

Annex 1A

Development Strategy Document: Summaries of Representations Received

9,771 comments received: 2,514 in support; 5,298 objections; and 1,959 comments.

| CONSULTATION POINT | SUMMARY OF ISSUE |
|---|--|
| Development Strategy 354 representations by 307 people 96 support 145 object 113 comment | Brownfield and previously developed land should be developed first to enable retention of Green Belt and Green Gaps and retain character of towns and settlements |
| | More evidence should be produced to demonstrate the availability of brownfield land in CEC – set up a community website to monitor availability of brownfield land |
| | No evidence to suggest brownfield sites cannot accommodate the demand or that Green Belt should be released |
| | Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to allow alterations to the Green Belt |
| | Focus development in principal towns to protect the Green Belt |
| | Sustainable Environment Policies – Make specific reference to the role of landscape character assessment, key features and 'opportunities' that will be a part of the revised National Character Area profiles and the more detailed Cheshire Landscape Character Assessment. Development should be required to 'protect and/ or enhance' landscape character through location and siting as well as design and landscaping. |
| | Consultation has been made difficult to understand, access and participate in. Documents are complicated, too long and hard to understand, discouraging participation. Poor consultation, should be subject to challenge. |
| | Participation online is difficult and online focus discourages participation |
| | Consultation was not publicised enough |
| | It's unclear if and how people's comments are taken into consideration to shape the plan |
| | The members of stakeholder panels were not representative |
| | The plan is too focused on economic growth |
| | We must attract investment or lose it to other authorities |
| | Make reference to the Water Framework Directive including the requirement for improvements to the physical state of watercourses and in-channel habitat |
| | Development will harm ecological environment – not enough focus on green spaces and ecological impact |
| | Development will harm existing service provision |
| | The plan does not promote sustainable transport |
| | Impact means semi-rural nature of some areas will be lost. Suggesting that development should 'safeguard' best and most versatile land does not give a strong enough direction. |
| | Unclear how the strategy deals with the impact of climate change |
| | The impact of destroying habitats is not clear |
| | Evidence is inconsistent between documents |
| | The case that housing growth will create jobs has not been made |
| | The evidence presented is generally unclear and does not support the conclusions reached |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Housing numbers are flawed. Demand has not been demonstrated |
| | Employment numbers are flawed. Demand has not been demonstrated |
| | Building rates are not clear |
| | No evidence to support transport and road proposals |
| | Landscape and environment evidence is not robust |
| | The plan does not demonstrate environmental, economic and social sustainability |
| | On energy there is no evidence to demonstrate how the plan will result in a reduction in CO2 emissions |
| | No evidence to suggest how HS2 will impact on the Borough |
| | Proposals do not meet the objectively assessed housing needs. Target is too low – should be 1,800 dpa rather than 1,350 dpa. |
| | No evidence to support need for new settlements |
| | No evidence to support the overreliance on service centres to accommodate growth |
| | Evidence needed on impact of development on Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope |
| | No evidence on convenience or comparison goods retail need and location, including leakage of expenditure from primary catchment areas of town centres. |
| | Three housing areas are identified in the evidence base but are not followed through in the strategy |
| | Further engagement is required under the duty to cooperate. The links between Cheshire East and neighbouring authorities are not demonstrated or given regard to, including linkages between South Cheshire and North Staffordshire, and the impact on Staffordshire County Council. |
| | Duty to co-operate has not been evidenced |
| | A regional impact of development in CEC has not been articulated – how will the strategy contribute to the growth of the wider region? Refer to specific sites or infrastructure schemes which join up with neighbouring area's plans, eg those of Greater Manchester. |
| | Given the lower growth path chosen by the Borough, there must be discussion on how housing pressures identified in the evidence base may be accommodated in neighbouring boroughs. |
| | Minerals have not been dealt with |
| | Evidence of impact of development on heritage and archaeological interests has not been demonstrated |
| | It is unclear how 20,000 jobs will be achieved |
| | The argument for growth is not supported or made clear |
| | Evidence to support that sites are deliverable and viable is not provided |
| | Gaps between villages should be protected |
| | Impact of development on capacity of existing infrastructure and services, particularly in rural areas, has not been demonstrated |
| | Not clear how flooding will be dealt with |
| | Development is too focused in the south of the Borough |
| | Cumulative development in the north of the Borough will be harmful |
| | There is a risk to surrounding smaller towns and villages – plan must ensure their rural character is retained |
| | More growth should go to towns and Key Service Centres |
| | Focus development on Crewe and around the motorways |
| | Level and location of development has cross-border implications for |

| | |
|---|---|
| | education, infrastructure, economy, transport and waste management |
| | The plan gives power to developers – not clear how the plan limits this |
| | Town centre first approach should be taken to retail |
| | Fails to recognise the importance of AstraZeneca as a stakeholder and the single largest employer in the Macclesfield area, nor the importance of its operations at Alderley Park and the potential for land which is surplus to requirements to come forward for alternative use as requirements change. Planning policies should support the need to implement a programme of upgrades/facility replacements. |
| | Follow Sport England's new guidance in preparing a Playing Pitch Strategy, including the use of locally-derived standards rather than FiT standards or Green Flag Standards. The Existing Open Space Assessment and Green Space Strategy is an audit rather than the required demand supply analysis. Carry out an assessment of indoor sports facilities. Consistency and clarity are needed regarding differences between 'open space' and 'sports facilities' |
| | There is no base date or plan period |
| | Need a more flexible approach to assess sites which are not in existing plans, based on social, economic and environmental grounds. |
| | |
| 1 Vision 65 representations by 56 people 23 support 23 object 19 comment | Sufficient housing of 'the right type' – needs clear definition |
| | Growth is not necessarily good, not necessarily achieved through job creation, and does not necessarily generate wealth |
| | Include more on the uniqueness of Cheshire East |
| | Reword to 'this sets out the overall number of homes and employment land that we estimate will be needed if we are able to attract the investment, industry and jobs to the area' |
| | Focus jobs and housing on main centres (Crewe and Macclesfield) and maintain uniqueness of countryside/villages |
| | These commendable aims should be better reflected in the draft policies/plan |
| | Traditional industries (car production, rail, silk) are in decline. Promote alternative growth industries eg tourism and footloose industries with little impact on countryside |
| | I support jobs-led growth |
| | Not detailed enough to be able to support it |
| | Include education; ICT, high speed broadband and wireless networks in rural areas and for home working; changing high street; clearance of expired old housing estates |
| | Lacks discussion on cost, value and measurables on issues such as regeneration, quality of life, support for local businesses to ensure vision becomes reality. Include cost/benefit analysis. |
| | Small-scale developments in towns and villages (including in gardens and on brownfield sites) are preferable to large-scale housing estates |
| | Unnecessary adjectives – vibrant, outstanding etc |
| | Define affordable housing |
| | Justify 'sensible pace' |
| | Justify the Medium Growth option |
| | Stated focus on Crewe and Macclesfield is misleading – highest new homes pro rata to population is in Congleton |
| | Support use of 'all' in relation to housing ie including provision for those |

| | |
|--|---|
| | excluded from market housing |
| | Define green infrastructure |
| | Level of development on Green Belt will make borough less attractive to investors |
| | HS2 is mistakenly viewed as a saviour to Crewe, without evidence or consideration of impact to Green Belt and countryside |
| | Has no regard to environment |
| | Has no regard to demographics |
| | Jobs and infrastructure must come before house-building |
| | No mention of delivering a sustainable transport system, only road-building |
| | Unnecessarily expansionist: true local need is 495 homes a year |
| | Strategy is not employment-led, as there are far more homes than jobs proposed |
| | This is not a creative vision, but a wish list to achieve targets |
| | Welcome inclusion of improved access to sporting facilities |
| | There should be greater focus on Crewe for development |
| | Object to Green Belt swap and provision of new Green Belt, without sound evidence base |
| | Too much focus on development in larger towns – evidence indicates significant need in all settlements and rural areas |
| | Very ambitious plan given that only 17 years of the plan period remain. Its success or failure must be monitored and publicised |
| | Support housing development to meet this vision. It will not undermine sustainability, particularly when meeting local need and enabling young people to stay in the Borough. |
| | Rural issues must be detailed |
| Statement Our Vision for Cheshire East in 2030 299 representations by 294 people 248 support 27 object 24 comment | New jobs and homes will not 'meet local needs'. Rather, they will draw in new residents from outside the Borough |
| | 'New sustainable settlement' – it will not be sustainable in the long term, particularly when brownfield sites are available |
| | 'High quality of life' – this is unlikely in view of the proposed scale and greenfield location of development |
| | Little mention of agriculture. Include the objective of preserving good quality agricultural land |
| | Should give more prominence to objective of prioritising brownfield sites over greenfield, regardless of cost |
| | Support balance between housing, employment and retention of greenfield land and open spaces |
| | This will produce a north/south divide in housing density and employment type |
| | It does not flow from the RSS, the Issues and Options Paper or the Town Strategy consultations |
| | Too large a scale of development, beyond local needs, which will damage the landscape, urbanise our small towns, overload services, and impact negatively on Crewe |
| | Sports and leisure plan needed |
| | Should be backed by masterplans and detailed community infrastructure projects |
| | Work with Manchester and Stockport to use their brownfield sites before CEC's greenfield sites |

| | |
|--|---|
| | No mention of demographics and ageing population |
| | Include synergy with Airport and Woodford BAe redevelopment |
| | A new school is needed |
| | I object to Green Belt swap |
| | Include aim to encourage housing for first-time buyers to diversify towns such as Wilmslow |
| | Include traffic calming for villages to make walking, cycling and horse riding pursuits safe |
| | Focus population where it will grow, not decline ie Crewe and Handforth |
| | Should detail CE's context ie broader relationships with regional and national economic and employment trends; and links between towns and villages |
| | Smart growth to reduce the need to travel and modal shift – CEC must improve on reducing carbon emissions |
| | Not a sustainable pattern of development |
| | Reword to 'will continue to reduce carbon emissions' |
| | Naïve to assume housebuilding will continue at the rates seen in the boom years |
| | Should seek to enhance and expand environmental assets – they are dynamic and require more than just protection. Designation is not enough. |
| | Define 'most valued' with regard to built and natural features |
| | Seek to improve health and biodiversity of countryside |
| | Refer to the water environment ie good quality rivers and canals |
| | Development does not guarantee economic growth and prosperity |
| | The Vision should recognise the importance of Alderley Park as a major employment site. |
| | Greater emphasis on tourism is needed – include ' <i>building on the existing and growing value of tourism and the visitor economy</i> the importance of the area as a visitor and tourism destination will have increased' |
| What is the Local Plan? 12 representations by 12 people 0 support 6 object 6 comment | Clarify purpose of Site Allocations Document and implications for the Strategy |
| | I cannot find the Site Allocations Document, Proposals Map, Waste Development Plan or Infrastructure Plan in order to comment on these |
| | Confusing to call this document a Development Strategy, even though it will become the Local Plan |
| 3 The story so far and what happens next 10 representations by 10 people 0 support 6 object 4 comment | Minimal engagement with the public prior to production of Town Strategies |
| | Consultation on Town Strategies has been ignored |
| | Extra copies of documents have not been forthcoming |
| | Residents feel that they have not been adequately informed and consulted – not enough advertising of consultations |
| | Congleton Town Strategy was not prepared as a Neighbourhood Plan - no referendum on the make-up of the Stakeholder Panel, lack of representation of small parishes |
| 4 The Town Strategies 38 representations by 38 people 7 support | Town Strategy approach doesn't meet NPPF requirement for strategic district-wide planning. Town Strategies should grow from strategic needs of the district, not vice versa |
| | Town Strategies have not been formally approved by the Borough. They serve to gather community views and have little weight in influencing the Local Plan – not robust evidence. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 25 object 6 comment | The Town Strategies were not Neighbourhood Plans. Government Neighbourhood Planning Frontrunner funding was therefore misappropriated and democratic rights disregarded. |
| | Alsager Town Plan proposes 1,000 homes and their locations. Ignored by the Local Plan which raises it to 1,100 homes |
| | Handforth Town Plan seeks limited future growth, improved town centre and employment opportunities, maintenance of Green Belt. How has this turned into a new settlement of 2,300 homes on the Green Belt? |
| | I support the Macclesfield Town Strategy, pending provision of more jobs and holistic traffic management plan (not a link road). |
| | Support the Draft Crewe Town Strategy's aim for wider housing choice and retention of Green Gaps |
| | Congleton Town Strategy has no right to allocate land in adjoining parishes (mostly Hulme Walfield, Eaton) for housing. This land is outside their sphere of influence |
| | Sandbach Town Council should agree its potential development sites to avoid speculative development |
| | Include in Knutsford Town Strategy, and the Local Plan: design templates, planning briefs for significant vacant sites; protection of significant views (eg to Tatton Park) |
| | Nantwich favoured development option derives from a small, exclusive consultation which did not represent the LAP or environmental matters. |
| | |
| Table 4.1 Summaries of the Town Strategies 78 representations by 73 people 16 support 43 object 19 comment | Several Town Strategies are only draft with unresolved objections. Undue emphasis is placed on the draft Town Strategies - make it clear where matters remain disputed. |
| | Strategies used a pre-planned template and did not take account of history and identity of each town |
| | Issues which were consulted and agreed on through the Town Strategy process have been altered without negotiation or consultation. |
| | Elevate Town Strategies to Planning Guidance integral to the emerging Local Plan with consultation, audit and Planning Inspectorate involvement |
| | Promote cycle tourism in Cheshire |
| | Wybunbury is part of Nantwich, not Crewe hinterland – the parish identified a need for 30 houses, not 300 |
| | More emphasis on retail business development in Wilmslow |
| | Development in Wilmslow, including affordable housing, will make it vibrant. |
| | Wilmslow Plan should recognise that it is a dormitory town of Manchester – exploit that and benefit from it |
| | Macclesfield needs new shops opening and cinema, particularly to retain the young |
| | Include Silk Quarter and National Silk Centre visitor destinations |
| | Use the Alsager Town Strategy as the template for the area |
| | Consider cumulative effects of development in settlements close to key towns eg development in Church Lawton, Barthomley and Haslington will put pressure on services in Alsager |
| | Scale of development in the Congleton Town Strategy is far too high |
| | Where is Holmes Chapel considered in the plan? |
| | What is the evidence for singling out the eastern side of Poynton? |
| 5 Planning For Growth | We must fight to ensure HS2 comes to Crewe as it will drive longterm economic growth |

| | |
|--|---|
| 86 representations by 80 people 13 support 35 object 38 comment | Shortsighted, unsustainable and will deteriorate the environment. There will be less open space and more social problems. |
| | Concern at a lack of impact modelling and investigation with regard to cumulative impacts of development in adjacent boroughs on community, heritage, Green Belt and quality of life |
| | Housing development and building will not solve problems of unemployment, low education achievement etc. We need a sustainable vision for the future eg eco building |
| | Will result in congestion - increased travel will be by car. Public transport is unlikely given dispersed pattern of settlement. |
| | CEC must commit to developing all existing sites with planning permission and all brownfield sites before any Green Belt is developed or safeguarded. Don't build on Green Belt. |
| | Dispute the evidence which suggests this level of local need |
| | Agriculture and related diversification must be seen as a generator of jobs, not something to be erased. |
| | The NPPF requires housing needs to be met unless there would be significant adverse impacts – loss of agricultural land and Green Belt are such impacts |
| | Carry out a survey of CEC secondary schools' and FE colleges' specialisms and produce an education/training strategy |
| | Improve what we already have, find tenants for empty retail/offices or convert them to residential use |
| | Housebuilding creates jobs and helps build a successful economy. Large-scale urban/village extensions can sometimes be the best approach |
| | Deterioration of Crewe's urban fabric and town centre is not addressed |
| | Dormitory towns such as Congleton need proportionately more new jobs than new housing. This has not been taken into account |
| | Concentrate on attracting higher value employment, not the low-paid workers who will require services but not be able to support them |
| | Houses are empty because there are no local jobs. Hence we need more jobs, not housing |
| | In light of the national economic downturn and depressed housing market, there is no sense in an aggressive growth strategy |
| | Explain the term 'environmental limits' (para 5.4) – this is not in accord with the NPPF's approach to sustainable development and environmental enhancement |
| | Strategy fails to meet the NPPF requirement to meet full, objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing, as it falls below affordable housing requirements identified by the SHMA. Require a target of 1,600dpa to at least 1,800dpa to meet evidence based need (particularly affordable requirements), ONS demographic projections and to support economic aspirations. Currently falls short by 50,000 dwellings over the plan period and will lead to a decline in the working age population – this is not a jobs-led growth agenda. |
| | How can permission have been granted for a strategic site, the Shavington Triangle, during the consultation period? |
| | Must maintain working age population by providing the right type of housing, or economic prosperity will suffer. |
| | Must follow the High Growth option, or the Borough will not achieve the growth it desires |
| | How will the Plan ensure that the aspiration for growth etc will be achieved |

| | |
|--|--|
| | sustainably? |
| | Discrepancy between Table 5.1 and Appendix F in terms of number of dwellings completed, further complicated by Table 8.6. Why? |
| | The NPPF states that Local Plans should identify broad locations and allocate sites. Why is the Council leaving some sites to the Allocations document but not others? |
| | We support the proposed level of development as it reflects current and future housing and employment growth trends |
| | Selection criteria used to identify preferred locations for New Settlements are unclear and unjustified |
| | Waiting list is actually 12,000+, an increase of over 2,000 in 6 months |
| | Rural villages (including Bunbury and Peckforton) should at least meet their growth needs, removing the need for isolated new settlements |
| | Object to phasing, over 1,150 dwellings per year are required now. Phasing perpetuates the problems of past undersupply of new housing, and will not allow swift addressing of backlog |
| | How will phasing work in practice? |
| | Include reference to importance of research and development sector to local economy including essential sites such as Alderley Park |
| | We agree that Key Service Centres can accommodate a significant share of future employment and housing growth |
| | Welcome a section which makes the case for growth and outlines negative consequences of constraining growth. |
| | Local need is from 32,000 to 79,920 |
| | We support the settlement hierarchy at paragraph 5.3 |
| | Population projections are based on out of date data and should be reduced by 25%. |
| | Adopt a medium/high growth strategy in Crewe, rather than the whole Borough. Increase its housing share to 10,000-10,500 dwellings to support regeneration and jobs growth. |
| | Convert existing empty properties to housing eg Cheshire Building Society Headquarters, Craven House in Macclesfield |
| The Case for Growth 40 representations by 37 people 17 support 9 object 14 comment | Every point is essential |
| | Required in every area, not just the two main towns |
| | People choose to live in small towns with easy access to the countryside – growth will destroy this |
| | Employment should be directed to the town centre and brownfield sites, not greenfield sites on the outskirts |
| | Provide houses which balance the housing stock for locals including single people, young couples, the elderly, the disabled |
| | GDP doesn't measure the overall standard of wellbeing, cost of environmental damage, distribution of GDP. See the UN's Human Development Index. |
| | Where are the housing needs of the ageing population addressed in this document? Extra care or another facility? |
| | Housing need is adequately catered for by the natural life cycle – newly-built homes will therefore remain empty. |
| | Building will decrease the attractiveness of the area |
| | Macclesfield town centre needs new life, which means more housing |
| | Case for growth is based on extrapolation of data and the outdated trends of |

| | |
|--|---|
| | the previous decade. Base the strategy on more recent projections of slow economic growth, at best. |
| | Neighbouring authorities with better transport links will prove more attractive to employers |
| | Firmly support the case for growth and associated allocation of land - beneficial for the Borough. Insufficient growth will mean a lack of housing, constrained economic growth and increasing house prices. |
| | Visitor economy has the potential to bring growth |
| | Unrealistic. Simplistic to imagine that building will solve the problem of this severe recession. We cannot grow forever. |
| | Build homes allied to employment opportunities – do not build homes for commuters |
| | No objective, in-depth sustainability assessment to test economic assumptions. Proposals are not supported by the evidence base |
| | What of the extra infrastructure and services that will be required? |
| | New homes and jobs are required to stop the young being priced out of their local housing markets |
| | Without growth, towns like Congleton will become dormitory settlements |
| | Do not support investment leading to substantial growth in population |
| Policy CS1 Overall Development Strategy 241 representations by 217 people 10 support 115 object 116 comment | No exceptional circumstances identified for development of Green Belt. A Green Belt Review must be carried out. |
| | Use brownfield land and blighted Green Belt |
| | Release of Green Belt around Principal Towns and Key Service Centres is justified: the need to accommodate significant market and affordable housing constitutes exceptional circumstances |
| | Restrict growth on greenfield sites. Cheshire East has enough brownfield sites to accommodate 8,000 houses. These should be identified and considered, including those likely to become vacant in the plan period. |
| | Obtain Central Government grants to clean up brownfield sites |
| | Where is evidence of joint working with other local authorities? Greater Manchester and Stoke/Newcastle should use their brownfield sites to fill some of Cheshire East's housing quota |
| | Population estimates are too high, not justified, based on out of data ONS data and should be reduced by 25% |
| | No correct assessment of the ageing population |
| | Are growth aspirations realistic at this time? Building houses and offices does not in itself create economic growth. |
| | Impacts have not been fully understood and analysed. Development must be of high quality, respecting its locality. |
| | Too many homes are proposed. |
| | Not enough homes are proposed to meet objectively assessed housing needs including ONS population projections; SHMA evidence; quantum of employment land required by ELR and CEC's economic aspirations. True requirement is 31,400 – a minimum of 36,000 over the plan period, plus allowance for past shortfall against RSS targets |
| | There should be 350ha of employment land |
| | The majority of respondents to previous consultation (59%) favoured the high growth option. |
| | Clarify approach to phasing. Alter phasing – i) higher rates in later phases are not environmentally |

