley Conservation Area to the east, which includes a number of listed buildings. Need to

	assess the impact on the Conservation area
	The watercourse adjacent to north-eastern boundary of site is "main river" and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken. Consideration must be given to supply of water and the sewage network capacity
	Site has been marketed for a significant period of time and therefore the Council needs assurance that it will come forward for residential development.
	When considering applications for residential development in areas that are near sources of aircraft noise, aircraft noise should be taken into account as a material consideration.
	Within the third most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links
	The Crown and Tatton Estates note that that additional sites in this northern part of Cheshire East, for example sites O and P at Mobberley, serve a different housing market to Knutsford. Therefore in the event of those sites coming forward, these would not detract from the housing requirements of Knutsford itself.
	Increased population and employment land in Mobberley is unsustainable from a highways perspective. It will be detrimental to surrounding towns such as Knutsford.
	No infrastructure -Schools already at maximum capacity. Village becoming more of a town ,Urban sprawl. Increased traffic risks/parking problems. Village loose rural identity What would be the future of businesses/jobs More housing goes against the wishes of the residents
	Development could be especially damaging to the visual amenity and landscape qualities of the wider area, including views from the Conservation Area. For this reason it is essential to ensure that adequate natural screening is established to reduce the visual impact of any new development on the surrounding open countryside. A Development Brief should be drawn up for local consultation.
	Has been in Industrial use for 60 years and should continue in Industrial use
	No further housing development in this part of rural Cheshire; employment is needed and should remain in employment use
	Within the Public Safety zone therefore should not be developed – serious safety issues. Site subject to airport noise
	Additional housing to Mobberley will ruin the character of the village
	Roads can not take any more traffic
	School is full and already turns away children from the village
	Access is down a narrow country lane
	Permission been previously refused for this site
	Mobberley had too much development in recent years (250 dwellings in last 10 years) – affecting its character. Infrastructure can not take any more – including medical facilities, Sewage disposal as well as school, doctors, dentists, roads, shops etc

	Should remain as employment site. Mobberley has one of the highest start up rates for new businesses and this site should be retained for that purpose
	Contrary to CE commitment to plan led, jobs let sustainable development – contrary to this: removes jobs, short term building employment for out of area contractors, no exceptional circumstances to build more houses, school full.
	Will result in loss of employment at Ilford's which employs local people who can work to work
	Green belt sites must be resisted. No special circumstances. Protected by green belt legislation/NPPF
	E-petition with 5 signatures and 52 signatures and petition with 191 signatures – against large housing development in Mobberley village; school is full; local amenities overstretched; Smith Lane is too narrow and dangerous; development too large for village and will destroy its character and identity.
Site P - Land at Junction of Town Lane and Smith Lane, Mobberley 91 representations by 88 9 Support 73 Object 9 Comment	This would make an excellent site – if linked to Ilford's site for housing and mixed use development
	Creating jobs too would be preferable
	Preferable to using green field sites
	Support if: new primary/junior school provided, railway station re sited to Broadoak Lane, inclusion of shops, access road are onto Town Lane, Smith Lane and Broadoak Lane needs to be included
	Site is deliverable; well contained; will deliver community benefits.
	Former ponds - contaminated land assessment required; railway noise; aircraft noise; AQA required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.
	Archaeology: The size of the site probably merits the preparation and submission of a DBA in support of any application
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact until the Council has confirmed its suitability, scale and delivery programme
	Adjacent to the railway with Broad Oak Farm to the West
	This site is in Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken.
	when considering applications for residential development in areas that are near sources of aircraft noise (e.g sites O and P), aircraft noise should be taken into account as a material consideration.

	Within the fourth most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links
	Additional sites in this northern part of Cheshire East, for example sites O and P at Mobberley, serve a different housing market to Knutsford. Therefore in the event of those sites coming forward, these would not detract from the housing requirements of Knutsford itself.
	Increased population and employment land in Mobberley is unsustainable from a highways perspective. It will be detrimental to surrounding towns such as Knutsford.
	It would be in the Green Belt and prime agricultural land. No village education facilities. Mixed use with small scale retail would detract from the village centre, create dangerous junction, traffic concerns, parking problems. Mobberley Village identity is gradually being eroded. More housing goes against the wishes of the residents as highlighted in the Parish Plan.
	This is green belt separating Knutsford and Mobberley and should remain as such. It is good agricultural land and should be retained for farming
	No further housing development in this part of rural Cheshire; greenfield; prime farmland; aircraft noise; scale of development proposed too large for Mobberley.
	Infrastructure can not support further development; facilities do not support the existing population. School full. Drainage, power supply, medical facilities and roads could not cope. Foul drainage system grossly overloaded
	Green belt sites should not be developed
	Pavements too narrow and road too busy – dangerous for children to walk to school
	Would have detrimental impact on the character of Mobberley
	On the fringe of the Airport Public Safety Zone. Site under the flight path; too noisy. Existing houses not selling
	Site serves green belt function – separates Knutsford from Mobberley; would destroy the openness of the green belt; would materially change the boundary of the village and lead to threats of further release of land
	Parking and traffic congestion already an issue. Roads too narrow
	Site has poor connectivity in terms of transport links in comparison to other sites
	Contrary to CE commitment to plan led, jobs led sustainable development
	Site of wildlife importance
	Inadequate publicity and awareness of this consultation
	Detrimental impact on water table – frequent flooding in several areas particularly Town Lane
	Not deemed necessary by Cheshire East Development Strategy
	Site not sustainable – need to own and use car
	Mobberley had a lot of development in recent years
	E-petition with 5 signatures and 52 signatures and petition with 191 signatures – against large housing development in Mobberley village; school is full; local amenities overstretched; Smith Lane is too narrow and dangerous; development too large for village