| | |
|--|---|
| | sustainable – delivery should be even throughout the plan ii) the starting phase should be slower to see if housing demand really exists iii) the starting phase should be higher to address the shortfall of recent years (updated SHLAA does not address these concerns) and to enable jobs growth iv) deviation from RSS requirements including a higher level of delivery in later years |
| | Development is not required as office/retail/industrial units lie empty – encourage their use, and change of use |
| | Housing figures are based on an outdated SHMA hence this consultation is invalid. |
| | The Local Plan suggestion of 1,350 dwellings per year will give rise to 2,900 jobs, not the proposed 20,000 jobs. Others believe it will result in an annual loss of 400 jobs. |
| | No explanation on the relationship between the job growth aspirations, the quantum of employment land proposed and the proposed housing target |
| | Agreement with the level of development chosen |
| | Support the proposals to concentrate growth in the two principal towns, but they sit in two distinct housing markets |
| | Little thought for the people who live here |
| | Bring forward the Site Allocations process in order to carry it out alongside the strategic sites, as one Local Plan. Additional or alternative Strategic Sites are required to meet true housing need – do this now. |
| | Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory for the plan period. |
| | Include an appropriate buffer to provide a supply of deliverable sites to ensure competition in the market for land |
| | The 'one size fits all' approach to growth ignores the complexity of CEC's towns, villages and rural areas |
| | Growth is not necessary: it produces waste, consumption. Consider alternative approaches such as de-growth. |
| | The number of jobs proposed is contained only in the Foreword and not in the policy or Reasoned Justification |
| | What about empty homes? |
| | The Plan fails to provide a sufficient quantum of affordable housing to meet the identified affordable housing requirements of the SHMA. As the majority will be secured by planning obligations, the overall housing target should be increased. |
| | When the housing figures were last discussed, the Environment Agency expressed doubts about being able to supply so many homes with water and waste services |
| | Figures which are now described as 'low growth' were previously described as 'high growth' |
| | Keep housing figures at 1,050 per annum until 2021, and increase only if there is a sound case based on demographic and other trends |
| | Account has not been taken of the 2011 census data |
| | Disregards town strategy consultations. What influence have they had on the Local Plan strategy? |
| | The use of minimum targets for employment and housing land enable flexibility in the Plan |
| | Population projections are lower than those in the Sub Regional Strategy of 2010. To maintain the role within the subregion that CEC then sought, |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>dwellings per annum must increase to 1,570 – 1,600 dwellings</p> <p>Via the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and an Indoor Sports Facility Strategy, plan strategically to increase the capacity of existing sports facilities and provide new ones.</p> <p>Completion rate on certain sites are unrealistic, including the new settlements.</p> <p>The Medium Growth Strategy is based on past housing completions including 2006 and 2008, when there were severe restrictions on new housebuilding. It is not a true reflection of housing need</p> <p>Where will the money come from to finance the development?</p> <p>How much is it costing the Council to produce the plan?</p> <p>The Population Background Paper does not provide a jobs-led scenario</p> <p>There are sufficient sites with planning permission for housing to meet immediate needs</p> <p>There is no robust analysis and nothing to constitute significant adverse impacts to justify a housing target below the true need. The NPPF does not allow for the recession to justify lower build rates or targets. Explore alternative approaches to avoid impacts on settlement character.</p> <p>Housing targets should be consistent, transparent 'maximum' figures. Which figure is correct?</p> <p>Reduce housing target to take into account smaller sites in the Site Allocations document; and re-use of empty homes.</p> <p>Recognise contribution of non-traditional employment such as leisure and tourism</p> <p>Need for a new local landscape designation to replace Areas of Special County Value which has been dropped.</p> <p>Infrastructure has not been taken into account, particularly road improvements and requirements of jobs growth/industry. Consider these before housing. A Community Infrastructure Levy is required.</p> <p>A 20 year view is far too long. The Plan period should cover 5 years.</p> <p>Implications for Cheshire's agriculture industry</p> <p>Good quality, well-paid jobs must be attracted</p> |
| | <p>Table 5.1 Housing Completions and Permissions</p> <p>11 representations by 11 people</p> <p>2 support</p> <p>6 object</p> <p>3 comment</p> |
| | <p>House building is at a historically low level. There is an oversupply of houses, including affordable houses: there is not a shortfall.</p> |
| | <p>Figure 5.1 Balancing the Competing Factors For and Against Development</p> <p>16 representations by 16 people</p> <p>3 support</p> |
| | <p>Building on the countryside will destroy local character.</p> |
| | <p>Protection of Green Belt cannot be used to prevent meeting the needs of newly-forming households</p> |
| | <p>The Plan strikes the right balance, with minimum greenfield incursions and the least harm to important assets</p> |
| | <p>Preservation of agricultural land should take precedence over other requirements</p> |
| | <p>There is no recognition of the need for the listed constraints.</p> |
| | <p>All the constraints can be overcome</p> |
| | <p>Where is the balance in the Plan?</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 11 object 2 comment | Takes no account of community assets and views |
| Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distribution 44 representations by 41 people 8 support 21 object 15 comment | New houses should be focused on our Principal towns |
| | 'Sustainable Villages' needs further definition |
| | Support controlled development approach to KSC – they must maintain their character |
| | Hough is not a sustainable village |
| | No consideration of interrelationships within Cheshire East e.g. travel to work areas |
| | No account taken of development within or beyond Cheshire East |
| | New housing around new settlements may not be sustainable – long distances to the centre encourage car-dependency |
| | Use proximity to rail stations as a strategic locational criteria for new employment / housing |
| | Object to the designation of Goostrey (including the 3 neighbouring parishes Cranage, Twemlow and Swettenham) as a Local Service Centre. Goostrey should be a sustainable village due to population size and proximity to Holmes Chapel |
| | Give appropriate focus to smaller settlements that can accommodate sensible and sustainable growth |
| | The settlement hierarchy is flawed until the distribution of growth is based on objectively assessed needs as per the NPPF |
| | Hotchpotch distribution due to piecemeal Town Strategy approach, based on the capacity of each settlement's chosen Preferred Strategic Sites. |
| | No explanation as to how the scale of growth has been calculated for each layer of the hierarchy |
| | Modest growth in LSCs is welcomed but must be sensitively located & designed to respect character |
| | Welcome supporting the retention and improvement of services & facilities in small/medium villages but must be sensitively located and respectfully designed |
| | Policy must go further to ensure all Local Service Centres contribute towards housing supply and reflect the SHMA. Brownfield sites are limited in their ability to provide development of an appropriate scale - assess LSC settlement boundaries where surrounded by open countryside |
| | The policy is not consistent for all LSCs |
| | Develop on brownfield sites to regenerate older estates in Principal Towns – do not build outside the settlement |
| | Housing supply evidence indicates that there is no capacity within Crewe to accommodate the residual housing requirement of 1,732 homes which must be delivered through the site allocations plan. Hence land currently designated as Green Gap will have to be brought forward for development. A thorough review of Green Gaps/Strategic Open Gaps must be undertaken, and sufficient land made available to meet the growth needs of Crewe. |
| | Include support for the expansion of facilities at large scale employment developments eg Alderley Park |
| | Do not support the creation of new settlements |
| | There should not be a restrictive upper limit to development. LSC figures should say 'at least'. Policy wording should allow for each settlement's individual housing needs to be delivered at the very least. |
| | Elevate Congleton to become a third Principal Town. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Crewe should be a 'super town' with Congleton and Macclesfield as 'main towns' |
| | Elevate Holmes Chapel to a Key Service Centre. |
| Statement Vision for Crewe 21 representations by 19 people 9 support 3 object 9 comment | Vision based on a dash for growth is totally unrealistic. Little evidence to show it is achievable given expected growth levels |
| | Little evidence that road schemes are needed |
| | Little evidence that HS2 is required and / or deliverable |
| | Traffic congestion in Crewe means roads are already at capacity |
| | Implementation of these schemes need to be demonstrated |
| | HS2 is essential – Crewe's unique selling point is its location at the heart of the rail and motorway network |
| | M6 Junctions 16 and 17 need significant improvement beyond current proposals |
| | Object to focus on geothermal plant. Totally unrealistic on plan timescale. |
| | Practical renewable(s) (such as wind turbines) are virtually ignored |
| | Impact of development is too great on green gaps |
| | Further strategic growth should be directed to sustainable locations in and around this, the District's largest town. |
| | Cannot say whether scale of development is appropriate for Crewe until the overall level of growth is properly formulated. |
| | New settlements in the Crewe Growth Corridor are wholly unsustainable in the intended scale and form. May also be counter to the regeneration strategy of the Potteries. |
| | Crewe town centre is dying. Regeneration requires large growth in businesses, industry and population to generate prosperity and thereby encourage developers to rebuild the town centre. |
| | Use South Cheshire's connectivity (rail, road, airports) to realise its economic potential |
| | The borough needs hotels and conference facilities - Crewe has the potential to benefit from this. |
| | Create a Theatre Quarter (cafes, wine bars, restaurants) around the new Lyceum Theatre which attracts household names |
| | Protect the green spaces in Warrington – designate them as Green Belt or Green Gap. |
| | The Council acknowledges the need to dual the A500 by providing a new settlement. Make reference (eg in paragraph 5.40) to this exceptional circumstance supporting removal of the land from the Green Belt, for consistency and robustness. |
| | Change paragraph 5.39 to reference 124 ha of employment land and 4,250 new homes |
| Statement Vision for Macclesfield 12 representations by 11 people 2 support 3 object 7 comment | Jobs and economic growth are essential |
| | Empty premises on increase – encourage landlords to accept lower rents. |
| | No substance, only an image of an attractive town "set in a visible landscape". |
| | To achieve this, CEC must reverse town centre dereliction through a commitment to its 'town centre first' statements |
| | New housing must have sufficient onsite parking |
| | Redevelop the town centre for residential and leisure use (multiplex cinema, bowling for evening entertainment) to generate economic growth. |
| | Why increase CE housing figures above Regional Plan requirements when |

| | |
|--|---|
| | other authorities are reducing theirs? |
| | Housing numbers are based on out of date ONS statistics, and should be reduced by 24%. |
| | Macclesfield needs hotels to take advantage of the 'Peak District' tourism brand that attracts visitors. |
| | Rectify disadvantages of poor accessibility from the M6 |
| | Lack of in-depth, objective assessment of town centre need and impact of development – 2009/10 retail assessment is flawed and superficial |
| | Include specific reference to delivery of affordable and aspirational housing and those for the elderly – impacts on achieving economic growth. |
| Statement Vision for Key Service Centres 47 representations by 44 people 12 support 27 object 8 comment | Development in Key Service Centres may not be deliverable or sustainable. |
| | Disagree with scattered, bolted-on approach to development. Spread so thin at low density, will result in car dependency and does not relate to settlements' size and objective housing need. |
| | Strong infrastructure plan is needed to support proposals |
| | Listen to local Town / Parish Councils |
| | Overreliance on town strategies in the preferred option |
| | Vision is outdated regarding town centre and infrastructure |
| | Limited vision, dealing only with nine centres and failing to recognise significance of the others. |
| | Market towns attract visitors – potential for festivals, events, food and drink to grow the Cheshire rural tourism offer |
| | Alderley Edge and Holmes Chapel should become KSCs |
| | We support the ambition for growth in Alsager and the objective of new development at Radway Green employment area. |
| | Disproportionate to propose that one third of the 10,500 new KSC homes be built in Congleton. It is half the size of Macclesfield. |
| | The Congleton link road is vital for the future of Congleton |
| | Don't concrete over prime agricultural land in Congleton |
| | Handforth should have a strategy as a Key Service Centre. |
| | Para 5.53 should propose 350 new dwellings in Knutsford in line with proposals on p.83. |
| | Need evidenced consideration of need in order to minimise intrusion into Green Belt around Knutsford |
| | Para 5.53 suggestion for development to the north west of the town conflicts with the proposed Tatton Park 'activities park' |
| | Middlewich has more to do to achieve Key Service Centre status |
| | The 1,500 new homes proposed in Nantwich plus new development of 240/270 provides enough new housing for 32 years |
| | Support the Nantwich vision, particularly new Green Belt separating the town from Crewe. No need for Green Belt to the west – already protected as a historic battlefield. |
| | Nantwich should engage its population to develop a cultural vision. Build on existing festivals and events. |
| | We support limited development and a bypass for Poynton. Development Strategy should emphasise a "brownfield first" policy for housing and employment. |
| | Junction 17 improvements are vital for achievement of Sandbach's growth potential |
| | Support the requirement for 'strategic gaps' to separate Sandbach |

| | |
|--|---|
| | particularly from Crewe. |
| | Large number of brownfield sites in Wilmslow |
| | Take proper account of the Wilmslow Town consultation |
| | Allocations for Wilmslow are too low – it is not justified to respond to local objection in this way |
| Statement Vision of Local Service Centres 69 representations by 68 people 6 support 54 object 9 comment | No need to alter Green Belt to meet this ‘modest growth’ – sufficient land with planning permissions and brownfield sites |
| | Define ‘modest’ growth. Amend the Vision to confirm growth is led by local needs, delivered sustainably in line with the NPPF |
| | Re-examine the settlement hierarchy - development in the designated LSCs cannot meet all objectives of Policy CS9. |
| | Partial vision without ambition for social/environmental needs. |
| | Work to date does not provide an in-depth objective assessment of the current situation and future needs. |
| | Modest growth is welcomed but must be sensitively located and designed to respect the character of each settlement. |
| | Confirm the status of and adopt all village design statements |
| | Green Energy Policies should be adopted |
| | Some of the larger LSC's, eg Prestbury, have little available / suitable housing land to support growth over the Plan period |
| | Prestbury is too small to be classified as a LSC |
| | Villages such as Goostrey should not be included as LSCs |
| | Haslington cannot accommodate the levels of employment or residential development envisaged for LSCs – its residents currently look to Crewe and beyond for jobs. |
| | |
| Statement Vision for Sustainable Villages 17 representations by 17 people 5 support 8 object 4 comment | Vision contradicts the high housing allocation numbers – this does not constitute ‘modest growth’. |
| | There should be no further development at the expense of Green Belt. |
| | Partial vision with no ambition for social/environmental needs. |
| | Provision of more services will spoil character and have questionable impact on sustainability. |
| | No new villages should be allowed in the area south of Crewe – they would not be sustainable development. |
| | Hough is not a sustainable village. |
| | Object to the designation of Winterley as a sustainable village |
| | Acton does not fully meet the definition of a sustainable village |
| | Brereton Heath is not sustainable – remove it from this list |
| Statement Vision for Rural Areas Vision for 12 representations by 11 people 1 support 6 object 5 comment | Allocate more Green Belt in rural areas |
| | Refer to the importance of cycle paths |
| | Make more mention of ICT connectivity |
| | Partial vision without ambition for social/environmental needs. |
| | Promote the importance of rural areas to tourism. Reword the paragraph – “The rural economy will have grown stronger and diversified, based primarily on to Include agriculture, but supplemented by appropriate small scale tourism tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations, food related businesses, recreation and other knowledge-based rural businesses, making use of ICT connectivity” |
| | Approach to heritage assets is too protectionist. Redraft para 5. 77 to recognise the need for listed buildings and their settings to be maintained and enhanced, not simply protected. |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy CS 2 Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distribution 508 representations by 476 people 31 support 394 object 83 comment | There should be a balance of development between the north and the south |
| | Classification/settlement strategy is agreed and consistent with the NPPF. |
| | Definition of 'sustainable' and 'small scale' and 'modest' are open to interpretation |
| | Total housing number is too low. |
| | The Council is using overestimated figures for demand |
| | The approach to the distribution of development is wrong, unsound, lacks robust justification/evidence and is not consistent with national policy. |
| | Some market towns require more development in light of affordable housing need. |
| | Policy should note the presence of heritage assets including conservation areas and the need to pay regard to them. |
| | To meet development requirements, the Plan must make provision for more than 'small scale' development and facilitate the review of Green Belt boundaries. |
| | Too urban centric and will not realise the potential of the rural economy. Additional allocations/policies are required to ensure positive approach to appropriate rural development, including use of former mineral workings. Only 2.3% (10ha) of targeted employment land has been allocated to the rural area, although it is home to 39% of CE's population (363,800). |
| | Neglects rural exception housing and would rule out several such sites which CEC and PINS have recently judged sustainable. |
| | Allow rural settlements to 'at least' achieve their housing needs ie include flexibility to permit small scale sustainable development in villages. Currently, the over-restrictive limitations to infill and building conversion will not achieve the sustainable village growth targets. |
| | Scale of growth may place a significant burden on Royal Mail requiring allocation of a new Delivery Office site or contributions through S106/CIL. |
| | Consolidate town centres and re-assign peripheral areas of the town centre to housing. |
| | Small-scale infill should only be on a local need basis, with the agreement of the local Parish Council. |
| | No evidence of compliance with the duty to co-operate with neighbouring authorities. |
| | Criteria are too stringent. CS2 should be amended to ensure it is positively prepared to achieve sustainable development. |
| | Shaped too heavily by the Town Strategy process which should only be given limited weight - panels were unrepresentative and there was a lack of environmental input, housing assessment, town capacity assessment and sound site assessment criteria. Town Strategies are generally prescriptive and constraining. Manage community expectations. |
| | Evidence does not demonstrate that Principal Towns' growth levels can be achieved. |
| | Towns have been presented with pre-determined housing numbers and no inkling of the spatial development framework within which they are set |
| | No explanation of how the scale of growth across the KSCs was determined |
| | Increase housing for all KSCs and LSCs |
| | Upgrade Haslington to a town with an allocation of 17 homes per year for 20 years. It is highly accessible with good infrastructure. |
| | Alderley Edge performs as a KSC and should be identified as such. It can support a higher level of development. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Holmes Chapel should be elevated to a Key Service Centre |
| | Increase development in LSCs to address demographic changes in those areas e.g. increased elderly population |
| | Shavington should not be constrained by being an LSC – it is needed to meet some of Crewe’s strategic housing requirement |
| | Reclassify Wybunbury as a Local Service Centre, either in its own right or combined with Shavington |
| | Provision is not made for the impacts of development on LSC |
| | All Local Service Centres should contribute to future sustainable housing supply. The 2,000 homes identified to be delivered across LSCs is insufficient to meet local needs. |
| | Spatial distribution of growth between LSCs should be detailed in policy. |
| | Support policy that includes a mechanism to make small amendments to the settlement and Green Belt boundaries of LSCs / KSCs |
| | The policy for LSCs should not necessitate any change to Green Belt boundaries |
| | LSCs should not include villages |
| | Prestbury should not be an LSC - too small and has poor public transport |
| | Housing growth in Local Service Centres should meet the needs of the local area |
| | Winterley is not a sustainable village |
| | Arclid, Brereton Green, Brereton Heath and Hassall Green are too small and too close to LSCs to be sustainable villages. |
| | Mobberley has accommodated considerable affordable housing, changing from small to moderately large village. |
| | Is Brereton Heath in Somerford Parish? |
| | Brereton Heath is not a sustainable village - it is not sustainable |
| | Somerford's character will be lost by new housing. The centre will be damaged by the link road. |
| | Two new villages should be introduced at Bunbury and Audlem |
| | Sustainable Villages policy is confused, inconsistent between identification of the settlements as places that can and should sustain growth, and restraint on new growth |
| | High Legh should be identified as a ‘sustainable village’ |
| | Recategorise Goostrey as a sustainable village |
| | Winterley to be removed from the list of sustainable villages. |
| | Hough should be categorised as a rural village. |
| | Tabley should be recognised as a rural community |
| | Great Warford appears to be defined as a Rural Village. |
| | We question the deliverability of the new settlements |
| | New settlements are inappropriate, unsuitable, unnecessary and inconsistent; contrary to the NPPF |
| | New settlements must provide employment to meet Garden City principles as required in NPPF. |
| | New settlements are not of sufficient scale to create new sustainable communities |
| | The Duchy suggest that for clarity, proposals should be referred to as a New Settlement comprising three villages; one for employment and two for residential development. |
| | The New Settlements will not have a direct impact on Cheshire West and |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Chester. |
| | Evidence base for new settlements is questionable in terms of its validity and robustness. SHLAA proves that they are not needed. |
| | Prefer extensions to existing settlements rather than new settlements. |
| | Test the proposed Handforth settlement against district-wide alternatives with regard to suitability and deliverability. |
| | How do the new settlements around Crewe accord with its status as a principal town? |
| | Maintain Strategic Open Gap to prevent merging of communities and preserve the character of our villages. |
| | Crewe should be apportioned the highest amount of new housing and employment land |
| | Be realistic in assessment of locations and sites on which to deliver Crewe's new housing supply |
| | Crewe should be designated as a Principal Growth Town in order to be distinguished from Macclesfield |
| | For a sustainable pattern of development, Crewe should have at least 35% of all dwellings over the Plan period. Requirement is 32,000 homes, i.e. 11,200 homes in Crewe. |
| | The allocation of 3,500 dwellings (13%) to Congleton is overly high, and not justified by the evidence base. |
| | The ELR suggested that Congleton become a Sustainable Town. This should be reflected in the Development Strategy. |
| | Increase Congleton allocation to 5,000 homes. |
| | Congleton should be a Principal Town |
| | Handforth East has enough homes. It should not lose its green spaces to cater for the housing needs of other parts of the Borough, notably Wilmslow. |
| | Too much development in Holmes Chapel |
| | Disproportionately low housing numbers for Knutsford compared to other Key Service Centres. Needs more housing. |
| | As CE's second largest town, constraint on Macclesfield's development will affect its economy. It needs more housing (5,500 units). |
| | What is the evidence for Macclesfield needing 3,500 new houses? |
| | Of all Key Service Centres, future development in Middlewich will have the greatest impact on Cheshire West and Chester. |
| | More housing should go to Poynton. |
| | 400 homes are not required in Wilmslow |
| | Wilmslow is second largest KSC yet has fewer houses proposed. Proposed level of growth is insufficient to meet needs and cannot accommodate natural population growth. Needs more housing. |
| Figure 5.2 Key Diagram 35 representations by 33 people 6 support 23 object 6 comment | Goostrey should be a sustainable village rather than a KSC |
| | The excessive distribution of houses in the south of the borough almost joins the village's together – urban creep and loss of village individuality. |
| | More reference should be made to the Peak District Fringe |
| | Lack of Green Belt status on the east side of Sandbach is a dangerous omission. |
| | Strategic site diagram does NOT show the Green Belt/gap between Crewe and Nantwich - it should be clearly shown |
| | The identity of strategic open gaps around the KSCs and their rural areas is crucial, linking with tourism development. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | The release of Green Belt land in North Cheshire will encourage developers to focus on expensive rural housing rather than the much need affordable housing and urban regeneration |
| | Include the inland waterway network on the Key Diagram |
| | This map is insufficient, too broad. It should demonstrate the spatial strategy; include locations of housing/employment growth; and detailed 'zoomed in' local area plans. A full Proposals Map is required now. |
| | Most of the proposals on the plan are sensibly grouped around existing centres: Crewe/Alsager, Middlewich/Sandbach, Congleton, Wilmslow/Handforth, Macclesfield/Poynton, Knutsford [these last three linking to Manchester] and motorways. The single westernmost blue spot - the strategic site of Wardle - does not. |
| | Include on the diagram the proposed highway improvement scheme for the A556 between junction 8 of the M56 and junction 19 of the M6. |
| | Revisit a potential new settlement and new railway station at Wardle. |
| | Update to include proposed HS2 route |
| | Key diagram is incorrect. There is no gap between Handforth north boundary and Stockport. |
| | Stapeley and Batherton have a strong agricultural history. Extend the proposed Green Belt to maintain area character and protect the agriculturally-based gateway into the town. |
| | |
| Table 5.2 Distribution of Development across Cheshire East 118 representations by 95 people 7 support 79 object 32 comment | Approach to delivery |
| | Distribution of development is not sustainable. Sustainable development should be delivered by extensions to existing towns |
| | Impact on neighbouring authorities has not been considered, particularly in the south of Crewe (RSS required constraint on borders) |
| | Evidence not provided to support spatial distribution in the plan; Green Belt development; or Macclesfield town centre development |
| | Evidence on housing numbers is inconsistent across documents |
| | What is the justification for the global housing figures, and those for each town/area? Why are they not higher or lower? |
| | Amount of employment land proposed requires higher levels of housing provision |
| | Some policy terms are not clearly defined eg 'small scale' and 'meet local needs' |
| | Clarify the role of Site Allocations in relation to Strategic Sites |
| | Promote a range of sites rather than new settlements |
| | Evidence should underpin the approach to new settlements |
| | What is the evidence to suggest new settlement is misplaced? |
| | LSC and SV should not be developed at the same rate |
| | Impact of increased housing on existing villages is not demonstrated |
| | Allocations for SVs and LSCs should not be restricted to infill and small scale development |
| | Evidence of Duty to Co-operate should be set out in the plan |
| | Clarify contributions to Community infrastructure |
| | What is the impact of increased development on provision of sports pitches? |
| | What is the impact of development on infrastructure from development across the borough and in each area? Infrastructure must be provided alongside housing. |
| | What is justification for settlement hierarchy |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Why are proposals contrary to RSS? |
| | Preserve Green Belt and pursue smaller developments |
| | Re-use empty homes first |
| | J17 should remain an employment allocation |
| | High quality design and develop contributions should be delivered |
| | Green belt buffer around south Manchester should be preserved |
| | No evidence to suggest growth should be focused in the south |
| | More sites should be released annually around Congleton |
| | In Crewe, connectivity and infrastructure will be overwhelmed by proposed development |
| | Why is Knutsford the only place to have 'low density housing'? How is this affordable and what is the justification? |
| | Housing requirement for Middleswich should rise to meet the allocated employment land |
| | Nantwich should deliver higher levels of employment land (20-25ha) |
| | Sandbach should deliver more employment sites |
| | Wilmslow should take more development |
| | Goostrey should not be allocated as a LSC |
| | Chelford's housing need can be delivered by existing permissions |
| Green Belt and Safeguarded Land 67 representations by 56 people 8 support 42 object 17 comment | "Green belt swap" is not evidenced and pays no regard to Green Belt purpose – to preserve a particular area which cannot be traded. CEC must identify the exceptional circumstances needed to alter greenbelt boundaries. This has not yet been done. |
| | There should not be constant 'nibbling away' of Green Belt every time a new plan is formulated and land is redesignated. Eg the Plan proposes a new settlement (Village B) in the Green Belt. Current Green Belt must be protected. |
| | New Green Belt must be sufficient and comparable to the land lost, in terms of displaced habitats and species |
| | Contrary to the NPPF regarding Green Belt – dual carriageway will reduce the narrowest part of Greater Manchester's Green Belt at Poynton and there will be 3,300 homes near Woodford. |
| | Agriculture and farming is not mentioned |
| | Restrain development in the Green Belt to encourage redevelopment in Greater Manchester. |
| | Green Belt should be a last resort, and should not be developed where brownfield land is available |
| | There are 400 brownfield sites in and around Wilmslow |
| | No evidence of CEC working jointly with Greater Manchester or Stockport to produce a joined up strategy. |
| | Provide safeguarded land to prevent villages merging together and to protect the countryside and the Peak Park's amenity and visual character. |
| | Proposed new greenbelt designations are insufficient to prevent merging, particularly Sandbach East between Sandbach and Alsager. |
| | New offices and hotels are being built at Manchester Airport (very near Wilmslow). Where is the evidence that homes, offices and hotels are needed on Green Belt? |
| | Policy CS 3 (Green Belt) and Policy CS 6 (Open Countryside) should both make provision for sustainable infill development. |
| | There is no material difference between Open Countryside and Green Belt |