	and will destroy its character and identity.
Site Q - Land West of Cooksmere Lane, Sandbach 293 representations by 280 5 support 279 Object 9 Comment	Opposed to all new build homes on greenfield areas.
	There are numerous brownfield sites prime for employment and residential development in Stoke On Trent, and allocated land throughout Cheshire East.
	The impact on the local infrastructure would be too significant and for what benefit??
	There are sufficient brownfield sites which could and should be used.
	Object to loss of farmland which we will need just to feed the people in the UK by 2050
	Wildlife will be severely affected also, at a time when many species are rapidly declining in the country as a whole.
	Objection to the number (scale) of houses been proposed on green fields with no regard to countryside, wildlife and infrastructure.
	Housing on this site would NOT be a sustainable development as it is too far from the town centre and other facilities. The site is not easily accessible. The only way to make the site accessible would be to build a northern bypass going from J17 all the way through to Middlewich Road north of Elworth. However, there is no mention of this in the plans.
	Sandbach is a great location for further development and expansion.
	If greenfield sites need to be developed, this is a preferred site owing to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail services & HS2. There is also good access to Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands & Birmingham Airports via the motorway network and direct rail services from Crewe to MIA & BHI.
	Sites Q, R and S are all farm land with nearly 3000 houses proposed and can be described therefore as monstrous. The pressure on the golf club which they will surround is obvious. The town will find it hard to provide a proper infrastructure for these houses which are not therefore sustainable.
	No to large housing developments that destroy our communities, green space, wildlife and agricultural land and threaten our well being and quality of life.
	No to commuter estates that contribute nothing to the local economy but increase demand on our already overstretched services and infrastructure.
	There is inadequate access for development from Cookesmere Lane / Bradwall Road / Vicarage Lane / Marsh Green Lane. North of



	Marsh Green Road. This is a very narrow country lane just wide enough for 1 car. 3000 houses here would be a nightmare. Traffic congestion is already very bad getting out of Marsh Green Rd in the morning with permanent queues stretching to town.
	Land prone to flooding - marshland.
	Threat to wildlife
	This proposal could only be viable if it helps create a thriving and sustainable community, including one new primary school, several play areas, a skate park with appropriate facilities for older children, community allotments, cycle tracks and dedicated space for woodland and wildlife.
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed. However if these sites are to be considered, it should be as an alternative to say Handforth East.
	The town needs investment and bringing in new people will encourage local businesses to stay in Sandbach. I hope this will force the changes needed to improve local roads and in particular to junction 17 on the M6.
	There is no offer to develop the centre of Sandbach to cater for this large increase of population
	It is contrary to Policies PS8 & H6 of the CBC local plan.
	The site would erode the "Green gap" between Elworth and Sandbach.
	Planning permission has already been granted for 1,639 new houses in the Sandbach area. This together with a planned housing growth of 700 dwellings represents a growth of over 30%
	These developments detract massively from what makes Sandbach a good place to live
	Bradwall Road is used by dog walkers, runners, cyclists for recreational purposes, this must be taken into account. Public rights of way linking Cookesmere/Wood Lane to Elworth Hall and Bradwall Road would be lost forever.
	Given that houses not required to meet local need and not included in local plan there is no justification in approving the appeal. Exceeding housing demand already satisfied by approved schemes.
	There is not enough employment within the local area to sustain the additional working adults who will live on the proposed development.
	Do not believe 600 jobs will be created and will be very surprised if any additional jobs will last beyond the build programme
	"When the last tree is cut down, the last fish eaten, and the last stream poisoned, we will realise that we cannot eat money"
	The site is not deliverable. The current land owner is totally opposed to development and does not want the site to be included in the local plan. Therefore the land is not available, rendering the site undeliverable in respect of meeting the Council's targets.
	Former ponds; former landfill; farms - contaminated land assessment required. Noise impact assessment required due to railway; AQA required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.

	Who will be financially gaining from this venture.
	<p>Archaeology work to date: A pipeline has passed through this site and been subject to a watching brief but without significant results</p> <p>Work advised or likely to be advised: Advice was provided on this site as part of the draft SHLAA in 2009. A DBA would be advised if the site was brought forward for development.</p>
	What's needed is sustainable, mixed use development on brown field sites, NOT more houses on open countryside.
	United Utilities is unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact until the Council has confirmed its suitability, scale and delivery programme
	The homes are not included in the emerging local plan; there is no justification for their inclusion.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public Safety. Risk especially at M6 Junction 17</li> <li>2. Danger on main roads. e.g. A50</li> <li>3. Danger on Country Roads. Those are crumbling and full of pot holes</li> </ol>
	Why are you engaged with Majolica Ltd, when a search suggests the Company is dissolved? Struck off register 2009.
	Before we expand Sandbach any further we need a 21 century town plan which takes through traffic away from the centre. This requires strategic land to be designated for this purpose before it has all been built on by ad hoc developments put forward by a large number of developers.
	A development of this size needs to include schools, doctors, dentists, a supermarket, leisure facilities, bus stops and safe footpaths and cycle ways. Sustainable transport should be encouraged. Employment zones should be included so that people can walk to work.
	There are also many sites which are undeveloped which already have planning permission - these should be developed first to stop the practice of property developers "land banking".
	Currently on rightmove.co.uk there is in excess of 1000 affordable (i.e. under £140,000) home within a 15 mile radius of the CW11 postcode, why build more when these could be inhabited?
	Location joins with resident area to south and also to proposal site R to the east making a total of over 2,000 new homes! Where is the infrastructure?
	This country is facing a major housing crisis and unless we start building more now we will be in a real mess. The planning laws need to be brought up to date so it is easier to get permission
	The watercourses along the northern boundary and through the central part of site are both ordinary watercourses. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affecting land along the northern boundary, although indicative only. Any proposed built development in FZ 3 is likely to require Sequential and Exception Tests and also compensatory flood. The remainder of the site is Flood Zone 1 and requires a site specific FRA
	Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be

	included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield
Site R - Land East of Cooksmere Lane, Sandbach 287 representations by 289 5 Support	Sites Q, R and S are all farm land with nearly 3000 houses proposed and can be described therefore as monstrous. The pressure on the golf club which they will surround is obvious. The town will find it hard to provide a proper infrastructure for these houses which are not therefore sustainable.
	This site links with site Q to the west, therefore the impact of both sites should be considered as one huge block of housing development. It is dishonest and misleading to present them as two separate sites.
	Why are you engaged with Majolica Ltd, when a search suggests the Company is dissolved? Struck off register 2009.
	Opposed to any new build houses on greenbelt areas.
	Opposed to building on a designated Green Gap, will result in urban sprawl
	The impact on the local infrastructure and services such as schools and doctors would be too great, it is stretched already
	Would cause traffic congestion
	Car parking in Sandbach is already full.
	Sandbach needs an overall traffic plan to divert through traffic away from its centre. This site provides part of an obvious route for removing the Middlewich traffic which must not be lost due to a premature housing development which based on its size would also overload the current local road system.
	There are sufficient brown field sites
	There are brownfield in Stoke on Trent
	Too much housing planned already
	Housing will not meet local need. Planning permission has already been granted for 1,639 new houses in the Sandbach area. This together with a planned housing growth of 700 dwellings represents a growth of over 30%. There is therefore no need for additional sites in the area, and there is no provision or plan to support any further sites with upgraded infrastructure.
	Knock on effect new homes will have on the prices of existing properties. This could put some existing home owners into negative equity. Currently on rightmove.co.uk there is in excess of 1000 affordable (i.e. under £140,000) home within a 15 mile radius of the CW11 postcode, why build more when these could be inhabited?
	Object to the damage to wildlife. Planners should read The State of Nature report, launched on 21 May 2013, showing why 60% per cent of UK wildlife species are in decline. This will just subtract yet more land from the habitat that wildlife needs. And we

	need wildlife, not because it's pretty but because it is vital.
	Object to the loss of farm land. Development on graded agricultural land, which supplies the food chain of the country and provides employment on the land for the farm and support industries. This 75 acre site produces grass, wheat, barley, fodder beet and oats for animal and human food.
	The site is not sustainable as it is too far from the town centre
	There is inadequate access for such a development Cookesmere Lane/Bradwall Road/Swallow Drive. Vicarage lane and Marsh green lane roads are insufficient for the capacity of cars that would be generated by the extra volume of houses.
	The site is not easily accessible and would need a bypass from J17, especially if the adjacent sites were also developed.
	1. Public Safety. Risk especially at M6 Junction 17 2. Danger on main roads. e.g. A50
	To make rapid expansion on this scale viable for a sustainable community, it requires a large investment in not only technical but also social infrastructure, including a primary school, play areas, skate park with appropriate facilities for older children, community allotment, cycle tracks and woodland and wildlife areas.
	Lack of local employment opportunities and poor public transport links
	Would be a commuter estate and would not contribute in any way to the local economy but rather would drain and place additional strain on services and facilities. Turning a pleasant market town into a faceless dormitory
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed. However if these sites are to be considered, it should be as an alternative to say Handforth East.
	This proposed site is totally unjustifiable, unsustainable and is contrary to policies PS8 & H6 of the adopted CBC local plan.
	The development will do significant and demonstrable harm to the open countryside and local wildlife. There are a number of Ancient Hedgerows (as defined by The Hedgerows Regulations 1997) on the site. Northern Crested Newts, a protected species under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, have been seen in the area of the site. Given that the houses are not required to meet a local need and are not included in the emerging local plan there is no justification for approving these sites.
	Loss of amenity. Local residents and visitors use the area for recreational activities.
	Loss of footpaths
	The site is of such a significant size that it will significantly impact on the character of Sandbach.
	"When the last tree is cut down, the last fish eaten, and the last stream poisoned, we will realise that we cannot eat money"
	The trees to the north of the site should be protected as a wildlife habitat. Sustainable living and transport measures should be included in the plans and paid for by the developer (ie safe pathways, play areas, skateboard park, cycleways)
	I object because it is too close to the site of the Bradwall Horse trials and the rugby club. The road is falling to bits and is not suitable for all the additional traffic.
	It would set a precedent for future development of open countryside for the next 20 years if this was to be included in the Local

	Plan.
	The site is not deliverable, the current land owner is totally opposed to development and does not want the site to be included in the local plan. Therefore the land is not available, rendering the site undeliverable in respect of meeting the Council's targets.
	<p>This site is adjacent to land north of Marsh Green Road, an area already considered by Cheshire East Council as an alternative site and rejected as unsuitable.</p> <p>- Preferred sites in the Sandbach area are for mixed development, this site is housing only and its use as an alternative site would result in a failure to meet the strategic development goals of the local plan.</p>
	Why not convert some of the vacant pubs and banks in the centre of Sandbach into housing? Bringing life back into the town centre
	Contaminated Land: There are a number of former ponds and pits on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There is a former brick works on the east of the site. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use.
	Air Quality Assessment would be required due to scale of development. There is presently 1 Air Quality Management Area in the Sandbach area, and a number of areas where levels of pollution are known to be close to statutory limits.
	All sites will need EMP for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment.
	Good for Sandbach to grow, but ensure smooth traffic flow and all types of properties are built.
	<p>Archaeology work to date: A pipeline has passed through this site and been subject to a watching brief but without significant results</p> <p>Work advised or likely to be advised: Advice was provided on this site as part of the draft SHLAA in 2009. A DBA would be advised if the site was brought forward for development.</p>
	United Utilities is unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact until the Council has confirmed its suitability, scale and delivery programme
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. There are ordinary watercourses along the northern boundary and through the site, some in culvert. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affects a relatively small area at the north-western part of the site. This is unlikely to have any significant effects on any proposed development. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA
	Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield
Site S - Land to the Rear of Park Lane	Sites Q, R and S are all farm land with nearly 3000 houses proposed and can be described therefore as monstrous. The pressure on the golf club which they will surround is obvious. The town will find it hard to provide a proper infrastructure for these houses

and Crewe Road, Sandbach 136 representations by 134 5 Support 121 Object 10 Comment	which are not therefore sustainable.
	Opposition to any new build homes on green belt areas.
	Object to infilling
	Would join Sandbach with Elworth; more suitable sites available; too many houses; would change nature of Sandbach
	To build on this land would destroy the villages of Elworth and Wheelock, amalgamating them into one large housing estate. There is also no suitable vehicular access.
	The Green Space Strategy document state that; "Sandbach has no accessible countryside on the urban fringe" and also "little public open space". Building on this land would not alleviate the situation.
	Infrastructure is not present to support this.
	Congestion is already seen at certain hot spots around the town and increasing the number of homes will only make this dramatically worse. Between 600-1500 vehicles trying to exit Park Lane early in the morning and returning at night doesn't bare thinking about.
	There are numerous brownfield sites prime for employment and residential development in Stoke On Trent, and allocated land throughout Cheshire East.
	We must preserve all green space at all costs to preserve our countryside for future generations.
	Should leave farm land alone
	Wildlife will be severely affected also, at a time when many species are rapidly declining in the country as a whole.
	Object to the scale of development 714 houses would mean approximately five times the number of houses
	This site fits in well with the strategy for further development of the south Cheshire area.
	We already have speculative housing developments going ahead and certainly do not need any more. The Development Strategy should be about jobs and economic investment not house building which is of no benefit to our community.
	None of these additional sites should be considered, as the requirement is already met by the sites already discussed. However if these sites are to be considered, it should be as an alternative to say Handforth East.
	This site is not sustainable It is outside the development area of Sandbach