| | |
|---|--|
| | provided the purposes of the Green Belt (CS 3 paragraph 1) are not prejudiced. |
| | Good attempt to provide necessary housing whilst protecting the environment |
| | Boundary alteration must maximise delivery of new edge-of-settlement homes and new permanent settlement boundaries |
| | Not possible to seek to protect/enhance the countryside and release Green Belt for development |
| | Use reassessment to remove anomalous sites from the Green Belt eg Land at Legh Road, Disley |
| | Alter the south side of Newcastle Road as per submitted map |
| | Extend Green Belt around Nantwich southwards to Stapeley to include Reaseheath College and retain market town character |
| | Insufficient justification for focusing housing growth in southern KSCs in order to avoid releasing so much northern Green Belt. |
| | Extend North Staffordshire Green Belt around Weston Village and Stowford due to development pressures, the amount of existing development and the SHLAA. Justified under the NPPF. |
| Figure 5.3 New Green Gap and Strategic Open Gap Policy 27 representations by 25 people 11 Support 10 object 6 comment | Extend the Strategic Open Gap between Crewe and Sandbach to include green areas between Sandbach, Elworth and Alsager |
| | Is the Albion Chemical Works included in the Sandbach Strategic Open Gap? |
| | Retention of Green Gap/introduction of Green Belt between Nantwich and Crewe is essential to maintain separate town identities AND provision of natural environment for the benefit of the population. |
| | The inclusion of New Settlements to relieve pressure on precious Green Gap land is a remarkable progression from previous request for development land |
| | I support the preservation of green belt and agricultural land. |
| | The new green belt along the A500/Nantwich corridor should include the south side of Shavington, Hough, Chorlton and Wybunbury, and should completely surround Nantwich. |
| | Cheshire East should adhere to national policy and only allow greenbelt development in the most exceptional circumstances |
| | The release of Green Belt land in North Cheshire will encourage developers to focus on expensive rural housing rather than the much needed affordable housing and urban regeneration |
| | The Strategic Open Gap protecting open space between Crewe, Sandbach and Middlewich should include Green Belt and it is poorly defined. |
| | The Green Belt “swap” idea is not described in or supported by the NPPF. Why should new Green Belt designation be any less vulnerable than current Green Belt in the future? |
| Policy CS3 Green Belt Overall Development Strategy 136 representations by 129 people | Proposed greenbelt boundaries are not robust and do not define boundaries clearly using recognisable, permanent physical features as required by the NPPF. |
| | Principle of greenbelt swap is not justified. New Green Belt in south is not adequate compensatory measure for loss in north |
| | Proposed boundaries of changed Green Belt are not clear enough - Proposals Map is needed to clarify sites and release |
| | No evidence of exceptional circumstances justifying Green Belt release – CEC must demonstrate need within the plan period. |
| | Boundaries of Green Belt and Strategic Open Gap must not constrain future |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8 support 63 object 65 comment | development needs |
| | Extend Green Belt to allow wildlife corridors and movement |
| | Consider brownfield capacity in neighbouring authorities, and evidence this joint working |
| | Brownfield sites and empty properties should be used before Green Belt and greenfield sites |
| | The policy should reference how a sequential test will be applied to greenbelt development proposals |
| | Green Belt has value for food production purposes |
| | Alderley Park should be considered as a brownfield site |
| | Numbers are wrong |
| | Rationale for new settlements is not clear, including Handforth site |
| | Show justification and evidence for new areas of Green Belt |
| | Green Belt review should have been undertaken prior to drafting the Strategy, for soundness. It appears decision have already been made. |
| | Development is necessary – increase the overall housing requirement with implications for Green Belt review |
| | Green Belt helps separate settlements and Strategic Open Gap will prevent sprawl |
| | Upgrade Green Gap / Strategic Open Gap to Green Belt |
| | Allocate new Green Belt to compensate for loss incurred by building new settlements |
| | Will encroach on buffer of south Manchester |
| | Clarification on the decision making process for these proposals, what are ‘exceptions’? |
| | Cumulative impact of the Woodford development on Green Belt in the north of borough and how this relates to proposals |
| | It is undemocratic to remove Green Belt against the wishes of local people |
| | Potential release of sites around Macclesfield to accommodate growth and need should be shown on Proposals Map |
| | Green Belt status should be given to land in the existing Green Gap/Strategic Open Gap in the Wistaston Parish area |
| | The Green Belt should be extended from Stapeley to Chorlton |
| | Consider providing Green Belt around Nantwich |
| Policy CS 4 Safeguarded Land 55 representations by 54 people 6 support 18 object 31 comment | The boundaries of the proposed Strategic Open Gap are not clearly defined. Clarity is required. |
| | It is inappropriate to consult on these policies without a Proposals Map to identify where Green Belt status will be lost as a result of proposals or safeguarding. |
| | The Strategic Open Gap is welcomed but any exception must safeguard openness and be sensitive to local character. |
| | No evidence has been presented to overturn the existing policy of restraining development. |
| | Provide a map of the Green Belt land in the north of the Borough, similar to that in the South. |
| | The Strategy must state that Green Belt should not be used when there are alternative brownfield sites. |
| | Support retention of the Green Gap. |
| | Measures in this policy will have no direct implication for Cheshire West and Chester. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Safeguarded land is necessary if the greenbelt dwellings requirement is increased within or beyond the plan period. |
| | Too much land has been designated as 'safeguarded' without evidence or justification. It was not the Government's intention for safeguarding to downgrade Green Belt in this way. |
| | Any designation of Green Belt as "safeguarded land" should be very strongly resisted. The Council will be pressured to release the land early, even though the NPPF discourages this. |
| | Plan should state that safeguarded land will be reviewed when the Local Plan is reviewed. |
| | Safeguarded land should be capable of review at any time without the need to wait for a Plan review |
| | Manchester Airport's Masterplan (2007) and related Land Use Action Plan - safeguard for future airport use the land alongside Runway 05R/23L for potential parallel taxiway. |
| | A Green Belt review is required and should also identify potential areas of safeguarded land |
| | Unacceptable not to indicate where areas of Safeguarded Land will be, and what the constraints on developing them could be, given the possibility of permanent development on these sites and their potential impacts on biodiversity. |
| | Safeguarded land should be identified now as part of Green Belt review and designation, rather than waiting until Site Allocations stage. |
| | Former Green Belt land around towns should be de-allocated and encouraged for development. Only appropriate sites will be seriously considered. |
| | Ensure boundaries do not unduly constrain the future delivery of housing and employment land. |
| | Create new SOGs between Sandbach & Astbury; Crewe, Haslington & Crewe Green; Crewe & Nantwich; Middlewich & Winsford; Betchton & Holmes Chapel; Alsager, Hassall, Wheelock, Winterley & Haslington |
| | NPPF states that 'inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved'. Handforth Green Belt proposal does not meet the requirement. |
| | Support Green Belt and Strategic Open Gap round Nantwich. Eastern boundary needs further consideration. Any exception must safeguard openness and be sensitive to local character. |
| | Support retention of Green Gaps between the town and surrounding settlements such as Haslington. |
| | SHLAA site 2620 at Sandbach should not be subject to the 'Strategic Open Gaps' policy as it is north of the town and its development would not merge Sandbach and Middlewich. |
| | Support development at Crewe Road Shavington, rather than preserving the openness. |
| | If site Aa (Wilmslow Vision document) is not allocated it should taken out of the Green Belt and allocated as safeguarded land. The plan must look beyond 2030 in respect of GB boundaries |
| Policy CS5 Strategic Open Gaps 118 | Upgrade whole area to Green Belt |
| | No justification has been made to demonstrate the objectively assessed need for SOG over and above Open Countryside or Green Belt designations, or the boundaries chosen - unsound |

| | |
|--|---|
| representations by 113 people 42 support 26 object 50 comment N.B – Two petitions received in support of this Policy | No justification for New Settlements – fails test of soundness |
| | Should be designated as part of Green Belt review |
| | Proposals must not constrain ability of settlements to expand sustainably |
| | Consultation is inappropriate without a Local Plan Proposals Map which clearly identifies the affected land |
| | Re-introduce Areas of Special County Value or prepare a replacement local landscape designation |
| | Why are SOGs only in south and central part of the Borough? |
| | Spread of housing at Elworth contradicts the policy |
| | SOG is vital to stop merging of towns, preserve character and safeguard openness. Required for all local centres |
| | No definition of where the gap is required to maintain the separation of communities |
| | Clarity needed over inner boundaries of proposals |
| | Allowing exceptions to the policy will undermine its intent |
| | SOG insufficient on their own to protect rural identity – infrastructure is needed and traffic issues must be addressed |
| | Brownfield, sustainably located sites in open countryside, Green Gaps and edges of key service centres should be considered before Green Belt development |
| | SOG, GG and GB should not constrain future growth |
| | Should exclude sites on edge of settlement which are sustainable |
| | Reserve an area within Sandbach as formal open space |
| | Change the proposed SOG between Crewe, Shavington, Weston, Willaston and Rope |
| | Extend SOG to cover Sandbach and Alsager |
| | Include South West Crewe in SOG |
| | SOG for Handforth |
| | SOG to be used at Congleton and Astbury |
| | SOG to be exercised around Haslington, Winterley, Sandbach |
| | SOG for Congleton and Somerford |
| | SOG for Oakhanger and Bartomley |
| | SOG between Middlewich and Sandbach insufficient |
| | Development near Wilmslow will make Wilmslow part of urban sprawl |
| | SOG between Tabley and Knutsford |
| | SOG between Mobberley and Knutsford |
| | SOG between Macclesfield, Congleton, Alderley Edge; Alsager, Holes Chapel and Knutsford |
| | SOG at Wistaston |
| | SOG should allow for rationalisation of the settlement boundary to the north of Shavington |
| | GB taken for Handforth settlement should be replaced near Handforth , not Crewe |
| | Remove land to the rear of the Lamb, Willaston from GG/SOG |
| Policy CS6 Open Countryside 107 representations by 86 people 33 support | Support blanket definition of open countryside – villages need this support to preserve Cheshire's unique countryside |
| | Policy and Para 5.99 are contradictory – the Policy does not state that Open Countryside excludes the Green Belt |
| | This policy removes the need for a separate Strategic Gap designation/policy |
| | This policy cannot operate without a map/list of open countryside areas and |