	Would be a great loss of open green space for recreation, wildlife and the wellbeing of local people.
	The site has for many years been subject to brine extraction collapse. Site within Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board consultation area; is a statutory requirement to consult with the Board regarding foundation requirements at planning permission and building regulations stages.
	M6 Junction 17 is already very severely congested, taking much more traffic than it is designed to take. Increasing the population of Sandbach in this way will make the problem worse
	The proposal is on open countryside in contravention of both the local adopted policies and the NPPF. It should not be considered in isolation. It is one of a number of similar developments submitted recently. Planning permission has already been granted for 1,639 new dwellings in the Sandbach/Elworth area.
	The houses are not required to meet local need and are not included in the emerging local plan.
	Based on the evidence to date, sufficient housing will be provided in Sandbach though the two sites for Sandbach as identified in the Development Strategy.
	Impact on listed buildings ( Abbeyfields grade 11) which would no longer be visible from the Wheelock Trail.
	It is contrary to Policies PS8 and H6 of adopted Congleton Borough local plan,
	Building on Countryside which has been designated as "Green gap" in the draft strategy.
	Contaminated Land: There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Noise: Crewe Road identified as 'First Priority Location' as part of the Environmental Noise Directive road noise assessment.
	Air Quality: Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area
	Light pollution will be caused
	Good for Sandbach to grow, but ensure smooth traffic flow and all types of properties are built.
	Archaeology work to date: Part of this site has been considered in a report by the Cheshire Gardens' Trust (ECH4709) as part of their wider project to examine gardens in Chester Work advised or likely to be advised: Advice was provided on this site as part of the draft SHLAA in 2009. A DBA would be advised if the site was brought forward for development.
	this and other developments that are proposed for the town are only going to spoil our beautiful town and turn it into urban sprawl
	The Local Planning Authority can demonstrate a 5 year supply of alternative housing land supply in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and as such the application is also premature to the emerging Development Strategy. Consequently, there are no material circumstances to indicate that permission should be granted contrary to the development plan.

	An application to develop this site has already been refused; nothing has changed to warrant its inclusion.
	I object to this site because it affects ancient woodlands
	Unable to provide any formal view from United Utilities on the potential impact until the Council has confirmed its suitability, scale and delivery programme
	If greenfield sites need to be developed, this is a preferred site owing to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail services & HS2. There is also good access to Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands & Birmingham Airports via the motorway network and direct rail services from Crewe to MIA & BHI.
	With adequate road access onto Crewe Road partial development here would be better than at Sandbach Heath/ Heath Road where there is no suitable road access for significant housing increase. Site S provides easy access to secondary schools and Wheelock Primary School and would avoid the need for a new primary school at Sandbach Heath
	This is a proposed local plan which doesn't even consider the 1000's of houses proposing to be built at present outside of the local plan. If proposals Q,R and S are approved then that will add a further 2,800 houses to what used to be a small market town and which is now experiencing unsustainable growth.
	Sandbach is already being overdeveloped, planning granted for 1600+ dwellings, WITHOUT any major 21st century infrastructure improvements.
	If this proposed site should be included for whatever reason then Sandbach Housing provision should be reduced accordingly.
Site T - Land on Crewe Rd along A500 Linking to Park Estate Shavington 102 representations by 98 14 Support 77 Object 11 Comment	No need for this development in Shavington eg Triangle site recently approved for housing.
	Site is Greenfield and should not be built on.
	Infrastructure cannot cope – local schools, doctors are full; BT; Royal Mail cannot cope
	Where is the social housing that is so desperately needed?
	Viability depends on the new "pinch point" road being built from A500 to Gresty Road, (just south of railway bridge). Traffic levels will still overwhelm Mill St/Nantwich Road junction at busy times.
	It will create unmanageable traffic congestion



	Contrary to current Green Gap policy & would join Shavington with Crewe.
	The Gresty Oaks proposal would make more sense. If the intention is for Crewe to join up with Shavington, then you have to choose carefully between the land options available.
	Site is unsustainable
	Short sighted to build housing here – site next door will be employment development – need a gap between it and the village of Shavington
	Shavington is a village with no parks to walk dogs or for leisure activities, so pieces of farmland like this serve a dual purpose in that respect & should not be built on.
	Will spoil the rural character of the area & Shavington village.
	Land should be used for agriculture
	Crime will increase
	Decent transport links to the site.
	It is completely outside the built-up boundaries of Shavington, and remote from most of its services.
	It would reduce the appeal of Shavington village & reduce local house prices.
	Not a suitable site for development
	Use empty properties
	Where will people work?
	Use brownfield sites first
	Development will result in more urban sprawl.
	Part of the SE Crewe corridor where development is being proposed – this area already has major traffic congestion which will be made worse
	Major employment is located to the north of Crewe – housing to the south will have to use congested routes through the town.
	Before any development is contemplated both junction 16 and 17 of the M6 should be redeveloped and their subsequent link roads upgraded, the HS2 station should be confirmed and the railway station should also be developed
	Constraints - Contaminated Land: There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use. Noise: Road traffic noise will be a big constraint. Noise impact assessment from adjacent commercial / leisure use on proposed residential. Air Quality: Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area and proximity to existing main road
	Archaeology: work to date – Desk Based Assessment (DBA) and mitigation carried out on the parcels adjacent to the A500 as part of the works associated with the construction of the bypass. DBA likely to be advised in order to establish the need, if any, for further evaluation, with particular reference to the less disturbed southern area. In addition, this site is within a sizeable area of

	Ancient Field Systems, as characterised in the Cheshire Historic Landscape Characterisation. The impact of any development on the historic landscape needs to be assessed in a DBA.
	Will cause more pollution & congestion & significantly affect people's health
	Object to the destruction of wildlife and the ecology of the surrounding area
	Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact this site may have on United Utilities existing infrastructure
	The main site to the South of the A500 is suitable for a carefully considered housing development whilst at the same time creating a better defined green buffer between the A500 and Shavington with appropriate tree planting and landscaping. Site has excellent access & potential to strengthen green buffer. Possible Emergency Centre site on one of the parcels. Number of potential dwellings overstated.
	Site has good highway links to M6, A500 & rail services
	The proposed development is too large.
	The two smaller sites bordering the road are unsuitable for housing - the residents would find it very difficult to walk anywhere safely - which is unsustainable. The site is more suitable for commercial use or emergency vehicles.
	Site is close to industry & the local community. This site is on existing bus routes, proposed cycleway to Basford West, in walking distance of Basford West; Basford East employment site also in close proximity. Shavington has existing schools, Doctors & leisure centre.
	Part of the site off the roundabout has possible potential for a roadside and emergency service centre.
	Care must be given to development design and sympathetic landscaping.
	A reduced amount of housing on the site is needed to allow this site to blend into its surroundings & making it an ideal site for development.
	Added to other proposals in the Crewe area means 10,000 properties not 5,000.
	Loss of biodiversity.
	It would fill in the last piece of green gap land between Shavington and Crewe.
	Site is important ecologically e.g. protected species on site
	The local people of Shavington say NO to this development
	Any expansion of Shavington should be further south, closer to the centre, so that residents can walk to the shops and other local facilities
	Land adjacent to this site (N of Weston Lane) & in a different ownership should have also been included in this consultation; land could be phased with this site.
	The two small parcels of land beside the on/off ramp of the A500 are of questionable delivery.
	Density too high – the main site could provide 165 to 329 homes.

	Object - the need for further large housing developments in the Shavington-cum-Gresty Parish could not be proven; will destroy village character; if all sites are developed it will double the housing stock in the village.
	Residential development in this location could suffer from increased noise levels and air pollution.
	Pedestrian and child safety could be compromised by the 'island' location of part of this allocation.
	Not a viable agricultural site.
	Site is suitable for mixed usage and recreation, benefitting the local community
	Site is often subject of anti-social behaviour
	It would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Shavington Hall - the NPPF considers that any substantial harm to or loss to a Grade II listed building should be exceptional. Any development proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they will conserve those elements which contribute to the significance of the listed building and its setting.
	Application on adjacent land has been refused, so this should not be supported either.
	Shavington getting more than its share
	Plans are unfavourably skewed to poorer areas eg large amount of new housing proposed for the outskirts of Crewe & very little for places like Wilmslow.
	The site to the west, known as Shavington House Farm, Crewe Road, is better suited & more sustainable as a prospective allocation for housing development.
	The Council should allocate sites that have been considered developable in the evidence base, the findings of which inform the formulation of the Local Plan.
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive. Ordinary watercourses affect the site, some in culvert. This site is in Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken.
	Of the 27 sites out for consultation, 1/3 of the total number of sites are directly within the Parish of Weston & Basford and would contribute a further 3500 dwellings (excluding Basford East) – 3 and a half times the number of dwellings currently existing within the parish. Over the last 15 years the number of dwellings has increased from around 400 to over 1000. In addition the Parish Council has supported and accepted the principle of Basford East which will provide a further 1000 dwellings.
	Too much emphasis and focus on housing provision to the SE of Crewe; there is a need for a more even distribution of growth within the Borough
	There is an urgent need to increase Green Belt and Green Gap protection around the settlements of Weston, Stowford, Basford and Wychwood.
	Adverse effect on the character of Basford

	Potential adverse effect on existing road system within the parish in particular Weston Lane Basford, Whites Lane (narrow country lanes) and Main Road, Weston.
	The Site is not part of an agricultural holding; it is farmland grade 3
	Part of the site is physically detached from Shavington and is separated by the A500.
	The emerging Local Plan identifies Shavington as a Local Service Centre (LSC). LSCs are only expected to accommodate modest growth. A proposal for 850 dwellings is not considered to be modest growth and could damage the character of the settlement.
Site U - Rotherwood Road, Wilmslow 193 representations by 190 14 Support 162 Object 17 Comment	Site suitable for development. Part brownfield land – strikes a balance
	Minor impact on existing housing
	Some support for brown field only part of the site
	Potential in preference to other proposed sites
	Appropriate improvements to local roads required
	Preserve any trees on site
	Suitable location – for occupants to commute to Manchester and where there are jobs, much needed houses for Wilmslow
	Wilmslow's allocation is disproportionately low – around 1500 would be proportionate
	Brown field sites must be used first
	Green belt sites must be resisted. No special circumstances. Protected by green belt legislation/NPPF
	Roads leading to Moor Lane are narrow and already congested and unsuitable for construction traffic and then the additional traffic the development will create
	Opposed to any development of Greenfield/greenbelt land.
	No need having regard to loss of jobs at Astra Zeneca
	Large area of disturbed ground; within 250m of landfill; garden centre - contaminated land assessment required. Road noise issues; AQA required. All developments: air quality, travel measures, noise & vibration important.
	Archaeology: in view of the proximity of Lindow Moss, a DBA may be appropriate to assess the presence absence of peat, early

	boundaries, etc
	United Utilities is unable to provide a formal view
	Will seek the preservation of all footpaths through East Cheshire Ramblers, affected by this potential development.
	Poor proximity to major roads and national rail links
	The strong wishes of Local communities to retain Green Belt for its own intrinsic and frequent ecological value, for the appreciation of it by their own and future generations should be paramount
	Existing buildings may be of local heritage interest - an assessment of their value should be made
	Ordinary watercourses affect the site, some in culvert. This site is in Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken.
	Within the third most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links – less preferable to group 1 and 2 sites
	Oppose development on undeveloped Green Belt part of site but don't oppose development on the brownfield part provided it forms part of the 400 homes identified for Wilmslow.
	Roads flood following development on Cumber Lane recently
	Roads and narrow pavement mean it is unsuitable for more residents. Children have to walk in the roads – further development would create unacceptable danger. Roads widely used by walkers, horse-riders, cyclists and dog-walkers.
	No new housing required in the Wilmslow area. Over 600 houses for sale within 1 mile and will increase due to Astra Zeneca move
	Soil/ground conditions /drainage unsuitable
	Site adjacent or on Lindow Moss – which could be damaged by construction ie depth of piles.
	Alderley Park should be added to list of strategic sites for development
	Potential impact on the flora and fauna due to moss and moisture levels. Impact on peat extraction. Bog area is fragile
	Adverse impact on Saltersley Moss Nature Reserve and the wider Lindow Moss environment
	Insufficient green infrastructure already and this would destroy more
	Gipsy site rejected – similar arguments apply
	Local health care would be stretched
	In the light of the latest national housing projections housing numbers should be reduced by 17% so the allocation for Wilmslow should be 320 houses
	Area prone to flooding
	The site is made up of 3 areas of land unrelated to each other, as such isolated blocks of land; they represent piecemeal and unsustainable development.
	Roads could not cope with cumulative impact of proposed developments in and around this vicinity
	Schools do not have capacity for more children