| | |
|---|---|
| 19 object 55 comment | settlement boundaries. Use of existing settlement boundaries is not appropriate. |
| | Do not allow extension of settlement boundaries – it erodes open countryside. |
| | Settlement boundaries should be in the hands of town/village authorities |
| | If development of greenbelt sites adjoining villages/towns is permitted, so should similar sites in the open countryside which are suitable and sustainable eg Shavington site SHLAA Ref 2957. |
| | The Strategy does not adhere to this policy, particularly on new settlements. |
| | Restrictive policy – the Plan’s growth objectives cannot be delivered in existing settlements. Undertake a strategic review of the open countryside to ensure development needs can be met. Identify areas of limited potential settlement expansion. |
| | Policy has not been ‘positively prepared’ in line with the NPPF. It is possible for applications to mitigate impact of development in open countryside through community park provision etc. |
| | This policy takes a predetermined view that open countryside boundaries will remain the same. They should be considered through the Local Plan process |
| | Such areas are usually ill-served by public transport, so it is hard to achieve sustainable development |
| | Numerical limits on infill are too restrictive – increase them significantly and judge each case contextually and individually |
| | Infill development in the countryside should be carefully designed and landscaped to uphold local character |
| | Define ‘other uses appropriate to a rural area’ |
| | Policy must support rural diversification, particularly for farmers |
| | Policy should support provision of community facilities |
| | Policy should include allowance for tourism uses |
| | Policy should clarify that infrastructure is an ‘exception’ ie flood relief and high speed broadband |
| | Do not erode open countryside in Goostrey |
| | Do not erode open countryside in Somerford |
| | Restore open countryside designation to land around Congleton |
| 6 Planning for Sustainable Development 27 representations by 25 people 2 support 18 object 7 comment | Development does not have to mean growth as per the NPPF. It can mean creating value, regeneration, improvement, or zero growth. |
| | Support for the prioritisation of brownfield sites |
| | The document does not have a true town centre first approach. |
| | Support providing employment close to homes |
| | Bear in mind the cumulative impact of HS2 |
| | Development on this scale involving such loss of agricultural land, cannot be sustainable. |
| | Sustainability means combining environmental responsibility, social integration and commercial viability. |
| | No mention of renewable energy; carbon-neutral buildings; reforestation and tree planting; retrofitting existing buildings |
| | Economic models used are dated. |
| | Engage with what people want – tidy up current messes first. |
| | Include plots for self-builders to attract highly skilled white-collar workers |
| | Use the UNESCO definition of ‘sustainable development’ ie socially desirable, economically viable, culturally appropriate and ecologically sustainable. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Not enough rented accommodation |
| | How will you ensure development is sustainable? Requirements should be specific, not general. Use the approach of the former Congleton Borough's SPD4 on Sustainable Development. |
| | Provision of infrastructure should precede development |
| | Ease transport across the borough by introducing trams |
| | Freight should be taken off the roads |
| Policy CS7 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development 48 representations by 48 people 25 support 10 object 13 comment | Why repeat policy which is clearly stated in the NPPF? |
| | Support use of PINS model wording |
| | Strengthen 'sustainable' through precise criteria at borough and location levels – at present this is a presumption in favour of development, not sustainable development |
| | Put onus on developer to prove sustainability |
| | A Neighbourhood Plan approach would have enabled preservation of CEC's varied character and heritage |
| | There shouldn't be a situation where there are 'no policies relevant'. If this happens, put new policies in place rather than simply allowing development. |
| | Put this policy earlier in the document so that it is seen as a golden thread through all CEC decisions |
| | The Plan does not reflect the NPPF |
| | Include focus on town centre development |
| | The Plan is not sustainable and compromises future generations |
| | Distances to services are not appropriate criteria by which to define sustainability. |
| | Define an 'out of date policy', or this opportunity will be abused |
| Policy CS8 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East 84 representations by 83 people 33 support 25 object 26 comment | Policy undermines the sustainability process by adding a lot of things that have nothing to do with sustainability |
| | The Plan contravenes this policy by suggesting sites outside Principal Towns and KSCs; encouraging inappropriate development; negatively impacting town centres and local character; building on agricultural land etc |
| | Agricultural land should not be developed unless all other options have been eliminated, and then only sites on peripheries of main towns, and not 'best and most favourable' |
| | NPPF does not require protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land – policy should recognise the need for a balance between retaining such land and ensuring development occurs on the most sustainable sites. |
| | These criteria must be adhered to in decision-making |
| | Lacks hard-edged, measurable criteria by which adherence and sustainability can be judged |
| | Neighbourhood Plans are needed |
| | Agree with prioritising growth of Principal Towns and Key Service Centres rather than creating new settlements |
| | Policy does not include the 12 core principles of the NPPF |
| | Define accessibility ie by public transport, linked to footpaths and cycleways |
| | Infrastructure should include planting |
| | Equality and social inclusion – what of those with severe/moderate learning difficulties who are not elderly? |
| | Comply with para 69 of the NPPF – planning should facilitate social interaction and create healthy, inclusive communities |
| | Policies CS8 and CS9 could be combined |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Highlight role of Local Service Centres, Sustainable Villages and New Settlements, and contribute to their vitality and viability |
| | Are the items numbered in order to show their relative importance? |
| | Agree with use of brownfield sites over greenfield ones – should be given a higher priority |
| | Add – housing should be close to employment areas, easily accessible by regular public transport, on foot and by bicycle. |
| | Strengthen point x – all new and modified buildings should exceed government guidelines on energy/resource efficiency, be carbon-neutral or 100% energy efficient |
| | Points (i) & (ii) should be subject to (say) all of (iii), (iv), (vi), ...(x), (xi) having been satisfied first. |
| | Include a commitment to protect important landscapes; landscape character; and the intrinsic beauty of the countryside |
| | Include a commitment to recognise local planning designations |
| | Include a commitment to take into account environmental capacity |
| | Refer to delivery of high quality new homes and new homes which meet identified local needs |
| | Include: significant developments require consultation of local residents and consideration of alternatives. |
| | Include a requirement to plan positively for the provision and integration of community facilities and local services including places of worship |
| | Policy is too weak – CEC must ‘ensure’ these are achieved, not ‘contribute to’ or ‘expected to’ |
| | Include guidelines/details on reduced carbon emissions. Strengthen it to require Passivhaus standards; BREEAM Good; wherever possible, south-facing and use of solar panels. |
| | Point ii should be more flexible in acknowledging the contribution of edge-of-centre sites close to Principal Towns and Key Service Centres |
| | Point ix should direct new gypsy and traveller sites to the north of the Borough in order to meet CEC’s obligation to apply policies consistently |
| | Incorporate NPPF stance on rural economy ie include ‘support the creation of a prosperous rural economy through taking a positive approach to sustainable development’ |
| | Incorporate NPPF encouragement for farm diversification: ‘Development upon greenfield sites should not occur on areas of agricultural land quality of 1, 2 or 3a, unless the land is unsuitable for modern agricultural uses and/or the strategic need overrides these issues.’ |
| | Include sports facilities in part iv |
| | Include a point prohibiting building on floodplain |
| | Include use of sustainable drainage systems |
| | Make reference to climate change |
| | Should include criteria on property types and affordable housing |
| | Public transport must run at all hours of the working day |
| Policy CS9 Sustainable Development Principles 90 representations | Policy must be supported by detailed definitions and evidence requirements to avoid ‘get-out options’ eg strategic needs overriding the issues |
| | Consult the local community on development – they know what is acceptable |
| | Define ‘locally’ |
| | Part 2ii lacks justification, is outdated (people travel further for shopping, small shops are unviable) and is too prescriptive, especially in rural areas. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>by 85 people 22 support 34 object 34 comment</p> | Could preclude suitable sites coming forward. Many strategic Plan sites fail the tests. |
| | Regarding distance to the nearest railway station: 1,000m is the maximum distance; 800m is more realistic |
| | Instead of specific distances, the policy should deem a site sustainable if it is within a mile of local amenities/services. |
| | Infrastructure must precede development, especially in Crewe |
| | The requirement to provide/contribute to infrastructure prior to development could impact on viability and deliverability |
| | Flexibility and/or prioritisation of requirements are needed, as there will be few developments that can comply with all the requirements |
| | Policy does not mention environmental capacity restraints |
| | Sustainability means development which contributes positively to area character |
| | Policy does not commit to only building on greenfield sites as a last resort, nor does it set targets for brownfield use. Making best use of land should be the priority, as it cannot be undone. |
| | Not possible to avoid 'permanent loss' of agricultural land once it has been developed. |
| | Development must support the green agenda |
| | Require developments to minimise trip generation and move focus from car to walking, cycling and public transport. |
| | Include cycle parking to the standards in DfT's Local Transport Note 02/08 – Cycle Infrastructure Design |
| | Adopt the Hierarchy of Green Transportation. |
| | Policy conflicts with several Strategic Sites |
| | Page 38, footnote 3 - alter 'Convenience Store' to 'Shop selling food and fresh groceries'; clarify 'multi-functional open space' |
| | All new development must respect and enhance heritage assets, their wider settings and nature conservation. |
| | Incorporate principles of compactness, appropriate density and sufficient level of development to support facilities and infrastructure. Design review should be required. |
| | Requiring all new development outside core town areas to be well-designed, sustainable and energy efficient will not improve economic performance |
| | Language is too vague and must be strengthened. Define 'sustainable community'; 'appropriate' |
| | Disaggregate this policy |
| | This policy conflicts with growth projections for LSCs, which cannot both deliver growth and comply with the sustainability objectives |
| | Criteria should not be applied equally to all locations eg inner urban, suburban, edge of settlements, rural settlements etc. |
| | Goes beyond reasonable infrastructure requirements related to the proposed development, hence does not comply with the NPPF |
| | The word 'particularly' suggests that contributions are expected where need does not arise as a result of the development proposal. This is contrary to policy and Regulations. |
| | The policy should refer to viability |
| | Clear advice is needed on open space requirements. The policy should note that accessibility standards for outdoor sports will change as a result of the |

| | |
|---|--|
| | emerging Playing Pitch Strategy |
| | Part 1 iii duplicates Policy SE4: Landscape of the Policy Principles document and should be deleted. |
| | Include a presumption in favour of renewable energy |
| | Section 1, add: 'minimise change in water absorbency of land' |
| | Section 1, add: 'minimise future requirements for ongoing maintenance' |
| | Section 2: 'bus stops should be served by regularly timetabled buses that operate with a reliable frequency before, during and after the normal working day' |
| | Section 2: add 'be nearby appropriate amounts and types of housing; provide for a balanced economy including manufacturing' |
| 7 Infrastructure 21 representations by 21 people 3 support 12 object 6 comment | Until the quantum of development is identified, infrastructure requirements cannot be assessed. |
| | No consideration of secondary school provision or expansion or connectivity (public transport, walking, cycling). |
| | Please make more direct reference to open space, play, health facilities and schools. Emphasis seems to be on roads which is unfortunate and presumably unintentional. |
| | No mention of Middlewich Eastern By-Pass completion, which is vital for Middlewich. |
| | Please add in requirements for cycleways / footpaths throughout the region |
| | The Policy appears to be road centred |
| | It is also considered that Part (6) of Policy CS10 should make reference to the proposed HS2 link as this will be key to improving the connectivity of the Borough with the Region and the wider area beyond. |
| | Caution is expressed in respect of Part 4 of this Policy that notes that the provision of infrastructure should precede the delivery of development wherever possible. This is not always possible, particularly whereby large pieces of infrastructure are concerned, that can have significant up front costs on a scheme. Part 4 should be revised to refer to the timely and phased provision of infrastructure, associated specifically with the needs arising from the development proposed. |
| | I welcome inclusion of green infrastructure in the justification but consider it should be explicitly stated in the policy, not covered under other |
| | Policy CS10 includes all community facilities with an explanation at para.7.4.3. For consistency please use the same terminology in the policy and in the Justification "Social and Community Facilities" or Community Facilities. For clarity, the last bullet point at para.7.4.3 should list "libraries, museums and theatres" |
| | It is vitally important that 7.13 include Place of Worship/Community facilities - including community centres, support for community groups and projects. |
| | Allocate council funds in proportion to population growth, not current population |
| | How much CIL will go to town/parish councils? What is the impact on infrastructure? How will their choice of projects be determined and/or ratified? |
| | Naïve to expect developer funding to provide road construction |
| | Who decides what constitutes acceptable contributions from developers? |
| | Who determines whether new development 'overburdens' existing infrastructure? |
| | Current infrastructure will not cope with proposed developments. No |

| | |
|--|---|
| | evaluation of infrastructure required for such large scale development. |
| | Will cause traffic chaos on roads which are already gridlocked |
| | More parking spaces will be required for rail commuters |
| | Consider secondary school provision and expansion |
| | Consider connectivity – public transport, walking, cycling |
| | Financially viable expansion of Leighton Hospital is necessary |
| | Compulsory purchase, demolition, railway bridge are needed but are not financially or practically possible. |
| | Environmental capacity implications of the high growth strategy? E.g. availability of minerals and aggregates |
| | Need direct references to open space, play, health facilities and schools |
| | Focus on road expansion is outdated. It will increase pollution; have a negative impact on health; and are not needed as traffic volumes are set to decrease. |
| | Instead of new roads, create an integrated transport system including free park and ride. |
| | Development of Junction 16 and A500 dualling will increase HGV traffic and vehicular speed with accident and health impacts. |
| | Dualling of Junction 16 link road will require mitigation of traffic at Reaseheath on the A51 |
| | Too much emphasis on Junction 17 improvements – growth in Sandbach will result in need for additional traffic management |
| | Support Congleton Relief Road to facilitate larger-scale residential developments in the town. |
| | Why are there 2 junctions from Congleton Relief Road to Manchester Road? |
| | Include Middlewich Eastern Bypass, vital for Middlewich |
| | Object to relief road south of Macclesfield - will destroy Green Belt and terminate on narrow London Road bottleneck |
| | Macclesfield relief road must not be followed by relief road on greenfield land between Macclesfield and Sutton. |
| | Macclesfield relief road does not relieve traffic problems, but serves new housing. It will increase congestion by slowing the traffic flow and introducing extra traffic from new residents. |
| Policy CS10 Infrastructure 127 representations by 114 people 25 support 49 object 53 comment | These proposals have been aspirations for a long time – will they really be realised this time around? |
| | Where is the Infrastructure Plan with evidence of need, cost, timescales, funding sources, delivery agents? |
| | Include reference to the tests in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations which avoid double-charging |
| | There must be a policy of ‘infrastructure first’ i.e. before development |
| | Costs will make it prohibitive to deliver infrastructure prior to development. |
| | The policy should recognise that limited housing/employment development can be used to enable infrastructure improvements where there is established local need |
| | Phasing of development must not slow delivery of infrastructure |
| | Developers must fund impact-based improvements required due to development near railway infrastructure |
| | There are no transport problems in the borough |
| | Involve the Peak District National Park Authority on impacts of major infrastructure improvements |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Proper delivery of infrastructure to support KSCs and LSCs will remove the need to provide New Settlements |
| | Have alternatives to the Congleton Link Road route been assessed for efficiency and value for money? |
| | Reduce car-based travel by reallocating space on the link road to sustainable travel modes – include this in the plan. |
| | Update this section based on impact of HS2 |
| | Contrary to RSS policy which seeks to reduce car use and commuting, especially on the motorway network |
| | Support links made between the economy and connectivity |
| | Very few of these expectations/principles will be realised through the proposed developments e.g. Green Belt development cannot protect environmental quality |
| | Despite the improvements proposed, extreme congestion will remain on the rest of the road network. Address the implications of growth, including additional employment |
| | I object to any new roads. Current roads are not maintained. New roads will create a dormitory borough. Instead, seek integrated transport with alternative public transport modes |
| | I agree with new road proposals |
| | Relief roads must have good quality foot and cycle paths |
| | Congleton Link Road should continue to Newcastle Road |
| | Congleton bypass will blight a beautiful part of the Dane Valley and lead to further loss through building along the route |
| | Congleton Link Road is unnecessary – all towns suffer rush hour congestion |
| | Congleton Link Road should join Macclesfield Road north or east of Eaton to avoid the village and dangerous road sections |
| | Congleton Link Road must not run through the centre of Somerford resulting in loss of green land, wildlife, farmland and further loss through ribbon development. Where is the supporting evidence, environmental impact assessment etc? |
| | Congleton Link Road does not help traffic travelling north/south or south/north – there will still be major problems on the A34. |
| | Northern part of the Congleton Link Road passes through the Tarmac sand quarry in Eaton parish |
| | No justification for the Macclesfield relief road, which will increase congestion on nearby roads. |
| | Provide relief road to the south of Nantwich |
| | No case has yet been made for the Woodford-Poynton Relief Road, hence it is premature to list it. |
| | Withdraw outdated protected status of the land formerly earmarked for the Woodford-Poynton Relief Road. It affects development of Adlington Industrial Estate. |
| | The Woodford-Poynton relief road is essential. Funding depends on identifying strategic land to the west of Poynton |
| | Add the Crewe Green Link Road to the projects list |
| | Link University Way under the railway to the A500 in order to make Nantwich Road less congested |
| | Airport link road is essential |
| | We support dualling of the A500 |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Object to dualling the A500 /developing Junction 16 –unsustainable, damages environment, encourages car use |
| | Include improvement of A51 at Burford, west of Nantwich |
| | Improvements to M6 Junction 16 &17 are desperately needed |
| | How will you address traffic problems through diversions from the M6 in case of accidents? |
| | Town centre developments that do not provide their own parking should pay a levy to support free local car parks |
| | Impose 20mph default speed limit in retail and residential areas |
| | Make pavements safer and more attractive |
| | Expand and improve network of cycle routes/tracks |
| | Improve transport in rural areas |
| | Crewe Railway Exchange does not need alteration. Just improve maintenance and cycling conditions |
| | Provide 'park and share' / 'park and ride' facilities at transport interchanges ie service stations, dual carriageway intersections |
| | Extend Metrolink to Knutsford, including a spur near Ashley to Manchester Airport to connect with Wythenshaw Branch |
| | Support reopening of the Sandbach to Middlewich line |
| | Public transport to the east of Wilmslow is non-existent. Interchange required at Wilmslow station, not Green Lane |
| | Macclesfield/Wilmslow to London train service must continue beyond the introduction of HS2 |
| | Include Metrolink tram station at Parkgate/Longridge |
| | Improving strategic transport network between Manchester Airport and CE will benefit passengers and open up opportunities at the Airport to borough residents |
| | Crewe should have a designated HS2 hub at tunnel level and an escalator up to the West Coast Mainline to remove the need for intrusive, expensive viaduct and new road infrastructure |
| | Growth of Crewe will be haphazard –need a new station and town centre improvements |
| | Development ambitions of Macclesfield and Congleton, which contribute significantly to GVA, are restricted by the plan |
| | Infrastructure proposals do not recognise the importance of Holmes Chapel as a Local Service Centre |
| | Improve infrastructure in rural villages eg sewage system and broadband in Great Warford |
| | What of broadband and high speed mobile connectivity? |
| | Para 7.13 should include a range of facilities: primary and secondary schools; medical and leisure facilities; allotments; places of worship; community facilities; rail and bus stations and tram on the list of infrastructure projects, for all areas, not just the large urban centres |
| | It is not realistic to expect the NHS to fund an expansion of Leighton Hospital, which also requires extra parking |
| | CIL threatens viability – how will it be kept fair across the borough's different types of areas? |
| | How will CIL spending be monitored? |
| | How will you balance use of CIL between strategic and local infrastructure? |
| | CIL funding must be able to provide infrastructure prior to development. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Potentially a serious problem. |
| | How will affordable housing be encouraged if CIL cannot be used to subsidise it? |
| | Devise a CIL formula to encourage industry rather than housing (given the dormitory nature of the town), but do not price industrial developers out of the market |
| | Support CIL – Section 106 is not transparent and is unevenly applied |
| | Consult the Canal and River Trust regarding the CIL and infrastructure requirements including canal towpaths |
| | Listing infrastructure projects for CIL funds use does not allow for flexibility |
| | Refer to the CIL Regulations' three tests for the use of Section 106 agreements to ensure there is no 'double charging' |
| | Sites reliant on CIL infrastructure should not be within the 5-year supply as timely delivery is questionable |
| | It is not realistic to require completion of infrastructure prior to development – it will be delivered as the development proceeds through trigger points in the Section 106 Agreement. Alter policy to refer to timely and phased provision of infrastructure |
| | Developer's responsibility is to pay CIL contributions, and it is the Council's responsibility to ensure the infrastructure is delivered. Hence if the infrastructure is not delivered, this is not a reason to block the development. |
| | Although proposed growth is outside the Nantwich town boundary, the impacts will be felt inside. How will CIL be apportioned? |
| | New Green Belt is needed to retain identities of Nantwich, Congleton, Eaton, Macclesfield, Gawsorth etc |
| | Green infrastructure should be referred to in the policy |
| | |
| 8 Strategic Sites 95 representations by 83 people 7 support 29 object 59 comment | No to all Green Belt sites – exhaust all brownfield sites first then use small greenbelt sites selected via a survey. |
| | Public preference for brownfield sites has been ignored. |
| | CEC must persuade developers to use brownfield, even though they prefer cheaper greenfield sites |
| | Publish details of the brownfield sites identified so that the public can identify additional sites. There are far more than CEC claim including 400 in Wilmslow – use these |
| | Take into account empty offices which can be converted to residential use; sites with poor quality, inefficient old buildings |
| | Brownfield sites must be available, deliverable, developable, achievable, suitable and viable for housing use. It is impossible to meet the housing target through brownfield sites alone |
| | Use sites which should no longer be in the Green Belt and do not contribute to Green Belt objectives eg Legh Road, Disley |
| | We support inclusion of strategic sites |
| | A policy is required to introduce the Strategic Sites collectively and individually, identifying them as suitable for the identified, preferred uses, and specifying what CEC aims to achieve |
| | Sites cannot be considered as the overall Strategy is flawed |
| | What constitutes a strategic site? Size, number of dwellings? |
| | Why are some of the strategic sites absent from the SHLAA? The SHLAA should inform the Development Strategy. |
| | No continuity from Town Strategies – sites are identified for different uses |
| | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | and different scale of development |
| | No site assessment or criteria – how were the sites assessed for their suitability? |
| | How can sites without full planning permission be included in the first phase of development? Plan needs more sites which are immediately deliverable. |
| | Lack of justification for development of Green Belt over more sustainable Alternative Sites |
| | Several of the listed constraints are not a barrier to development |
| | Only a few of the proposed strategic allocations meet CEC's own accessibility standards |
| | Inconsistencies and lack of evidence on the housing figures given in the document eg number of permissions, brownfield homes etc |
| | Why so much new employment land? Evidence suggests only an additional 5.4ha to 51.3ha is required |
| | Focus development in locations with the best connectivity ie Crewe, Middlewich and Sandbach |
| | Make it clearer that the Site Allocations Document will identify further smaller sites |
| | Strategic and non-strategic sites should be identified and considered together |
| | Non-strategic sites should not be considered now. Only those which are central to achieving the strategy are appropriate. |
| | Over a quarter of Crewe's requirement is left for later allocation, whilst the entire housing requirement for Macclesfield, Middlewich and Nantwich is identified. |
| | Reliance on few strategic sites – consider delivering the requirement on a series of smaller sites. They result in greater housing choice, and will add flexibility - should development of even a few sites be delayed, there will be a substantial shortfall in housing delivery. |
| | Sites have been included in this Preferred Options stage without any previous consultation eg New Settlements. Last minute changes to sites' capacity and timings and lack of transparent justification indicates a lack of evidence, and evidence being prepared to justify decisions – this is unsound. |
| | Reduce allowance for slippage to avoid overprovision of homes |
| | Mention design of development including design review attendance and Building for Life |
| | Assistance in bringing empty homes into use |
| | Estimate contributions from the Allocations Plan |
| | Demand high quality, sustainable buildings |
| | Para 8.8-8.9 – will all applications require this information and Air Quality Management Plans? Will affect viability. |
| | I support para 8.11. At para 8.8, amend wording to include residents' exposure to vibrations from construction activities |
| | Why are public houses 'standard issue' on all development sites? Impact of alcohol-related illness of NHS and police services. CEC have committed to the Cheshire and Warrington Health Commission (Health and Wellbeing) |
| | Generally in favour of these sites |
| | Locate a new settlement around Wheelock to make it a less linear settlement |
| | Locate a new settlement at Arclid – good connectivity and existing services |
| | Use site near Ford House in Prestbury (ref 3183) |
| | Correct decision to remove other sites around Prestbury |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Use site at the junction of Town Lane/Smith Lane in Mobberley |
| | Object to further residential and retail development in Moston and on its fringes. Already congested. |
| | Redevelop Radnor Park for housing and relocate its few businesses to a business park closer to the M6 eg at Sandbach |
| | Brownfield site at Cotton Equestrian Centre, Middlewich Road |
| | Redraw Crewe/Shavington Strategic Open Gap to allow further development. Relocate Gap to south of Shavington |
| | Use site at Crewe Road, Shavington(2911/2905/3381/2909) |
| | Use site next to Adlington Station |
| | Address shortage of affordable housing in Alderley Edge |
| | Use the former Arclid Hospital site |
| | Use site off Lymewood Drive, Disley |
| | Use site at Clough Bank, Bollington |
| | Use site opposite Rose Cottages, Holmes Chapel Road, Somerford |
| | Use site at the Willows Retirement Village, Warford Park, Faulkners Lane, Mobberley |
| | Use land to the north of Beech Road, Alderley Edge |
| | Identify strategic sites for Poynton to enable the Poynton bypass including land at Lostock Hall Farm; Lower Park Road (for immediate start); and Clay Lane, Handforth. Without these, the provision of the Bypass is not possible |
| | Allocate Alderley Park and its potential new bioscience park facility. Site is essential for growth and investment in the Borough |
| | Use site at The Meadows, Heyes Lane, Alderley Edge |
| | Use site at Bridgemere Garden World |
| | Use land at Ollerton Nursery |
| | Use Poole Meadows site in Haslington |
| | Use SHLAA Sites 2911 and 2905 |
| Crewe 51 representations by 42 people 6 support 20 object 25 comment | The numbers don't add up. |
| | No evidence that greenfield/open countryside / land of agricultural value is required for allocation. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Crewe. |
| | Strategy for Crewe is piecemeal and confused. Need to adopt a comprehensive approach to its future growth |
| | Imbalance of housing allocation through the borough. |
| | Traffic congestion issues already exist in Crewe: Sydney Road; retail park; 14 bridges and 6 roundabouts. Infrastructure must be improved. Clearly demonstrate mitigation measures. Cannot accommodate significant and sustained increase in traffic. |
| | A500 dualling is vital for any development in Crewe, Nantwich and Wardle plus widening the M6 |
| | A500 dualling will not solve existing congestion on roads near J16 of M6 |
| | Redevelopment of railway and bus stations are important – support hub station |
| | Support the Strategic Open Gap; do not build on Green Gap. |
| | Redefine Strategic Open Gap boundaries. Review its purpose. |
| | Support retail-led development in the town centre. |
| | Clarification sought on how improvements to the physical environment of the town centre will be funded and delivered. |
| | Need a free bus from Crewe Station to Leighton Hospital. |
| | Undertake a proper risk assessment for Wybunbury Moss. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Strongly object to any further development in Crewe. |
| | The housing target for Crewe should be increased to a minimum of 650 dwellings per annum / between 9,500 and 11,840 dwellings over the plan period. |
| | Crewe must be considered in context. Larger scale development (extensions to towns/villages) can be the best way to supply new homes |
| | Improve connectivity between town centre and rail station |
| | Assumptions are made without market testing or understanding of technical compliance or delivery. Must balance employment and housing development with the ability of the market to accommodate the growth. A flexible approach with more, smaller sites should be taken. |
| | Land to south east of Crewe will become a suburb & lose its identity and history |
| | Support improvement of education, town centre, broadband, additional housing/employment sites. |
| | Concern re lack of affordable housing including single-bed units |
| | Housing Associations should be able to develop CE land. |
| | Concern at high number of empty homes in Crewe |
| | Developers of sites adjacent to the railway line must contact Network Rail Asset Protection Team to ensure mitigation. |
| | Scale, type and location of sports and leisure facilities must be informed by Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy. |
| | Support the vision and the ability to bring future employment and housing growth reinforcing the role of Crewe. |
| | Provide a retail park and park-and-ride facilities on the outskirts of Crewe, on the A534 road between Crewe and Wheelock |
| | Undertake future development sensitively, preserving biodiversity/habitats and retaining rural feel. |
| | To reduce the potential disparities between north and south & reduce impacts of development on existing infrastructure in Crewe, one of the New Settlements (Village A or Village B) or one or a combination of the Strategic Sites identified should not be developed. |
| | Object to new villages at Barthomley – not sustainable. |
| | The Parish of Weston and Basford are not part of Crewe - it should remain separate. Lots of development already. Concern regarding HS2 and its impact on the Parish. |
| | Object to the sites proposed for Shavington area. |
| | Why is Shavington included as part of Crewe? It is a Local Service Centre. Development should accord with size of village. |
| | Land at Pool Meadows Road, Haslington should be allocated for housing |
| | Land Off Wistaston Green Road, Wistaston, Crewe should be allocated for housing. |
| | Land at Cheerbrook Road, Willaston should be excluded from the strategic open gap |
| | Land at Broughton Road, Crewe should be allocated for housing |
| | Land off Clay Lane, Haslington should be allocated for housing |
| | The area most suited for development is land on Crewe Road, along A500 linking to Park Estate (2911,2905,3381,2909). |
| | Expand B&Q where MFI was |
| | Site at Land off University Way is unviable for its employment allocation due |

| | |
|---|--|
| | to £2m substation requirement. Use for housing. |
| | Additional sites in the Duchy ownership should be identified for housing: Crewe SHLAA Site 3029 – junction A534 & Sydney Road; junction B5077 Crewe Road & A5020 University Way; Weston SHLAA Sites 3765 & 2999. |
| | Land off Newcastle Road, Willaston, Crewe should be developed for employment/commercial purposes, including a roadside service station; travel hotel and an emergency services sub depot. The site is approximately 4ha. |
| | Land rear of The Lamb, Willaston should be removed from the Strategic Open Gap and developed for housing. |
| | Underestimated housing need. Crewe requires 10-10,500 new homes to deliver the economic, regeneration and employment benefits the Council seeks. |
| Fig 8.1 Preferred Strategic Sites around Crewe 9 representations by 8 people 3 support 5 object 1 comment | Support |
| | The plan does not reflect local people's wishes |
| | Regenerate town centre and provide new bus station |
| | Too much development proposed to the south and east of Crewe without considering the impact on transport links. |
| | Delete employment areas 2 and 3. |
| | Query use of parts of Basford East and West as residential |
| | New cultural developments must be of high quality |
| | Schools are full |
| | Doubts about deliverability. Is an anchor retail store really going to be attracted to what is becoming an increasingly run down town centre. |
| | HS2 must be made to stop at Crewe. |
| Site Crewe 1 Crewe Town Centre 22 representations by 21 people 7 support 4 object 11 comment | Lacks VISION. |
| | Unlikely to be deliverable, especially housing, and certainly not within the initial stages of the plan. |
| | Merge with rail exchange site. Create integrated transport hub with major transformative development based on connectivity. |
| | The current traffic issues do not encourage visits. Provide free parking; park and ride from train station. |
| | Need to solve problems of congestion eg build new road link(s) over railway; link from University Way/Barthomley Road roundabout to A500 under railway. |
| | Problem of traffic congestion on the eastern approach to Crewe town centre needs attention eg another access point to the retail park. Sydney Road will become a permanent ring road with 20,000 additional cars on the roads. |
| | Encourage cycling in Crewe town centre including pedestrian/cycle/bus only link to station. |
| | Need new bus station |
| | Relocate car parking to within the town's footfall eg the bus station |
| | What is a 'major leisure use'? Suggest anchor store and leisure use, not one at the expense of the other. |
| | Encourage market. Consider whether it should relocate. |
| | Railway station should be within town centre boundary. How will links be improved between the town centre and the railway station? |
| | Strongly object to Grand Junction being part of the town centre – Council must confirm this will not be considered. |
| | Ignores Crewe Station. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Need a HS2 station in Crewe |
| | Make Crewe a more desirable place to live. |
| | Encourage businesses into town centre, not out of town retail parks. |
| | Increase town centre population with a mixture of properties and a direct reference to affordable housing. Make use of brownfield sites. Sites include next to Christ Church/MFI / Dunelm Stores sites and Oak Street. |
| | Need a new shopping centre |
| | Regenerate the area around High St, possibly by locating the new bus station here |
| | Consider the viability of the current town centre. Think of future 20+ yrs hence when trends in shopping, leisure, internet use have developed and changed from now. |
| | Infrastructure improvements are important. |
| | Development central to the regeneration of the town and in line with the aspirations for All Change for Crewe. |
| | |
| Site Crewe 2 West Street/Dunwoody Way 11 representations by 11 people 2 support 8 object 1 comment | No evidence of deliverability and highly unlikely to yield any housing in the initial Plan period hence should not be a strategic site to be relied upon to meet housing requirement. |
| | Houses should be developed in the town centre. |
| | Keep this an industrial site. Need more employment here. |
| | Brownfield sites should be developed |
| | All or part of the site has potential to become high quality open space/GI linking to Tipkinder and Queens Park. Adjacent SBI (Crewe swift colony) should be a consideration. |
| | CEC's Heritage & Design Team are in the process of finalising a Briefing Note on this site which considers its heritage value. |
| Site Crewe 3 Basford East 26 representations by 24 people 10 support 12 object 4 comment | Should stay as a regionally significant employment site, as intended, with employment site only. Object to residential use. |
| | If residential use is necessary to enable employment development, the policy should evidence that. |
| | Scale is too large – will result in huge warehouse sheds which provide few, low-skilled jobs. Encourage manufacturing and hi-tech businesses. |
| | Support mixed development here including some housing. |
| | Support delivery of Crewe Green Link Road |
| | Restrict development to small units to encourage manufacturing start-ups for Crewe residents. |
| | Unsuitable site for housing due to proximity to railway line. |
| | Need high quality restaurant/hotel for business travellers. |
| | Provide opportunity for farms to diversify into tourism |
| | Infrastructure will not cope. New road infrastructure, schools, travel-to-school system, doctors, hospital capacity etc needed now. |
| | Removal of viable agricultural land which is required to feed the increasing population |
| | Destruction of green space /recreation/ wildlife habitat / corridors. Needs protection/conservation for benefit of all. |
| | Links required between employment and housing on site to limit car use and need to travel. |
| | Are job numbers feasible? Are jobs well paid enough to merit this level of housing development? |
| | Specify the amount of office space (B1a) proposed. Must evidence the need |

| | |
|---|---|
| | for such large-scale, out of centre offices through sequential assessment of alternative sites. Could harm regeneration of Newcastle and Stoke. |
| | If 1,000 homes are provided, a local centre is essential. |
| | Crime will rise. |
| | Weston and other villages will lose their rural character, becoming joined up with Crewe |
| | Address discrepancy between retail proposed for Basford East, Stowford and Barthomley new settlements, all of which will support 1,000 homes. |
| | There are other sites that do not suffer from the same level of constraints or sensitiveness or landscape value. |
| | Query timescales for delivery. |
| | Object to the proposed railway access road which will wreck rich habitat alongside Basford Brook. |
| | There is a good physical boundary to the site in the form of the A500 Shavington bypass. |
| | The Crewe Green Link Road leading to the A500 needs to be coupled with positive plans for traffic attenuation measures to protect the indigenous road network within the Parish. |
| | We need to welcome new industry and have a 'can do' approach, not a 'not in my backyard' attitude. |
| Site Crewe 4 Basford West 30 representations by 24 people 11 support 11 object 8 comment | Object to housing on this strategically-significant employment site. There are other sites that are more suitable for housing. |
| | Support mixed use on the site with housing and hi-tech business. |
| | Employment area fine alongside railway. Object to extending housing/industrial building further south towards A500. |
| | Extend site to the north to include two sites at Crewe Road, Gresty which have capacity for 40 dwellings |
| | Local centre will definitely be required. |
| | Far too large in scale. Looks like a new settlement with new infrastructure. Expansion will merge villages, destroying communities and rural industry |
| | Provide sustainable employment, not short-term, low-density warehouse work |
| | Concerned about ecological and aesthetic impact on greenfield sites. Develop brownfield sites first. Attractive, unspoilt area with mix of fields, meres, marshes, woodland and some special scientific interest. Require updated ecological information and possibly new mitigation strategies |
| | No evidence of deliverability |
| | Infrastructure requirements would put pressure on the Alsager/Crewe road. Has the new infrastructure been realistically costed to ensure it is deliverable? Where is this evidence for local people to examine? |
| | High quality restaurants/hotels to attract business travellers |
| | Lacking justification and evidence explaining why the site has been selected. The Plan is therefore unsound. |
| | Support but mixed-use scheme including residential uses is required the wider Basford West site to be brought forward and to confirm contribution towards the Crewe Green Link Road. |
| | The policy should reflect the recent 'viability led' outline planning application and the site capacity of 'up to 370 residential units'. Should read 'Where scheme viability may be affected, developers will be expected to provide viability assessments to demonstrate an alternative mix of uses on the site'. Request that the requirement for 'a community facility / place of worship' be |

| | |
|--|---|
| | removed from the Policy – this would have to form part of a viability study. |
| | There is a good physical boundary to both sites in the form of the A500 Shavington bypass. |
| Site Crewe 5 Leighton West 537 representations by 185 people 8 support 523 object 6 comment | Support increase in population and housing. |
| | Prioritise site after the delivery of Basford West and East sites. It can deliver at least 750 homes, and with appropriate mitigation, the highway network can accommodate it. |
| | Leave the site alone to prevent the area from losing its identity and merging into Bradfield Green. No new houses or employment land needed given recent permissions. |
| | Doubt need for commercial activities eg pubs, restaurants. Retail is disproportionate and would compete with other centres. |
| | Road network is already inadequate. Link road will be required across to the A534 between Winterley and Wheelock; address slow funeral traffic from new cemetery on Minshull New Road; new crossing for hospital and better access via improvements to Smithy Lane. |
| | Traffic-impact assessments are required in the area of Minshull New Road, Bradfield Road, Parkers Road, Smithy Lane, Flowers Lane, Sydney Road and the A530 (Minshull Vernon). |
| | Require supporting infrastructure - new roads, buses, trams, school places, hospital parking, another hospital, medical centre. Has deliverability been assessed? |
| | Carefully consider the type of affordable housing provided. |
| | Support exciting geothermal plant concept. |
| | Poor drainage and regular flooding due to clay soil. Provide drainage infrastructure, de-culverting and river restoration. Leave land between Flowers Lane and Moss Lane as open countryside, as it floods. |
| | Loss of the only green fields in the area. Use brownfield. |
| | Need for an attractive environment, gardens, relaxation spaces to reduce stress and encourage health and wellbeing |
| | Site should be designated Green Gap/Strategic Open Gap to prevent merging from Nantwich to Crewe . |
| | Do not create a countryside park on a former landfill, foot and mouth graves, underneath/around pylons. Guidance states build at least 60m from pylons: proposal states 30m. |
| | Undemocratic. The Council ignored the public petition against this development during the Crewe Town Strategy consultation |
| | Accommodate future expansion of hospital in the plan. |
| | CEC Asset Management Service Masterplanning document for part of the site that is in CEC ownership proposes 400 dwellings; country park & open space; green energy park with geothermal energy generation & office park. |
| Site Crewe 6 The Triangle 93 representations by 69 people 1 support 87 object 5 comment | Support for the proposal and the open space facilities. |
| | Extensive opposition - over 90% of respondents across the 3 parishes have opposed this plan. Development of the site has been refused at least twice in the last 20 years. It is contrary to the NPPF. |
| | Enough houses. Do not need this quantity which would increase village housing by 50% - disproportionate and would ruin village character. Based on creating jobs which will not occur. |
| | Why consult? Development here was approved on 21.02.13. |
| | The site is a natural soakaway. Local flooding is already an issue, plus climate change impacts. Many hectares of flood plains in the area. Development will |

| | |
|--|--|
| | cause flooding of existing houses. |
| | Adverse impact on the local wildlife. At least 57 species of bird have been recorded on site, including 9 on the Birds of Conservation Concern Red List and 8 on the Cheshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan. Additional protected species. |
| | Various habitats. Significant risk to the West Midlands SAC, RAMSAR 1 area, SSSI Wybunbury Moss. No formal scientific assessment has been undertaken by Natural England or others of the risk to the Moss and significant bowl area. Protected mature hedgerows, ponds and lowland grassland. |
| | Shortsighted to build on greenfield sites and agricultural land. Will create urban sprawl between Wybunbury and Crewe. Use brownfield sites elsewhere. |
| | 75% of this proposal is within Wybunbury parish, a sustainable village where there should be small-scale infill, not large developments. Use more suitable, viable, sustainable sites closer to Crewe. |
| | Wybunbury Parish will not benefit from improvements to public transport; highways; affordable housing provision; or schools |
| | Site is Nantwich, not Crewe. |
| | Infrastructure impacts – narrow lanes; antiquated drainage; oversubscribed doctors and schools; local shops and public transport. |
| | Transport assessment for the village is required. Highways (mainly B roads) are already congested and dangerous. Would impact Shavington congestion; be impact on pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. |
| | The site capacity has been assessed as up to 400 dwellings. 300 is inefficient and too low. |
| | The archaeology assessment was not completed as the land was too wet. |
| | The proposed development does not contain the specified minimum % of "affordable houses" |
| | Unsustainable development increasing car use and pollution |
| | Development will take the focus away from the main urban area and put pressure on existing services and facilities. Retail premises here would take trade away from village shops. |
| | Would undermine the viability of strategic sites such as Basford West and Basford East and the vision for All Change for Crewe and the Crewe Town Strategy. |
| | Shavington would accommodate a third of the Local Service Centres' development allocation – excessive and unsound. Apportion development equitably between villages. Shavington should not accommodate the housing needs of the principal town of Crewe. Settlements such as Wilmslow should take more housing. |
| Site Crewe 7 East Shavington 22 representations by 19 people 3 support 19 object 0 comment | Development will not prejudice delivery of Basford East and West: they serve different housing markets in a different location and have longer lead-in times. |
| | Support phased release, after development of the Basford sites has got underway. |
| | Support development on the site, will meet all Development Strategy aspirations. Shavington needs new homes now, particularly affordable. Village hasn't seen major development for 40 years. Development can be delivered at an early stage. It is not Green Gap; close to employment sites and village centre; good access by public transport to Crewe. |
| | Amend constraints section – no sandpits on the site, they are further north. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Other constraints mentioned can be resolved. |
| | Mass of local opinion against development. Use numerous empty homes and acres of brownfield instead of agricultural land. We need a holistic, not piecemeal, approach. |
| | Development too large. Phasing will cause prolonged disruption in the village. |
| | Create new villages rather than destroying current ones. |
| | Development of the site will not benefit Shavington residents. Wybunbury and Shavington Parish Plans oppose massive developments which will totally change their character and join up the two villages, creating urban sprawl. |
| | More suitable housing sites are to be found north of Shavington with instant access to the A500. |
| | Site will flood due to proximity to Swill Brook. |
| | Hydrological risks to Wybunbury Moss. |
| | Infrastructure cannot cope – schools are full; congested, dangerous roads; existing weight of traffic. Proposed facilities are inappropriate. We need schools, hospitals, doctors, assisted housing for the elderly. |
| | Protected species, valuable mixed habitats including hedgerows, trees will be disturbed by development. |
| | The green space is needed for community health and wellbeing |
| | Where are the jobs locally? |
| | Unsustainable - CO2 emissions, lack of viable public transport. |
| | Inadequate access - only vehicular entrance/exit to and from the site is poorly sited on a bend of the busy Crewe Road. |
| | Inappropriate ground conditions - soft soils, flooding conditions. |
| | Too close to the Triangle, too many houses only 200m apart! |
| | Shavington is a Local Service Centre/village which should accommodate only local needs. It will become a small town, amorphous, losing historic identity, lacking in facilities and infrastructure. Permissions at Rope Lane and the Triangle are already out of proportion with the settlement size. It does not form part of Crewe – it is not a suburb. Crewe can accommodate its growth without reliance on lower-order peripheral settlements. |
| | Suitable, available and achievable development opportunities exist within and particularly on the edge of the principal urban area, and are better related to the town of Crewe. |
| | No rationale or justification for the allocation of either the Triangle or East Shavington for housing presented in the Plan. |
| | Would undermine the viability of strategic sites such as Basford West and Basford East and the vision for All Change for Crewe and the Crewe Town Strategy. |
| Site Crewe 8 Crewe Rail Exchange Zone 12 representations by 11 people 7 support 0 object 5 comment | Proposal is 25 years overdue. The sooner it happens, the better. |
| | Development of the site is central to regeneration of the town, in line with All Change for Crewe aspirations. |
| | Great potential for business tourism. |
| | Support identification of Macon Way as unsuitable location for retail development. |
| | Lack of vision – link Crewe station and the town centre to create attractive place to establish businesses. Extend west along Nantwich Rd to the Edleston Road junction, taking in the South Street/Gresty Road triangle. |
| | Clarify exact location and type of retail envisaged in the context of the 5,000sqm proposed for Mill Street. It must only meet local needs; cap the size of individual retail units so retail here is not at the expense of town |