	Infrastructure is not capable of coping with this proposed level of development
	Object to development within the Green Belt. There are sufficient Brown Field sites available within Wilmslow for all proposed housing needs.
	There are lots of empty offices that could be used
	Consultation misleading/not honest – doesn't make it clear that most of this site is green belt.
	Has an archaeological survey been carried out
	Site is on periphery of Wilmslow – there are better sites closer to the centre
Site V - Land South of Weston, Crewe 200 representations by 193 7 Support 184 Object 9 Comment	The pressure on the infrastructure of Weston would be devastating as would be the impact on local businesses
	The site is also on high grade agricultural land (MAFF 2) which must be retained
	Two neighbouring sites (Basford East and West) have been given the green light and must surely be enough for this area
	This proposed development is out of character with the surrounding areas and will swamp the existing village of Weston
	850 new houses would have a detrimental effect on the existing infrastructure which would not cope with the additional traffic (already overloaded at peak times) and school places required
	These will almost double the size of Weston Village, making it difficult to see how it will retain its character
	In terms of Primary School there is one in Weston, but we already have such huge development going at Wychwood that pressure for places will be high. The issue of secondary schools is of greater concern
	This is open countryside and provides a gap between Weston village and Wychwood Park and Chorlton
	It is close to the West Coast Main Line and will be adversely affected by the HS2 and its new viaduct. Considerable sound proofing will be necessary.
	It will destroy the natural flora and fauna of the area and loses the Green Gap separating this village from its nearest conurbation
	A good site for development with good road and rail network. Any trees on site should be preserved
	It would adversely affect the beautiful and rural nature of Crewe Hall
	While it has the excuse of being near Weston, it completely dwarfs the village and would require a complete new set of services. Destroys the character of this area
	There is insufficient employment to support such a housing development in the foreseeable economic future

	The village will lose most of its green space
	It's all about speculation and land banking
	No demand for these homes
	The land proposed has much needed industrial units for rent with competitive rents for small businesses and is presently occupied by a number of small businesses adding value to the local area
	Is Crewe and Nantwich going to be littered with empty old properties?
	The telephone exchange which covers Wybunbury and Hough are experiencing extreme problems
	The result would be chaotic on surrounding roads around Weston, particularly Wychwood village
	It is an unsustainable, unnecessary and unwanted development
	Brownfield sites should be developed for housing
	Urban sprawl
	The size of the community as is only manages to support the Post Office and, just about, the White Lion Public House. More people being resident in Weston would bring more amenities to the area
	We note that sufficient sites have already been identified in the Cheshire Local Plan and that additional sites are clearly not required
	Contaminated Land: There are a number of former ponds on the site which may have been infilled and therefore may pose localised contamination and ground gas issues. There are also two former landfills within 250m of the site and there may be localised contamination issues associated with the farm at Weston Hall. Any application would require a suitable contaminated land assessment to prove the site's suitability for its proposed use
	Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of development and potential cumulative impact in the area. Any development has the potential to cause adverse effects on local air quality as a result of increased transport emissions. In turn this can lead to negative health impacts where exposure to such pollutants occurs. We would require Air Quality Impact Assessments for all developments, which consider the impact of not only that development, but the effect of all other developments (proposed or likely) in the area
	All sites will need EMP for construction noise / hours of work, piling etc. All commercial catering activities end use would require a kitchen extract odour and noise assessment
	<p>In order to mitigate the potential effects of increased transport emissions we would look for the developments to incorporate a low emission approach such that all developers consider the likely increase in emissions, and propose measures which are aimed at reducing those increases. Such measures could be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of Electric Vehicle Recharge technology into properties (to encourage the uptake of cleaner technology)</li> <li>- Individual Travel Plans for each new householder/commercial travel plans - focusing away from private vehicle use</li> <li>- Investment in the Public Transport Infrastructure to reduce the need for private vehicles</li> </ul>

	<p>- Incentivising cleaner HGV / LGV technologies as part of developments (delivery vehicles etc)</p> <p>For information, it may be that by the time these developments come along Cheshire East has a formally adopted a Low Emission Strategy and possible SPD's.</p>
	<p>Noise, Vibration: Site design and layout is crucial to avoid incompatible uses being placed in close proximity and the potential for loss of amenity caused by noise / vibration. Commercial / industrial uses in close proximity to residential properties for example have the potential to cause issues at the detailed planning stage and may require expensive extensive mitigation / redesign which could be avoided by careful early consideration. Presently we would look that all internal habitable rooms achieve the "Good" standard in accordance with BS 8233:1999 and all external areas achieve the WHO Guideline Noise Levels. Environmental Noise Directive: National mapping exercise has identified 'Important Areas' and 'First Priority Locations' where exposure to road noise is considered greatest. Noise action plans are to be proposed in these areas. Any new development proposals will need to consider if new exposures are being introduced, if they may impact on existing areas and if mitigation measures may be appropriate for existing areas. Noise impact assessment on Community Infrastructure required</p>
	<p>Archaeology works to date: No previous work on this site. The size of the site merits the preparation and submission of a Desk Based Assessment in support of any application in order to establish the need, if any, for further evaluation and mitigation</p>
	<p>Weston does not have the facilities to provide for a new influx of residents, the nursery and surrounding schools are already full</p>
	<p>Development would destroy the character of the historic site of Weston Hall (where approval for a replacement Weston Hall has already been granted)</p>
	<p>The site is physically detached from the settlement</p>
	<p>This reflects the sustainability credentials of the settlement. There are more sustainable settlements than Weston. Developments should be directed towards the most sustainable settlements</p>
	<p>No information is known about the site; therefore, the deliverability remains questionable.</p>
	<p>Weston is a village settlement. Paragraph 5.75 in the emerging local plan identifies Weston sustainable village. Sustainable villages are only expected to accommodate small scale infill and change of use or conversion of existing buildings. A proposal in excess of 850 dwellings is not considered to be appropriate and does not accord with the emerging local plan. It is also considered that this level of development will damage the character of the settlement.</p>
	<p>Within the second most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links. Should be included in the Plan in preference to any sites around Congleton or Macclesfield</p>
	<p>Unable to provide any formal view on the potential impact on United Utilities until the Council has confirmed its suitability, scale and delivery programme</p>
	<p>A provision of a bus service would be necessary that would transport people to Newcastle, Crewe and the Railway Station. The houses would need to be built to the highest eco standard and inspected</p>
	<p>The housing density would need to be reduced so there is a feeling of space and the house are not crammed in</p>
	<p>If greenfield sites need to be developed, this is a preferred site owing to its close proximity to the M6 / A500 interchange, local rail</p>



	services & HS2. There is also good access to Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands & Birmingham Airports via the motorway network and direct rail services
	None of these proposals are tolerable or indeed justified on any conceivable measure of economic / growth / or the buzz word sustainable for Crewe
	Englesea Brook is a small hamlet in a rural setting, with a historic Primitive Methodist Museum in its midst
	Imbalance would be created between population and currently available local services
	Agricultural land should be protected to ensure food security
	Impact on Weston Conservation Area
	Once brownfield sites are fully exploited, this site should be considered owing to its good proximity to major roads, the M6 motorway & national rail links
	There are areas of woodland on the boundaries of this development which are home to much wildlife and their ecosystems, Basford Brook runs adjacent to the site as well. There are a number of protected species which have been found along this waterway as part of the investigation into the Basford East development
	Too much emphasis and focus is being given to housing provision to the South East of Crewe
	Object to this allocation as a large residential development would have potentially seriously damaging impacts on important Local Wildlife Site (Basford Brook) and woodland and other wetland habitats within the site boundary. Loss of greenfield with biodiversity value. Loss of landscape character and distinctiveness of Weston village
	Houses are struggling to sell in the North West currently (see recent government figures) identifying that there is no need for additional housing
	No heritage assets and potentially sufficiently separated from Weston Conservation Area and its Listed Buildings
	The proposal of this site shows a disregard to the Councils policies, the 'Vision for Cheshire East' and Development Strategy. The response to both the Crewe Town Strategy Consultation and the Development Strategy and Emerging Policy Principles Consultation showed an overwhelming support for the retention of Green Belt, Green Gap and Open Countryside
	Coppenhall East could take more development
	Of the 27 sites out for consultation, 1/3 of the total number of sites. Are directly within the Parish of Weston & Basford
	Objection to proposed sites to the South of Crewe and in the South East Crewe Growth Corridor and furthermore consider that the sites do not appear to offer any reasonable alternatives. The Councils consider that insufficient information is included with these alternative site options to justify why these sites should offer more sustainable sites and be taken forward. In particular the sites have not been the subject of a sustainability appraisal, which the Councils consider to be an important part of the evidence. Furthermore without this information it is impossible to assess the potential economic and social impact on the North Staffordshire Conurbation, including its Travel to Work Areas. The City and Borough Councils trust the issues outlined above regarding the location of development to the South and South East of Crewe will be taken into consideration in the preparation of

	the pre-submission version of the Cheshire East Local Plan alongside the comments made by the Councils in respect of the Cheshire East Local Plan Draft Development Strategy earlier this year.
	<p>Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. If it is thought that any deterioration could be caused, then the developer has to put in place suitable mitigation measures. As part of any significant development we may also require a Water Framework Directive assessment to be undertaken. In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the Council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information. Basford Brook ("main river") runs along the western/south-western boundary of the site and as such under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank. Ordinary watercourses also affect the site. Flood Zones 2 and 3 affect land along the western/south-western boundary, although indicative only. Any proposed built development in Flood Zone 3 is likely to require Sequential and Exception Tests and also compensatory flood storage. The remainder of the site is Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken.</p>
	<p>A 'Vision' document for the site is attached - the site could create a sustainable development of 850 dwellings. As long as the Council's favoured development strategy is to identify new settlements to the south of Crewe within the emerging Local Plan; credible non Green Belt &amp; Green Gap sites should be favoured ahead of Green Belt release. We do not consider that 'exceptional circumstances' have been demonstrated that justify Green Belt release to facilitate Village B. Site V, as evidenced by the Vision Document attached is capable of delivering the same benefits as Village B without encroaching into Green Belt. It is essential that in addition to simply consulting on this site that a full sustainability appraisal of this site is undertaken ahead of completing the next stage of the plan. Site V represents an opportunity for the Council to allocate a sustainable, non Green Belt site as a strategic location within the next draft of the Local Plan. Site would provide financial contribution to the upgrading of the A500. Site is available, achievable and suitable for development. Site would bring a range of social, economic and environmental benefits e.g. job creation; high quality new homes; new homes bonus; support for local services; employment opportunities; increased GVA; improved public transport and sustainable transport infrastructure. Local community infrastructure would be provided e.g. a primary school; mixed use/retail/workshop; open space; community health provision. The site is well aligned with the Development Strategy that advocates substantial housing growth to the south of Crewe in the form of a new standalone settlement and safeguards the individuality of existing villages to the south of Crewe</p>
	All of the above proposals would be contrary to the Borough Council's own policy on Best Use of Natural Resources. As these sites are distant from access to services they are contrary to this principle