| | |
|--|--|
| | centre retail development. |
| | Factor in HS2 Phase 2 route |
| | Redesign road layout at Crewe Arms Hotel roundabout to deal with congestion. |
| | Need pedestrian/cycle link through Mill St / Nantwich Road triangle to link proposed retail and other new developments. |
| | Investigate the possibility of a shuttle bus route along redundant railway land from Mill St bridge, under Nantwich Road into the station at rail level. Must cross little-used freight line. |
| Macclesfield 124 representations by 114 people 19 support 55 object 50 comment | Support the Plan and the strategic sites. Macclesfield should have growth as it is the second largest town and there has been a lack of growth. |
| | More growth is required - Macclesfield is a Principal Town and has witnessed no growth for the last decade. |
| | Development should focus on the town centre |
| | Strategy states no units to be allocated in the site allocation process however change in capacity figures mean a further 375 dwellings need to be identified in Macclesfield |
| | Need contingency allowance/allocations in case identified sites do not happen |
| | Too much development. Constraints include capacity, Green Belt, landscape quality and road system. |
| | Think beyond the plan period ie safeguarded land |
| | Central, south and south west sites are most logical |
| | Retain Green Belt – don't develop Fallibroome/ Rugby Club |
| | Do not use greenbelt, greenfield and agricultural sites – they provide the area's charm and value. Re-development is contrary to the NPPF. Once gone, they are lost forever. Develop brownfield sites first. |
| | Do not allow construction of link road. |
| | Insufficient, flawed evidence – need Green Belt review, better evaluation of population statistics |
| | Conflict with RSS in terms of the amount of development and the brownfield target |
| | Capacity figures for sites vary between the Strategy and other documents |
| | Object to housing development at Tytherington business park – it contradicts the strategy |
| | Support housing development at Tytherington business park |
| | Siddington should be developed |
| | The brownfield sites are not specifically allocated – should be shown. |
| | AZ's site at Hulley Road should be a Strategic Site |
| | Macclesfield Golf Club alongside Hollins Road should be a Strategic Site for housing |
| | Where in the town centre would the strategic development be? |
| | Some of the alternative sites should be allocated as Strategic sites (details in the relevant section) |
| | Macclesfield needs to be developed in a manner which enhances the history and attractiveness of Macclesfield |
| | Town centre – provide adequate bus services, car parking, park and ride linked with town centre and hospital |
| Figure 8.2 Preferred | Support all sites including the alternative sites |
| | No evidence to show thorough search of brownfield sites |

| | |
|--|--|
| Strategic Sites around Macclesfield 38 representations by 36 people 6 support 25 object 7 comment | Increase brownfield town-centre housing proposals in order to reduce use of greenfield sites |
| | Utilities and infrastructure already near/at/exceed current needs – Macclesfield cannot take further development |
| | South Macclesfield Relief Road is essential |
| | No evidence to show need for link road – unnecessary, inadequate consultation, effect on biodiversity, ancient woodland, SBI, protected wildlife, will not ease congestion |
| | Cost of relief road will make housing development unviable |
| | Object to use of greenbelt/greenfield sites. No justification for its use. Nothing has changed since south-west Macclesfield Green Belt boundary change was rejected at Local Plan inquiry |
| | Need to consult other authorities |
| | No justification for site selection |
| | Reallocate employment land |
| | Allocate site at Blakelow Road |
| Site Macclesfield 1 Macclesfield Town Centre 58 representations by 58 people 11 support 19 object 28 comment | Support for town centre housing – investment in public realm, restaurant/bars, hotel are required. Build more than 300 homes. |
| | Where will the dwellings be? Will there be demolitions? |
| | Clarify the discrepancy in number of homes that can be built in the town centre |
| | Development likely to comprise high density apartments, for which there is limited demand. |
| | Concerns over deliverability |
| | Need more emphasis on refurbishing/redeveloping empty town centre properties and sites, both commercial and residential |
| | Designated town centre is too large for the shopping habits of the future. |
| | New development should create and enhance views to the Peak District hills. |
| | New buildings must be in keeping with architectural heritage |
| | Object to town centre retail proposal - based on an out-of-date retail model |
| | Proposals based on an out-of-date model for retailing |
| | No evidence to support the 'Relief Road' |
| | Improve pedestrian and cycle links to railway and bus stations |
| | Consider traffic congestion – development may make it worse |
| Site Macclesfield 2 South Macclesfield Development Area 61 representations by 60 people 16 support 28 object 17 comment | Most appropriate area, logical extension. Low grade farmland, wasteland, brownfield. Preserves Green Belt elsewhere. Opportunity for public open space, pedestrian routes. |
| | 900 dwellings is a reasonable number for this site |
| | No evidence why this site is preferred. Are 900 houses needed in this area? |
| | Jobs are located to the north. First develop the many vacant brownfield sites in the town. |
| | Site is unsustainable – will exacerbate traffic, too far from facilities |
| | Are more retail units needed? Development should not include any retail due to town centre impact. Would conflict with town centre retail focus. |
| | Development should include social housing and mentoring/ support to enable locals to take advantage of new employment |
| | Support the inclusion of community/place of worship |
| | Will require mitigation measures due to proximity to railway. |
| | Site has been a longstanding proposal without progress – previous allocation undeliverable due to funding. Site is dependent on delivery of southern link |

| | |
|--|---|
| | road. No evidence of deliverability. Undeliverable sites should not be allocated. |
| | Link road would solve congestion and reduce pollution on Park Lane and Moss Lane. Without it, pressure will build on congested alternatives eg use of Moss Lane as a heavy traffic through route |
| | Object to relief road – will not alleviate traffic congestion, will have unacceptable impact on congestion into Macclesfield town. Relief roads are outdated, short-term thinking |
| | What are the exceptional circumstances which demand that an SBI site should be developed? Insufficient evidence to justify the allocation. Development would have unacceptably high levels if impact on biodiversity: permanent loss of 2 UK BAP Priority Habitats including impact on protected species; loss of buffer zone between urban edge and Danes Moss SSSI and CWT Reserve; impact on SSSI and NR including from hydrological changes; peat bog. Also TPOs; public rights of way; loss of football pitches. |
| | Cost of remediation of potential contamination from former waste transfer station and cost of road/infrastructure will render development unviable |
| | Does not support economic growth. Contrary to NPPF |
| | New hotel/restaurant must be high quality to attract visitors |
| | Biomass power supply and energy from waste should be pursued to bring about sustainable development |
| | Welcome inclusion of sport/leisure facilities but type, scale and location must be informed by Pitch Strategy. SE would object to this site if relocation of Macclesfield Town FC is not addressed. |
| Site Macclesfield 3 Land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road 548 representations by 515 people 18 support 520 object 10 comment | Has least harm to urban regeneration; no environmental designations; not best quality farmland; previously favoured by former authorities. Deliverable, sustainable. Will support economic recovery and protect vital services. |
| | Development should include education and leisure amenities |
| | Object due to vast, excessive scale of proposal which will impact on property values and existing residential amenity. Housing requirements have been overestimated. |
| | No evidence of need for houses or road – conflicting numbers, evidence that additional housing can be met without touching Southwest Macclesfield Green Belt eg reallocate industrial/employment land not needed for that purpose |
| | What type of employment uses? Currently an oversupply of employment land hence not needed. Astra Zeneca is contracting and other companies do not wish to locate here |
| | Use brownfield land first eg empty town-centre retail spaces and derelict/vacant sites. |
| | Use of greenbelt land without exceptional circumstances is contrary to the NPPF; will create urban sprawl; and is unjustified |
| | Will generate a huge amount of traffic and pollution – does not address congestion issues including at Broken Cross |
| | Design must be appropriate |
| | Destruction of vast greenbelt farmland/open countryside. Loss of protected wildlife species, ancient trees, Cockwood SBI, grade 2 and 3a agricultural land, ancient hedgerows |
| | Support relief road - will relieve town centre traffic and form a new clearly-defined greenbelt boundary |
| | Strong objection to relief road - relief road relieves nothing, environmental |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>impact, impact on wildlife, Macclesfield town centre and adjacent roads, contrary to NPPF</p> <p>No assessment of impact on declining town centre. Inclusion of leisure and shopping uses will hasten this.</p> <p>Will encroach on the local parishes including Gawsorth and destroy communities, merging them into Macclesfield</p> <p>Defeated in the Macclesfield Local Plan because of its unsustainable nature</p> <p>Will result in a heavy influx of people from outside the area</p> <p>Proposal not in the economic, social or environment interest of Macclesfield</p> <p>Land liable to flooding – development would increase flood risk</p> <p>Presence of silica deposits</p> |
| <p>Site Macclesfield 4 Land east of Fence Avenue</p> <p>148 representations by 135 people 58 support 83 object 7 comment only</p> | <p>Confine development to land adjoining Fence Avenue on site of existing buildings only</p> <p>This site is less objectionable than the alternatives and would support town centre regeneration. Site benefits include proximity to public transport and town centre facilities. Inclusion of highly desirable homes would bring encourage investment.</p> <p>Site suitable for good quality, low density, family housing in garden suburb, sympathetic to surroundings.</p> <p>Green Belt swap may be beneficial - this site does not contribute to separating towns.</p> <p>Where would King's School relocate to?</p> <p>Any development should be sympathetic to Canal Conservation Area.</p> <p>Developer must contribute to towpath and bridge improvement</p> <p>Will result in loss of Green Belt, accessible countryside, a green lung for Macclesfield. Adverse impact on Area of Special County value with high landscape value.</p> <p>Nature conservation value - nature conservation priority area in the Local Plan; local wildlife including rich, extensive bird life and amphibians and protected species; tree preservation orders; area highly valued for recreation – local residents, walkers and other canal users; loss of playing fields; urbanisation/urban sprawl – effect on Peak Park fringe.</p> <p>Impact on charm/heritage of two adjacent conservation areas</p> <p>Exceptional amenity value of the site confirmed by planners over last 35 years</p> <p>Loss of links and views between town, hills, canal, walking paths, Victoria Park and conservation area</p> <p>Unsustainable – too far to walk from the town centre with shopping</p> <p>Impact on the already overcrowded local road system; limited access.</p> <p>Flood risk</p> <p>Unsuitable land with a restrictive covenant</p> <p>There is sufficient housing already.</p> <p>More sustainable, brownfield sites should be used first.</p> <p>Site is not available as it depends on King's School's plans. Site was not in the SHLAA 2012 or the Town Strategy.</p> <p>Objection to loss of playing fields – site and impacts must be examined in the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> |
| <p>Alsager</p> <p>50 representations</p> | <p>Support use of brownfield sites at Twyfords and MMU</p> <p>Lacks justification. Large housing figures compared to Wilmslow. Do not increase Alsager housing numbers as demand is elsewhere due to loss of</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| made by 40 people 2 support 20 object 28 comment | employment locally. |
| | Alsager needs jobs – deliver 10 ha of employment land before housing. Deliver employment on the MMU site. |
| | Need for affordable housing. |
| | Plan is flawed due to congestion impact; loss of agricultural land and countryside; creation of urban sprawl; impact on decaying town centres. We need well-planned, attractive, thriving community with green space and access to countryside. |
| | Focus on services/facilities – Alsager is a KSC hence infrastructure must serve catchment including Haslington and Barthomley developments. Need supermarket and petrol station (Twyfords site), playing fields (MMU). |
| | MMU – build on existing footprint; maintain sports fields to create first class, strategically managed sports facility. |
| | Add MMU extension site |
| | Add deliverable, developable, achievable SHLAA sites |
| | Alsager is a KSC so should deliver new housing. There is capacity for more housing in the west of the town. |
| | Alsager has travel to work links to the North Staffs conurbation. The relevant local authorities consider that the proposals are appropriate but reserve the right to make further comments. |
| | Concerns regarding White Moss Quarry and Barthomley new settlement |
| | Include the Cardway Cartons site, Linley Lane for mixed use |
| | Include land south of Hall Drive, Alsager |
| Figure 8.3 Preferred Strategic Sites around Alsager 8 representations made by 8 people 2 support 0 object 6 comment | Develop brownfield sites before green |
| | Retain sporting facilities at MMU |
| | Increasing housing numbers would undermine regeneration in the Potteries |
| | Why is the site south of Radway Green not shown? |
| | Support Cardway Cartons site |
| | Request for traffic calming through neighbouring villages |
| Site Alsager 1 Twyfords 15 representations made by 15 people 4 support 2 object 9 comment | Support for cycle links to town, station and Talke Road. Include links to Linley Lane (A34); the canal; the road to Kidsgrove; and employment area at Butt Lane. |
| | We need a supermarket and petrol station |
| | New supermarket etc must not affect town centre |
| | Need for better footpaths |
| | Opportunities for de-culverting and river restoration |
| | Railway infrastructure must be protected from development impacts. Development must mitigate railway noise and vibration, considering future potential intensification of routes. |
| | Welcome the inclusion of provision of sports and leisure facilities but scale, type and location must be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and an Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy. |
| | Negotiations re affordable housing provision and Extra Care provision are ongoing |
| | Do not develop old railway line – it may be needed for HS2 |
| Site Alsager 2 Former Manchester | Support the site: sustainable location; opportunity for mix of dwellings; results in less demand for greenfield sites. |
| | Need mixed use site with housing and employment |

| | |
|--|---|
| Metropolitan University Campus 31 representations made by 28 people 4 support 16 object 11 comment | No justification for increase in numbers on site |
| | Support campus redevelopment for sports facilities, housing, green infrastructure etc |
| | Site requires highway/junction improvements |
| | Development should accord with the site development brief |
| | Support retention/protection/sustainable management of playing fields; evidence shows shortage of outdoor sport in all towns and no justification that this site is surplus at present. Address the site in the Playing Pitch Strategy. |
| | Fields to the north should be excluded from development |
| | Need for leisure facilities in Alsager – sport and leisure hub, children’s play space, green space/park |
| | Services required – medical facilities, burial provision |
| | Is a new pub and restaurant needed? |
| Site Alsager 3 Radway Green 7 representations made by 7 people 2 support 2 object 3 comments | Retain site for employment |
| | Need more detail on enterprise, growth and infrastructure requirements |
| | Support sports/leisure facilities |
| | Site needs highway/footpath improvements |
| | Protect railway infrastructure from development impacts. Developers must mitigate railway noise and vibration, considering potential future intensification of routes. |
| Congleton 337 representations by 301 people 201 support 99 object 37 comment | Growth is too fast and housing target too high (30% bigger) without justification. Would destroy identity. Why so much in Congleton and not elsewhere? Disproportionate and not based on local need. |
| | Unsound to focus all new housing in north of Congleton rather than the south – NPPF para 50 urges Councils to deliver homes ‘in different locations to offer choice ... and create sustainable ... communities’ |
| | Flawed assumptions and lack of evidence |
| | Difficult to justify sites other than for enabling the road. |
| | No mention of brownfield sites which could deliver 780 houses. Agricultural land will be lost forever. Need more positive statements to protect the green spaces around the town. |
| | All sites suggesting the same facilities. A secondary school should be proposed. |
| | Look at the alternatives in more detail as they have fewer constraints. |
| | |
| Fig 8.4 Preferred Strategic Sites around Congleton 808 representations by 793 people 720 support 70 object 18 comment | Object to the use of pre-filled comments forms from the Town Council to show support for the link road. |
| | No mandate for the link road - it only appeared in the final Town Strategy and was not debated, consulted on or made public, but decided at a Special Town Council meeting. |
| | No evidence base for the link road |
| | Build a bypass, if required, not this link road and houses, whose residents’ cars will undo any improvements brought about by the new road |
| | Strategic sites have been chosen to fund the Northern Link Road and do not relate to the needs of the town. |
| | Congleton Link Road - we will not sell our farm in Hulme Walfield as it will damage wildlife and landscape. |
| | Development in Macclesfield should contribute to the cost of the link road |
| | Link road needs to join up Macc Road and Manchester Roads and A34 to the south |
| | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Not enough detail to comment on the link road |
| | 60% of monies needed for the road haven't been secured; Regional Growth Fund monies may not materialise; there is no CIL in place to fund the road. It is therefore premature to consider it. |
| | Problem of quarry along route |
| | We need town centre traffic improvements |
| | Need improvements to offpeak rail links |
| | Dane Valley environmental damage, second fastest rising river in the UK |
| | Development is not in Congleton, residents of Somerford can't vote for a Town Councillor |
| | Not enough infrastructure at present |
| | The mix of housing and employment is at odds with enhancing this area of the town. |
| | My land at Somerford is classed as being available for development. This is not correct |
| Site Congleton 1 Back Lane and Radnor Park 66 representations by 64 people 10 support 49 object 7 comment | Development on a Village Green would be unlawful. |
| | Some land here is publicly owned. This is a conflict of interest for CEC as planning authority and site promoter. Government guidance forbids council officers using their positions to create private advantage for themselves or the Council. |
| | Level of growth will destroy: character and uniqueness of surrounding countryside; prime agricultural land; and recreational land – environmental vandalism. |
| | My land in Somerford is not available |
| | Potential covenant against development on RSPB land |
| | This site is not accessible from the town centre (3 miles away) or station (4 miles). It will be quicker to get to Holmes Chapel station, so will not address local need, but provide for Manchester commuters. |
| | Congleton doesn't need two business parks; there are empty premises in the existing parks; hence no need to extend into countryside. |
| | Redevelop Radnor for housing and relocate employment to the Arclid Hospital site. |
| | Relocate all business areas to town outskirts to minimise congestion and pollution |
| | Abandon the link road in favour of redevelopment in Congleton town to ease the through-flow of traffic. |
| | Even with a moderate increase in employment opportunities, the overall employment figures for Congleton will be reduced if the housing is built and increases the size of the town by 30%. |
| | Maintain a distinct Green Belt between Congleton and Somerford to prevent a featureless sprawl of overdevelopment |
| | River Dane is a site of Special County Value; ancient woodlands are at risk; Link road passes through a designated "wildlife corridor" |
| | Flood zone 2&3 |
| | Congleton Business Park access to the motorway is very good. To make the link even better widen the A34. |
| Site 2 Congleton Business Park Extension 30 | The EPP document promotes 'town centre first' for retail and commerce. CEC is going against this although acknowledging that vacancy rates are over 20%. |
| | The site is close to an Air Quality Management Area, which is a material planning consideration. |

| | |
|---|--|
| representations by 27 people 6 support 20 object 4 comment | Site is in the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope Consultation Zone |
| | A wider transport study, Travel Plan and cultural heritage assessment are needed. When will they be done? |
| | In the SHLAA 2011, the site (2534) was considered not suitable, achievable, developable or sustainable. What has changed? |
| Site 3 Giantswood Lane 39 representations by 36 people 7 support 23 object 9 comment | Sensible site, if expansion is required. |
| | Jodrell Bank issues prevented incorporation of parts of this site in the previous Local Plan. What has changed? |
| | A major incursion into the Dane Valley landscape, flood zone restrictions, wildlife corridor, destruction of versatile grade 2 and 3a agricultural land. What mitigation is planned? |
| | Create Strategic Open Gap or Green Belt between Eaton and Congleton due to the ecological importance |
| | Support alternative shorter link road route through site 3 |
| | Hulme Walfield Parish is not within the town plan/boundary? |
| | Don't build a bypass: in Biddulph it made the town into a ghost town. Instead, widen the A34 through Congleton and improve junctions to facilitate local/through traffic. |
| | SHMA 2010 identified high need (50% of annual need) for older persons' housing in Congleton, especially 1/2 beds in Congleton. |
| Site 4 Manchester Rd & Macclesfield Rd 34 representations by 33 people 4 support 24 object 6 comment | Additional constraints include: ponds; possibly Great Crested Newts; TPOs, localised contamination; Jodrell Bank Consultation Zone. |
| | Development and link road will have a significant detrimental impact on the distinctive character and remoteness of Eaton. It will be encompassed by Congleton urban sprawl. Contravenes proposed policy of minimising impact on Green Belt and village individuality. |
| | Explore alternatives of improving existing infrastructure |
| | Site is only allocated due to the potential bypass |
| Handforth 38 representations by 31 people 2 support 25 object 11 comment | Is Handforth a Key Service Centre? Why does it not have a supporting statement of intent? |
| | Sustainable site |
| | Improve connectivity with an improved Airport Express rail service |
| | Refer to the need for convenience goods floorspace in Handforth |
| | More social housing would undermine the social balance |
| | Big shortage of social housing |
| | Handforth needs more homes than are proposed |
| | Population predictions for Handforth to 2030 indicate a decrease of 100 – why is this plan introducing 2,500 people rather than building only for what we need? |
| | Local need figure will reduce by 25% if up-to-date software is used and the ageing population is taken into account |
| | Cumulative impact with Woodford proposals – there will be up to 6,000 additional vehicles on gridlocked roads |
| | Plan encourages the merging of separate areas together – Handforth/Cheadle, Wilmslow/Woodford |
| | Site is not suitable for development |
| | Refurbish old and vacant business properties for commercial or residential uses |
| | Protect Handforth's few green and open spaces. Object to development of |