	The Borough Council has expressed the view that development should only be allowed where it is consistent with its setting, appropriate in scale and character, and supported by adequate infrastructure. Rural areas are therefore not an appropriate location for large scale development which could be accommodated in or adjacent to existing urban areas. For these reasons the proposed sites identified above are unsustainable
	The Parish Council strongly supports the principle expressed in Policy CO1 (Sustainable Travel and Transport) of the Development Strategy document 'Shaping Our Future' policy, in particular the view that development should be directed to "sustainable and accessible locations".
	The proposed allocations fail to meet the following policy set out within the Borough Council's own Development Strategy document 1.3 .1 Policy CS9 (Sustainable Development Principles) sets out (in Section 2 ii) a range of access to facilities which residential development will be expected to meet. None of the proposed residential allocations appear to meet these standards.
	The area this development is proposed on contains the crop marks of the main area of medieval strip open field systems of farming in Weston township. There will be an abundance of archaeological material which if not recovered and recorded would be lost to future generations and the local area. There is also a unusual crop mark adjacent to Hodge Lane (Main Road) opposite the Cricket Club which would require further investigation to ascertain its age and function
Site W - Land Adjoining Lark Hall, Macclesfield 334 representations by 321 19 Support 299 object 16 Comment	Disagree with any building on green belt land and brown field sites must come first, it would be a great benefit to the hospice
	Site is close to amenities – town centre, bus and rail links, schools, parks, canal and Middlewood Way
	Preserve the trees and protect the wildlife if developed
	Minimal impact on roads and adjacent wildlife and can incorporate open space within it – site better than some other potential sites
	Ensure minimal impact on the environment
	Site is within 250m of a known landfill site which may pose issues/risks. Air Quality Assessment will be required due to the scale of the development and effect on other developments proposed or likely in the area.
	Possible candidate for a DBA but marginal in view of size and limited obvious archaeological potential.
	United Utilities is unable to provide a formal view
	Will seek the preservation by East Cheshire Ramblers of all footpaths affected by this potential development.

	Concerned about access and impact/increase in traffic using the narrow one-way road system of Barracks Lane/Cottage Lane and traffic passing Puss Bank School. Concerned about the impact on the landscape which was recognised in past development plans. Difficult site to develop without harm to natural and heritage features including Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area.
	Any development should have regard to the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and not cause any deterioration in WFD status of watercourses. If it is thought that any deterioration could be caused, then the developer has to put in place suitable mitigation measures. As part of any significant development we may also require a WFD assessment to be undertaken. In accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance, the council should use the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as a basis to apply the sequential and exception test in any development allocation. Where there is a main river watercourse within the site boundary any proposals should seek to enhance and integrate this with the overall development. Consideration should be given to existing infrastructure and the plans for future improvements e.g. is there enough water available to supply the new homes (resource availability), can the sewage network cope with the increases in dirty water etc. As such we would advise you contact United Utilities for this information. There are lakes/reservoirs affecting/adjoining the site. This site is in Flood Zone 1 and any proposals greater than 1 hectare in size will require a site-specific FRA to be undertaken.
	There are various listed buildings that are immediately adjacent to the site two on the northern edge and three on the southern, all of which are listed Grade II. Surrounding uses should include reference to the Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area, which is in the east of the site.
	Within the fourth most sustainable group of sites based on proximity to existing major roads and public transport links – should not be developed
	Access to site would be extremely difficult
	Development would guaranteed future loss of greenbelt between site and centre of town
	Object: Plenty of other brownfield sites within Macclesfield town suitable for houses
	Little merit in additional housing in this part of Cheshire
	Object: Protected wildlife species. Wildlife should be protected and local amenities useful to local people and dog walkers etc.
	Serious/problematical access/highway issues. Detrimental access/ egress roads such Barracks Lane, Higher Fence Avenue, Cottage Lane etc . Buxton Road already congested and can not take additional traffic
	Dangerous impact on school children attending Puss Bank School and traffic to and from School
	Land is located on the site of old mine workings therefore unsuitable for development. 2 properties on Telford Close had to be demolished because of extensive subsidence
	Development would be in contradiction to retaining the natural landscape
	Enough brownfield sites – do not build on Greenfield/greenbelt sites
	Beautiful countryside enjoyed by many local residents – a green lung and used for tourism
	Risk of flooding and would cause more potential flooding to lower areas

	No need for this development – no evidence/need over estimated and Government has reduced household projections/targets
	Development not justified on green belt, no exceptional circumstances. Land currently serves the function of green belt land as laid down by Government, no good reason for removal from greenbelt.
	Area of Special County Value adds to protection required for this land. Wildlife on site will be destroyed along with mature trees. Swans pool threatened by this.
	Puss Bank School is full to capacity.
	Important area for children to play
	Site was carefully considered and rejected at previous local plan inquiry (1995) see paras 4.317 to 4.322 of Inspectors report where the harmful impact on the green belt, Peak Park Fringe, and Areas of Special County Value etc were fully considered.
	A Nature Conservation Priority Area
	Not needed with changes and loss of jobs at Astra Zeneca
	Planning permission been dismissed on several occasions in the past and the reasons still stand
	Very strong opposition to this site in the town strategy consultation
	CEC is proposing to upgrade the public footpath between Ecton Avenue and Bibbys Lane to a bridleway. Area of high amenity and wildlife value
	Important visual and physical link between the Peak Park Fringe, Victoria Park and the town centre.
	This area is deficient in public playing field provision so retaining open space should be a priority
	Contrary to Emerging Policy Principles SE3, SE4, and SE5 relating to areas of high biodiversity and geodiversity, wildlife corridors and green spaces.
	Serious lack of water pressure that can not be resolved in this area
	This site is totally unnecessary and should not become a designated development site and is not needed as there is overprovision of land to meet the estimated growth distribution
	Petition of 540 signatures against any development on this site (and land behind Kings School) having regard to destruction of green spaces and increased traffic and affects on schools and services
	Petition submitted with 532 signatures and e-petition submitted with 371 signatures against development of this site as it is green belt, sufficient brownfield sites exist, site is haven for wildlife, important open space, old mine workings in the area and subsidence, significant infrastructure issues including roads, drainage, power, can we afford to keep sacrificing farming land –we need it for animal feed, detrimental impact on Macclesfield town and views to and from it, area well used by people for leisure pursuits, impact on character of the area and landscape, no arithmetical need to develop this site, would have wider impact on the character of the area, significant opposition to Town Strategy consultation for this site, would result in dangerous conditions for children attending Puss Bank school
	Site not deliverable

	Variety of brown field sites within Macclesfield suggested instead
	Other sites put forward by landowners/agents as more suitable than this site