| | |
|---|---|
| | valued community space. Retain and improve it with an arboretum and an area for ground-nesting birds. |
| | Local character will change |
| | Infrastructure cannot support more development |
| | New settlement would harm Handforth's economy and shops |
| | Why was the Clay Lane site rejected? |
| | Consider other alternative sites |
| | New settlement, 200 homes and 10ha of employment land is far too much for Handforth – disproportionate. Handforth should not accommodate Wilmslow's housing need |
| | Development should be restricted to sites in the settlement boundary due to the size of the settlement |
| | I would support small development on non-strategic sites in Handforth instead of the new settlement |
| | Where did the 10 dwellings per annum figure originate from? |
| | Can sites within the settlement boundary accommodate this? |
| | Protect green space between Handforth and Handforth East |
| | There are not enough jobs to cater for the new residents |
| | Do not object to limited development west of the A34 |
| | Do not build west of the A34. |
| | Allocate site to the south of Sagars Lane, Handforth |
| | Allocate Peacock Farm site on Wilmslow Road, Handforth |
| | Allocate land east of Wilmslow Road, Handforth (Junction of A555 & B5358) |
| | Do not use site at Knowle House, Sagars Road |
| | Use only Sites B, C and MOD land within Site M1, from Handforth Town Strategy |
| | Extend district centre to include station and Meriton Road |
| | Cumulative impact of traffic from new development and 28% increase arising from SEMMS road |
| Knutsford 49 representations by 45 people 3 support 29 object 17 comment | No justification for level of housing/employment - it is too much. Knutsford is full: it is constrained by Green Belt and development will damage local heritage. It should have a maximum target of 20 homes a year. |
| | No proper consideration of development potential within urban boundaries including underutilised land/property in the town centre and abandoned shopping areas on the town centre fringe. Use the latter for small households eg the elderly who need good access to town centre facilities |
| | If we build on Green Belt in 25 years, there will be no fields left. Loss of prime agricultural land, destroying Knutsford's open, rural character |
| | Scale of development is proportionate to the settlement size |
| | 1,500 net additional dwellings are required to cater for local need and sustain the town centre facilities |
| | Detail the specific infrastructure which is required |
| | Town lacks infrastructure including transport, medical facilities, primary school places, play spaces, green corridors, cycle facilities, community leisure rooms, congestion, parking, water supply. Improve through development, ensure capacity is resolved prior to building. |
| | Need new affordable family houses including self-build, shared equity, sheltered housing |
| | What type of houses will be provided? How ensure they are for locals? How will you keep affordable houses as such? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Half Knutsford's offices are empty – no need for more, especially with virtual working. Existing industrial units are not fully utilised, hence no need for more. |
| | Local people should nominate the projects that the CIL will contribute to |
| | Why were other sites around Knutsford rejected? Provide detailed site selection rationale document including Green Belt release requirements. |
| | Do we need more sports facilities or allotments? |
| | Object to distribution of new housing. Disproportionate impact on north west area of Knutsford in density and number of homes. Smaller sites would be more in keeping with local character. |
| | Consider cumulative impacts of commercial developments in Northwich and at Manchester Airport on the viability of Knutsford. |
| | Consider impacts of HS2, A556 and new M6 junction |
| | Need a policy protecting and enhancing Protected Open Space |
| | Improve the northern approach to Knutsford – no retail, takeaways or restaurants |
| | Design brief to maintain historical context of the town |
| | Lack of analysis of landscape character, historic dimension, landscape capacity and sensitivity – prepare the relevant evidence base to inform the Development Plan |
| | Inconsistencies and gaps regarding historic assets at Tatton and extent of Registered Historic Park and Garden |
| | Summary of Development Requirements (para 8.39) is inconsistent – it should show 350 new homes, not 400. |
| | Tatton Park and local visitor economy are economically essential and must be supported |
| | All sites over 1ha should have a planning brief |
| | Development in the Green Belt does not require alteration of Green Belt boundaries and can enhance the Green Belt |
| | Knutsford residents work outside the Borough. For employment land allocation, work with Greater Manchester and Warrington. |
| | Locate new community facilities in the town centre, not Green Belt. |
| | Developer contributions should support Knutsford Railway Station as a viable transport option through links to Middlewich and Crewe |
| | Use vacant part of the Ilford site for housing and employment |
| | Use site at Moorside, Knutsford for residential development |
| | Use site east of Toft Road for residential development |
| | Use Booths Hall site |
| | Relocate Egerton School alongside protected open space in NW Knutsford and use former site as healthcare facility |
| | Include a potential site/sites for a health centre eg Cottage Hospital on Northwich Road |
| | Not enough homes. We need over 400 affordable homes. |
| Figure 8.5 Preferred Strategic Sites around Knutsford 21 representations by 20 people | Support protected status of sports facilities (football ground, sports/boys' clubs). What prevents future development? |
| | Has CEC consulted with the FA, Cheshire FA, Sport England and other sporting/football authorities? |
| | What is meant by improved facilities and who will fund this? |
| | Town football club is c. 3ha, should not be referred to as a pitch |
| | Development will remove Knutsford's uniqueness as one of very few English |

| | |
|---|--|
| 5 support 15 object 1 comment | towns where gentry landholdings prevented suburban growth, retaining countryside feel in town. |
| | Housing will be expensive in this premium area. |
| | 20 houses a year is unrealistic - it is only viable for developers to build all 400 houses and commercial premises in one go |
| | Detail the business types in order to determine workforce and hence type of housing required |
| | Safeguards must be put in place to ensure affordable housing remains so in perpetuity, and not 'affordable in relation to local market housing costs' |
| | Requirement of 30ha is stated, but 65ha are allocated |
| Site Knutsford 1 Parkgate Extension 38 representations by 38 people 9 support 20 object 9 comment | Why is the site now for employment land and not the 300-400 houses stated in the Draft Town Strategy? Housing on this site was favoured by respondents to the Town Strategy. |
| | Do not use this site for employment as there are too many unoccupied premises. Support mixed housing use here eg high value housing so residents live near potential employment. |
| | Support as a non-greenbelt site of low agricultural classification – allocate it now for housing to remove the need for Green Belt release. It could accommodate much of Knutsford's housing need |
| | Develop this site comprehensively to include community facilities to reduce East Knutsford's current deficiency |
| | Better access is essential. Pedestrian and cycle links are not realistic given Tatton Park, golf course etc. |
| | 11ha for future use should not be allocated at this time. |
| | Develop safeguarded area for housing now to minimise release of Green Belt elsewhere. |
| | Safeguarded area is too far from town to be used for housing. |
| | Marl pits on the site will be affected, lowering the water table in the ponds to unsustainable levels, changing water quality and chemistry. Impact on flood risk. |
| | Site used by a range of ground-nesting birds; 6 species of bats; dormice etc. |
| | Use this site instead of Site 2 |
| | Incorporate a Metrolink stop |
| | Proximity to waste water treatment plant is not a constraint |
| | Railway underpass will be required |
| | Include a higher proportion of intermediate affordable housing |
| | Proximity to Tatton Park requires sensitivity to the setting of the significant heritage asset including design and character of development, and landscape buffer to northern, western and eastern boundaries |
| | Resulting increased footfall at Knutsford Railway Station should prompt Section 106 payments to enhance station |
| Site Knutsford 2 North West Knutsford 107 representations by 72 people 11 support 83 object 13 comment | Consultation on the Knutsford Town Strategy showed that this is the least popular site for development |
| | Loss of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land producing high yields in various crops, and related jobs. |
| | Green Belt – use the many available brownfield sites, such as Knutsford Site 1 Parkgate |
| | Located on a main artery road which suffers extreme congestion, especially when traffic diverts from closed/busy M6. Requires a relief road giving access to the M6. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Support protected open space including Knutsford Sports Club, Knutsford Football Club and Egerton Youth Club. What are the Council's plans for it? Requires a policy on 'Protected Open Space' which must not diminish current its greenbelt status. |
| | Safeguarding land now is premature. Could concentrate all new development here beyond the plan period. |
| | Such low density will discourage affordable housing. |
| | Re-word to 'onsite provision, or where appropriate, relevant contributions towards ENHANCED highways and transport, education, health, open space and community facilities'. |
| | Facilities are welcomed but how will residents cross the A50 to reach the sports facilities to the east? |
| | Protect visual impact on town gateway to retain Knutsford's uniqueness for tourist trade: no industrial units, retain leafy, open approach of green cordon between Mereheath Lane and Tatton Park wall; install screening to east and west of Manchester Road. Do not upgrade Mereheath Lane. |
| | Limit commercial development here |
| | Reduce housing density, volume and scale – would have a disproportionate impact on North Knutsford, destroying character. Spread houses throughout the town. |
| | Include high value housing |
| | Loss of spectacular countryside views including Delamere Forest |
| | Prone to waterlogging |
| | No valid reason for creating one large site from the 4 separate sites previously consulted on as part of the Town Strategy. |
| | Open space, existing wildlife (potentially Great Crested Newts and lapwings) and pond habitats must be protected |
| | More detail on the exact use of the land; workforce requirements; resulting house types; quantum of housing land; location of commercial development. |
| | Too far for people to walk from the site into town, resulting in congestion and environmental damage |
| | Infrastructure issues – reduced water pressure, water cut off, electric voltage varies, lack of parking, noise issues from planes |
| | Better to build 200 houses on Town Strategy Sites C and D between Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane. |
| | 35ha of land is excessive for 350 houses and other stated uses. Apply density of 30 to 40dph, requiring smaller land take (15ha) and enabling a range of homes including standard, smaller family homes, single-storey homes for the elderly. |
| | Sports clubs must be engaged regarding the proposed 'provision of sports and leisure facilities' |
| | Results of Sustainability Appraisal on the original Town Strategy version of this site scored worse than almost every other site, and failed 17 of the 22 accessibility criteria |
| | Some development is possible on this site, if there is investment in current facilities to east of Manchester Road |
| | Commercial development is not appropriate here – site it alongside existing sites eg the former Red Cross hospital on Northwich Road, away from residential areas |
| | Relocate Egerton Primary School to this site and release its former site for new medical facilities |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Land is liable to subsidence due to presence of brine |
| | There are already commercial uses here, so it makes sense to locate others close by. They could bypass central Knutsford. |
| | No objective criteria have been applied to the selection of this site from those identified in the Town Strategy |
| | Piecemeal bolt-on development, too small to support the facilities proposed. Not a considered, masterplanned extension |
| | No consideration of site being adjacent to Historic Parkland of Tatton Park (Grade II*) – consider its setting, heritage and landscape character assessment |
| | Land east of the A50 is not contained to the north, so could result in future expansion. Site to the west of the A50 is contained on each boundary and could alone satisfy the new housing requirement. |
| | Seek Section 106 contributions to enhance Knutsford Railway Station, which would see increased footfall as a result of the development |
| | Locate housing development on wasteland off Longridge |
| | Unrealistic to suggest that developers will only build 20-25 homes a year – it will only be viable for them to build all 400 houses and commercial land in one go |
| | As a senior football club governed by the FA, Knutsford Football Club could not become part of a shared sports hub. Club must be consulted regarding any proposals. |
| | Build a relief road to the west of the town |
| | Site has direct access to M6 and M56, promoting commuting to Warrington, Trafford and Manchester. Link to employment in east and south Knutsford. |
| | Do not relocate sports facilities – it will decrease accessibility |
| | New facilities are required on the development site, as those existing would not cope with an increased population. Knutsford needs more health, education and community facilities, not a pub, takeaway or restaurant. |
| | Future of the existing sports facilities including impact of development and options for replacement, should be assessed via the Playing Pitch Strategy |
| | If commercial uses are required, they should be limited to B1(a) and B1(b) |
| | This development would almost join Knutsford to Mere with minimum Green Belt |
| | Use site at Toft Road, Knutsford |
| | Build a hotel, golf course and clubhouse on land adjoining the Knutsford Golf Club |
| Middlewich 16 representations by 16 people 4 support 4 object 8 comment | Support the Middlewich Eastern bypass to relieve congestion – include it in priority infrastructure spending as per Policy CS10.4, as a strategic element in the economic regeneration of Middlewich and Mid Cheshire |
| | Will the bypass from the South (Sandbach) ever be built? |
| | A sustainable location for future development. Strategy aligns with the NPPF. |
| | Clear mismatch between employment land and housing delivery. Increase Middlewich housing allocation to 2,500 dwellings |
| | Object to the identification of strategic sites around Middlewich as there is no consideration of sites outside CEC, hence is not an effective strategy as required by the NPPF. |
| | Cooperate with Cheshire West and Chester to deliver housing on edge of Middlewich to meet both Boroughs' acute housing shortfall |
| | Divert planning obligations for affordable housing towards other |

| | |
|---|---|
| | infrastructure |
| | Middlewich needs a train station; bus station; eastern bypass; western bypass; reconstruction of town wharf; and a properly designed town centre |
| | Resurrect the Middlewich Masterplan and ambitions of the Canal Corridor Area Action Plan/Civic Centre Study. |
| | Include land at Darlington Road for mixed use development. |
| Preferred Strategic Sites around Middlewich 8 representations by 8 people 1 support 4 object 3 comment | Middlewich has seen too much development over recent decades and little infrastructure improvement to match. |
| | The Rural Hub 'Cheshire Fresh' initiative makes Middlewich an international destination venue for livestock, horticultural, agricultural and business incubation activities that are appropriate to this edge of town, semi-rural location. |
| | The "Potential Cheshire Enterprise Hub" in the Mid Point 18 site is not qualified therefore no qualified comments can be logged |
| | I object to the potential Cheshire Enterprise Hub as there is sufficient land and the site has permission for landfill use. |
| | Support the allocation of a 'Cheshire Enterprise Hub' but require policy detailing type and quantum of development |
| | Allocate the mostly-brownfield site to the north-west of Booth Lane, adjacent to Midpoint 18, for mixed use development. |
| | |
| Site Middlewich 1 Brooks Lane 7 representations by 7 people 2 support 3 object 2 comment | Include railway station and marina as essential on Middlewich Site 1. |
| | Maximise site usage for tourism, employment and retail |
| | Logical site in a sustainable location. Keep it in the plan. |
| | Site development must address the Trent & Mersey Canal, including developer contributions to improve canal infrastructure for resulting increased towpath use. |
| | Main employment area. |
| | Contaminated land here, will be expensive to develop. |
| Site Middlewich 2 Glebe Farm 13 representations by 13 people 2 support 8 object 3 comment | River Croco and Sanderson's Brook meet on the site. |
| | Object. It is a major extension of Middlewich into open countryside. Instead, favour developments that make the town more compact. |
| | Improve amenities and roads before building new houses |
| | Will adversely affect the amenity and character of Warmingham village. The impact of this and extension of Middlewich 4 would have a major impact on Warmingham Lane, Moston and surrounding country lanes. Mitigation required - adopted traffic management plans and preferred routes to direct traffic onto primary roads. |
| | Support. Revise site boundary. Extend site to the south-west for further residential development and ecological purposes |
| | Include direct links to Booth Lane to reduce the congestion and traffic pressure on Warmingham Lane |
| | Do we need this in light of recent permissions on three sites to the west of Warmingham Lane? |
| | Developer contributions should be sought towards the improvement of the Trent & Mersey Canal towpath. |
| | Draw site boundaries to match field boundaries in order to preserve priority habitat hedges and maintain the landscape. |
| | Extend the corridor of Green Infrastructure that runs north-south across Sycamore Drive, on a similar alignment through Site 2, to maintain links with open countryside and to Sandbach Flashes SSSI to the south |
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Permission for Midpoint 18 Phase 3 has been renewed. This cannot be repeated, hence the bypass must be delivered soon. The only realistic option is through development of Glebe Farm. |
| Site Middlewich 3 Mid Point 18 Extension 9 representations by 8 people 2 support 5 object 2 comment | Increased traffic on A54 should not allow further development. |
| | Greenfield development in this rural location is unsustainable and will adversely impact infrastructure. |
| | Support. Retain the allocation in the Plan. |
| | Linkages to the town with footpaths, cycle ways and reopening of railway station, support the green agenda. |
| | Early completion of the bypass with financial contribution from CEC would allow for increased jobs in the area at a much greater rate than starting new projects from scratch. |
| | The site includes land south of Cledford Lane which has not been previously identified. Cheshire County Council limited further development south of Cledford Lane until completion of the Middlewich Eastern bypass to Tetton Bridge. |
| Nantwich 26 representations by 23 people 4 support 10 object 12 comment | Use brownfield sites first. Concern at loss of Green Belt and areas of natural beauty around the town. |
| | Scale of growth is too high. Nantwich has had more than its fair share of development in the last 12 years. Set a maximum level of housebuilding for Nantwich at 1,500 dwellings. |
| | Constrain growth to retain, protect and enhance character and identity of Nantwich as an historic market town which attracts tourists. It will become urban sprawl instead of a compact market town. |
| | Housing target should be itemised between need and demand; include allocations sites with permission; windfalls; and subtract empty homes. |
| | Justification for new housing should be based on analysis of the existing urban form, character and extent; and appraisal of physical capacity to accommodate more development. |
| | Should take a cautious, planned approach that develops the town incrementally & delivers infrastructure in a timely fashion |
| | Support – let's get on with it. |
| | Increase housing allocation to 125 dwellings per annum. |
| | Object to phasing. |
| | Need less focus on housing numbers and more focus on integrating new developments with the town |
| | 240 dwellings approved at Queens Drive, Nantwich should be subtracted from housing figure for Nantwich |
| | Accessibility and congestion - too much traffic comes through Nantwich. Northern bypass inadequate, needs improvement, especially at A530 roundabout. Need more car parking. |
| | Nantwich is a Key Service Centre - a sustainable location, with good access for services and facilities and not constrained by Green Belt. |
| | Independent shops will not benefit as developments are not within walking distance |
| | Opportunity to grow the area for the future but also need to make Nantwich a desirable place to live ie sustainable growth. |
| | Increase employment allocation by 5 ha to 10ha. |
| | Little employment locally, so unsustainable travel patterns. |
| | Developers should fund requirements arising from increased use: bridges to replace level crossings; drop-off/parking; lighting; access; platform; CCTV; |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Equality Act access; and roads. |
| | Support proposed Green Belt to maintain existing Green Gap |
| | Strain on infrastructure – roads, schools, medical centre, hospital |
| | Welcome inclusion of sports and leisure facilities but their scale, type and location must be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and an Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy. |
| | New housing allocation for residential development sought at Audlem Road, Nantwich. |
| | Lets get on with it! |
| | Improvements to the Nantwich riverside are welcomed as a means of increasing the footfall in Nantwich. |
| | There should be a moratorium on additional developments in Stapeley - infrastructure cannot cope. |
| | Developments should be done in a sensitive way to preserve biodiversity and retain rural feel, habitat and way of life. |
| | Cheshire Community Action report explores in depth the workplace and resident populations in Crewe and Nantwich |
| | |
| Figure 8.7 Preferred Strategic Sites around Nantwich 31 representations by 31 people 1 support 1 object 29 comment | Support the local plan for Nantwich. |
| | Improve local infrastructure including car parking which affects local businesses, shoppers and visitors. |
| | Allocate a range of smaller sites on the town periphery in keeping with its organic, historic development eg the eastern side up to the A51 corridor. Allows infrastructure to keep up. |
| | Development should be phased. |
| | The former Regents College site in Nantwich is a sustainable location for future housing development. |
| Site Nantwich 1 Kingsley Fields 96 representations by 84 people 72 support 9 object 15 comment | Kingsley Fields is preferable to the proposed Nantwich South - it has better road links, is sustainable, close to the town centre, improves the A51 and helps Reaseheath College and hence the wider community and town centre economy. Relieves pressure on green gap. |
| | Support. Site emerged as the most appropriate urban extension location through the Nantwich Town Strategy. |
| | We support with the improved infrastructure to accommodate the new housing and population increase. Must deliver link road, new primary school, doctors, hospitals, provision for elderly and local centre. |
| | Object- lack of evidence to support site selection. |
| | Refer to Kingsley Fields constraints including highway problems; potential archaeology (study underway); adjacent Battle of Nantwich Registered Battlefield; adjacent Reaseheath Conservation Area and many listed buildings; flooding due to proximity of River Weaver; and Nantwich Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (Dec 2012). |
| | Site is far too big. Amend to 2ha of employment land in order to be consistent with Reaseheath College requirements. |
| | Development will overwhelm the town and have a negative impact on its character |
| | Not convinced that this expansion is necessary. Expansion of Reaseheath College does not justify development of the site |
| | Do not support any further large scale development in Nantwich; it does not need any more. |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| | Consider its use as a green space for health and wellbeing of community; and protection of wildlife environments |
| | Phasing is appropriate and realistic |
| | Why doesn't this include the need for a community facility/place of worship? |
| | Protect area at the southern tip as a green buffer - no housing development permitted here. |
| | Average net density should be 35ha as site is close to town centre on an expected high frequency bus route. |
| | Increase to 1,100 dwellings. |
| | Potential to link with the college to create a destination local food facility like Ludlow – a boost to tourism & business |
| | It must deliver greater sustainability in Acton; good quality design; retail facilities that do not compete with Nantwich town centre; highway improvements (new road from Waterlode to a realigned A51 near to Reaseheath) and contributions to village environmental improvements. |
| | Extend the boundary of the site to include whole of Nantwich Town FC site as a central recreation/community/retail facility area for the benefit of existing Kingsley Fields housing residents. |
| | It will not pass the NPPF justified test of soundness |
| | Contribution to Burford Crossroads improvement on the A51 should be counter-balanced by a reduction in affordable housing below the Policy SC4 target rate, separate from any viability assessment |
| | Instead, develop Land to the South of Nantwich for mixed use. It performs better on the Sustainability Appraisal's objectives. |
| | Extension to Riverside Park is deliverable. Amend restrictive wording: open space description should include dual use playing fields at primary school, linear green routes and a buffer to Battlefield |
| | Expand proposals for major green infrastructure as per Riverside Strategy and Wetland Creation Study. Proposed riverside park extension should occupy full width of flood plain; provide transitional area between development and park to safeguard biodiversity. Include wooded transitional zone on boundaries between development and historic battlefield . |
| | Developer understands that the town centre primary health care facility has capacity for this development |
| | Concern that the A51 realignment crosses the floodplain |
| | Build smaller 'starter' homes (not just flats) for young families and the increasing number of people living alone. |
| | Restrict development to sites within the town boundary. Developments in adjacent parishes do not contribute to the town |
| | Growth should not go on large sites, but smaller ones |
| | Development could take place beyond this site |
| | Not sustainable – too far from the centre & other parts of town; will encourage car travel |
| | Greenfield site with no defensible boundaries. Must protect ecological assets. Brownfield sites will remain undeveloped |
| | Not all land owners are willing for their land to be developed |
| | Improved public access to River Weaver |
| | Sustainable development – easy access to town centre |
| | Design Development Brief is required for the site |
| Site Nantwich 2 | Refer to adjacent Nantwich Conservation Area; many listed buildings; |

| | |
|---|---|
| Snow Hill 71 representations by 71 people 63 support 2 object 6 comment | Nantwich Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Strategy (Dec 2012) which requires preparation of development briefs for allocated sites. |
| | Should support town centre, if in keeping with historic nature of Nantwich |
| | Support but is this site viable/deliverable? |
| | Object – flood risk |
| | Retail development in Nantwich must not prejudice Crewe town centre; the Council must limit occupation of units to independent retailers; small shops are vital; a larger store could assist redevelopment of Swinemarket/Snow Hill. |
| | Support - sustainable brownfield development in close proximity to the town centre; will benefit tourism & business |
| | Site was supported in Nantwich Town Strategy consultation |
| | Requires a car parking strategy and improved infrastructure and access throughout Nantwich. |
| | Swinemarket/Oatmarket should be pedestrianised |
| | Expand swimming pool into a leisure centre. |
| | Sensitive high quality design required, especially on St Annes Lane – suggest boutique hotel and small shops, not houses |
| | The Cheshire Retail and Leisure Study identified additional capacity for convenience and comparison retail. High quality retailers and interested and would benefit the town. |
| | Consider delivery due to multiple ownerships and varying uses. Refer to tools that enable the site to be taken forward eg development brief, procurement, development partner. |
| | Consider design, views into/out of Conservation Area, appearance of development from Riverside and Swinemarket |
| | Retain TPO trees |
| | Regeneration benefits of developing the site |
| | Protect and enhance river, banks and open space. Include more land abutting the river/Waterlode in the Riverside Park to enhance town gateway |
| | Enhance green infrastructure in the town |
| | New housing should meet local, affordable needs |
| | Community benefits need to be clear |
| | Town centre boundary should be drawn more tightly within this site to exclude the expanded Riverside Park |
| | St Annes Lane should be a separate site |
| | The southern boundary of development should be the river. |
| | Need more focus on the importance of design; consultation with local businesses on the need and type of new retail premises. |
| Site Nantwich 3 Stapeley Water Gardens 126 representations by 69 people 64 support 2 object 60 comment | Allocate the whole site for housing only. Original mixed-use scheme is no longer suitable or viable. Remainder could accommodate up to 200 dwellings in the first 5 years. Proposed quantum/types of uses proposed do not physically fit. Does the 250 unit allocation incorporate the existing detailed consent for 146 units? |
| | Requirement for the provision of community facility, place of worship etc is unjustified. |
| | Sports, open space and recreation requirements are unviable and unjustified. |
| | Point 7 Newts is no longer relevant – already implemented. |
| | Point 8 requires justification of bypass being directly related to development of the remainder of the site. Contribution already made for 146 dwellings |

| | |
|--|--|
| | currently under construction. |
| | Why are contributions required to the A51 Nantwich bypass? Congestion relates to town centre access, hence there should not be more development here |
| | Support but only on former Stapeley Water Gardens site. |
| | Infrastructure needs improving: roads for traffic congestion; greenspace; schools, doctors |
| | Support – brownfield site; mixed use supported in Nantwich Town Strategy consultation. |
| | Support use of part of site for employment |
| | Protect wildlife, trees, hedges. Requires extensive protected species mitigation and longterm management. |
| | Site is not sustainable |
| | Retain and upgrade Policy NE.10 New Woodland Planting and Landscaping of the CNRLP west of Stapeley Water Gardens to prevent construction of road infrastructure here. |
| Poynton 18 representations by 15 people 1 support 10 object 7 comment | Allocation of 200 dwellings acceptable. |
| | Inadequate allocation for size of town, local needs, and to maintain relationship with employment land. Increase housing allocation. |
| | Where is the evidence for finding the identified sites inappropriate? |
| | Approach to housing distribution is fundamentally flawed. |
| | First use brownfield sites and vacant units for housing and employment uses |
| | Do not use any Green Belt. |
| | Carry out Green Belt Review. Strictly limit greenbelt development; choose sites with strong boundaries |
| | Plan identifies 5 hectares of employment land but does not consider the location or what the occupier or market needs. |
| | Roads already congested, Poynton bypass needed |
| | No consideration of land requirement for local needs including retail, care homes, leisure, community, older persons' and affordable housing |
| | Allocate land to south of Dickens Lane (140 dwellings) |
| | Site on Anson Road is suitable, available and deliverable for 44 housing units |
| | Armcon site is deliverable for housing |
| Sandbach 36 representations by 29 people 2 support 13 object 21 comment | Town is overdeveloped, lots of recent planning permissions granted. Losing its character. Too many homes, far in excess of those proposed for most other parts of the Borough. |
| | Infrastructure and services are overloaded, and cannot cope with the numbers of houses proposed. Roads are dangerous. Must provide infrastructure as you develop. |
| | Planned improvements at Junction 17 will not stop traffic congestion getting worse. |
| | Rebuild Junction 17; move it south to the A533; create a Northern Bypass joining the M6 to Middlewich Road at Sandbach Station |
| | Sandbach needs a primary school, secondary school, a leisure centre and road infrastructure improvements |
| | Not enough jobs for proposed new residents – they will not benefit the town. Build new homes closer to Manchester, where Sandbach residents tend to work. |
| | Use the Arclid Hospital Site (SHLAA Site 2729) |
| | Sandbach Town Council approved 500 houses, not the 1,800 stated in the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Plan. Ignoring the Town Strategy is unacceptable. |
| | Re-insert Site A Employment only site on land opposite the Texaco garage and Site C Land off the Wheelock Bypass as approved in the Sandbach Town Strategy |
| | Retain Sandbach Common for its community uses |
| | We need homes for the next generation but not if they make Sandbach a place that they do not want to live. Consider the long-term effects of plans. |
| | Should use land south of Old Mill Road to address the qualitative deficiencies of Sandbach's retail and leisure offer, as required by the NPPF |
| | More sustainable and better connected sites which address the growth requirements of Sandbach are the Old Mill Quarter and Houndings Lane sites. |
| | Increase housing target to 3,500 – Sandbach is a Key Service Centre, unconstrained by Green Belt. Use sustainable edge-of-centre sites. |
| | Use the Waterworks House site at Dingle Lane, Sandbach |
| | Use the Dingle Farm site at Dingle Lane, Sandbach |
| | The more reasonable and acceptable alternative sites in Section 4 have not been properly considered by the Council. |
| | Build in flexibility mechanisms so that other edge-of-settlement sites will come forward if the Strategic Sites do not deliver the quantum of units expected |
| | Ensure separate village identity of Elworth through Green Gap |
| | Not a sustainable form of housing delivery, given that most future housing will be from sources later in the plan period, contradicting the NPPF which requires frontloaded delivery to make up for undersupply |
| | SHLAA Site 2866 (land to the south west of Park Lane and due west of Crewe Road) is more sustainable than the proposed site and should be identified as a strategic site |
| | Allocate Yeowood Farm Site |
| Figure 8.8 Preferred Strategic Sites around Sandbach 16 representations by 16 people 3 support 12 object 1 comment | Increase employment land provision – Sandbach needs enough jobs for each resident to prevent it becoming a dormitory town |
| | Job creation has not been quantified; amount of employment land required has not been substantiated by statistics. |
| | Building houses does not create sustainable jobs. |
| | Ensure new housing developments provide bungalows for the ageing population |
| | Develop smaller, brownfield sites in order to spread development and impacts |
| | More 'local centres' will impact negatively on Sandbach town centre |
| | Object to both sites –want to maintain a small market town feel |
| | No plan for dealing with the extra traffic congestion and other strains on current infrastructure |
| | Include the mixed-use site for employment and 245 houses in Wheelock – this was approved at public consultation on the Sandbach Town Strategy |
| | Pipeline impacts on sites, and could be affected by proposed road improvements at Junction 17 and Junction 16/A500 |
| | Strategic sites are identified for only just over half the stated required dwellings. |
| | Allocate housing site at Elworth Hall Farm |
| Site Sandbach 1 Land adjacent to | Too many houses - there should be no more than 250 |
| | Loss of agricultural land |

| | |
|---|---|
| Junction 17 of M6, south east of Congleton Road 192 representations by 182 people 25 support 140 object 27 comment | Preserve this attractive introduction to the town |
| | This is Sandbach's prime employment site – build state of the art business/science park with separate access to/from the M6 |
| | Too large to be viable and deliverable |
| | Visual impact cannot be mitigated |
| | Flood risk, consequences of climate change and water run-off |
| | Protected Area of Open Space which is used by the local community for recreation. Retain the Heath as a 'designated green space' for the community |
| | SBI, wildlife corridor and semi-natural habitat, amphibians in onsite ponds, Tree Preservation Orders. |
| | Cuts into Green Belt |
| | No justification to prefer this site over Alternative Site 4, which shares many of its characteristics |
| | Junction 17 improvements are a pre-requisite to development |
| | Town Strategy consultation approved employment-only use of this site, and rejected housing. Local opinion is being ignored. |
| | Give a grant to a developer to create a business park for small business start-ups with low rents and rates. They might become the new Foden/ERF, employing hundreds of local people. |
| | Make clearer the number of housing developments already in the pipeline and what impact this has on the numbers proposed and delivery phasing to prevent oversupply of new homes |
| | We already have a car sharers' car park opposite the Texaco petrol station – include covered cycle parking there |
| | Link the development to the Sandbach Service Stations of the M6 so that cyclists could car share from the service station, reducing the burden on Junction 17 |
| | Site Ba from the Town Strategy consultation should be used for employment; and Site Bb for less than 700 houses |
| | Relocate ambulance and fire stations here to release a huge brownfield site for development including former garage and haulage business on Congleton Road |
| | Delivery of a new school is unlikely – amend wording to 'one new primary school or financial contribution' |
| | Agree, provided that the infrastructure is in place to support the development, particularly Junction 17 improvements |
| | Good site with contained boundary to prevent further expansion. |
| | New primary school not needed in Sandbach, but in Ettiley Heath |
| | The proposed hotel and pub will not be viable |
| | Not a single site, do not consider it as such. 1) Arclid Brook Valley/Offley Wood Wildlife Corridor and feeder valleys must be protected. 2) Land between the wildlife corridor and A534 Old Mill Road/Sandbach Bypass to the M6 Junction 17 should be a prime commercial gateway to Sandbach. 3) Land between Arclid Brook Valley, Heath Road and the motorway is not appropriate for development due to access and environmental constraints. |
| | Access for at least 700 cars will be impossible on roads such as Hawthorne Drive and Church Lane (single lane in part) |
| | Air quality problems |
| | Include three-bedroomed houses which are truly affordable |
| | Support a balanced mix of employment and housing use |

| | |
|---|---|
| | This is the right number of homes |
| | The ELR confirms that Sandbach has a limited supply of industrial and office space. This is one of the few sites that can deliver significant employment, hence providing housing here will limit employment allocations opportunities in the future. |
| | Sandbach requires 5,300 additional jobs to provide for the town's working-age residents |
| | Use a more sustainably-located extension to Sandbach urban area for a housing/mixed-use development – this site is strategically located and should be used for employment only |
| | Make reference to the need to safeguard land at Junction 17 (including part of Site 1) for comprehensive junction improvement towards the end of the plan period, if required. |
| | Proposal cuts the town in half |
| | Any development should be village-like |
| | Consider population density |
| | Motorway improvements are now being funded by Government, so additional housing here is no longer needed |
| Site Sandbach 2 Former Albion Chemicals 66 representations by 64 people 49 support 5 object 12 comment | Support development of this brownfield site, will be more attractive than current eyesore and prevent destruction of countryside. Ideal, use before all others, if development is needed. |
| | This is the right number of homes for the site |
| | Site will need better transport links or will rely solely on use of car. No pedestrian/cycle links. Open a railway station here. Provide a dedicated cycle track from Sandbach to Middlewich Halve the speed limit in the Sandbach direction to enable cycling. |
| | Middlewich Eastern Bypass must be completed before development of the site |
| | Object – entirely unsustainable location away from the urban area, and requiring significant remediation, making delivery doubtful. Other sites are more central eg Abbeyfields. |
| | Strategic Open Gap between Middlewich and Sandbach should not encroach onto this site. |
| | Is adjacent to semi-natural ancient woodland with native tree species and the Sandbach Flashes SSSI |
| | Use for B class employment uses |
| | A flexible approach to jobs on this site are needed – those that do not fall within the B classes are likely to be acceptable due to the changing economy and emerging sectors. Consider based on number of jobs created, not by floorspace created. |
| | Support mixed-use development on this site |
| | Infrastructure is needed before development occurs |
| | Appropriate number of school places must be provided prior to development – several local catchment areas are oversubscribed at present |
| | Provision of restaurant, leisure centre is does not make sense given the proximity of Sandbach and Middlewich. No need for pub as many have closed down. |
| | Include canal-related leisure |
| | It is critical for the Borough's 5 year housing supply that the specified 375 units all come forward |
| | The site should be included within the Sandbach settlement boundary |

| | |
|--|--|
| | p.105 – please correct to Sandbach to Northwich line, and clarify that there is no station at Middlewich |
| | Retain old sportsfield and adjoining farmland – do not add them to the development |
| | Development here must be sympathetic to surrounding villages. Adopt traffic management plans and preferred routes |
| | Retain the site for employment use – the ELR identifies that Sandbach has a limited supply of industrial and office space hence delivery of the 5,300 jobs required for working-age residents will be problematic |
| | Part of the site is still in use |
| | Should not be included in the Sandbach section as it relates equally to Middlewich; and will be separated from Sandbach by a Strategic Open Gap |
| | Extant planning permission on the site has not been realised, hence deliverability is questioned. Extensive use of mercury onsite by former chemical works. |
| Wilmslow 174 representations by 155 people 5 support 142 object 27 comment | Wilmslow is a sustainable location for additional housing and can support further development. All sites in Wilmslow should be allocated for housing to provide much needed affordable housing to assist families commuting into Manchester. |
| | Neither of the two sites occupy 'valuable green belt land'. |
| | Lack of housing supply is a problem - few brownfield sites |
| | Wilmslow is the fourth largest town in Cheshire East. To meet local need and retain hierarchy position, it needs 1,500 to 2,300 dwellings. Why has the level of provision dropped from the 1,500 target which was in the draft Vision? Is it envisaged that windfall sites will increase the build rate? 400 is a gross underprovision which will increase house prices, provide insufficient affordable housing, preclude younger couples from the local housing market and will not sustain present levels of economic activity. Intrinsically flawed and unsound, conflicts with evidence of need. 600 new affordable homes are required. |
| | Level of development reflects settlement size and proposed employment allocation. Explain how 20dpa was established. Can this level of development be accommodated within the settlement? |
| | The majority of the 400 houses have already been built, given permission or could go on brownfield sites. |
| | Disagree with housing need evidence. It exaggerates need and disregards empty homes; ageing population need for smaller homes; census 2011 prediction of lower population; commitments. |
| | There are enough brownfield sites to meet need: convert empty town centre spaces to residential use; use vacant business space. Residents of Wilmslow (RoW) identified brownfield sites for over 1,000 units. SHLAA identifies 1,164 brownfield sites housing potential. CEC must be active in bringing these to fruition. |
| | Far too many homes for the area – instead, 100 to 175 |
| | Object to Green Belt loss when brownfield sites are available. Changing boundary should be the last option. First explore reducing growth, accommodating growth outside the Green Belt including in Manchester. No exceptional circumstances. Green Belt gives Wilmslow its character. Need GB to grow food and make less impact on the land. Don't need more homes. Contradicts local and town policy. |
| | 80% of residents called for no building on greenbelt, safeguarded or |

| | |
|--|---|
| | greenfield land. CEC has ignored our wishes. |
| | Despite number of brownfield sites available, most will not be suitable, available, developable nor viable ie not deliverable. |
| | Disagree with evidence, no need for more employment land due to development by Waters, Astra Zeneca, Royal London Insurance, Airport City. Take into account many unoccupied offices; changing work patterns number/range of new jobs within 5 minutes drive of Wilmslow |
| | No evidence of joint working with Greater Manchester and Stockport in accordance with planning guidelines. Restrain greenbelt development to encourage GM development. |
| | Danger Wilmslow could lose its character and become part of Greater Manchester urbanisation. Protect Green Belt, it influences nature of Wilmslow, makes it an aspirational town. |
| | Infrastructure close to saturation; no proposals to deal with high traffic flow through town centre; few opportunities to improve roads/cycleways. |
| | Total of proposed developments at Adlington Road, Woodford and Handforth East equals 3,375 new homes within an area of 2 square miles. This will be around 10,000 extra people and 6,000 extra cars. This will have a detrimental impact on the area and infrastructure including roads and schools. Further development could cause more problems. |
| | No regard to effect on natural environment. Green spaces are important for wildlife, support biodiversity and wellbeing of residents |
| | Impact on infrastructure – flood risk, roads/traffic, health service including hospitals and doctors, primary and secondary schools, town centre and retail provision |
| | No regard to social needs of an ageing population |
| | Needs of Wilmslow and Handforth should be assessed separately as they are very different – evidence not available as to housing targets. Pressure for housing development in Wilmslow is unlikely to be successfully diverted to Handforth East. No evidence that the Handforth settlement will be suitable for Wilmslow's housing needs. |
| | Development would remove the natural separation between Handforth, Wilmslow and Alderley Edge |
| | Fulshaw Green Belt fields were left to provide open land for Wilmslow residents/visitors. They must be preserved for the future. They deserve upgrading to Village Green status. |
| | Why is there no development planned for Alderley Edge? |
| | Fails to identify any policy which will provide a showpiece town centre development in the area of the railway station |
| | Two sites allocated have constraints, including TPO's, ponds, railways, traffic noise, railways. |
| | No need for hotel |
| | Plan for a mix of housing on larger scale developments in urban extensions. Smaller housing units appropriate in town centre. |
| | When releasing Green Belt sites, ensure defensible boundaries with longterm permanence. |
| | Safeguarded land should be safeguarded from development |
| | Alternative sites have not been significantly investigated |
| | Plan does not adequately promote visitors to come to spend in Wilmslow. |
| | No mention of revitalising Wilmslow Town Centre |
| | Welcome the inclusion of provision of sports and leisure facilities but the |

| | |
|--|--|
| | scale, type and location must be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy. |
| | No evidence of deliverability of the Wilmslow and Handforth East sites |
| | The current proposals for Wilmslow are more measured and proportionate than those set out in the draft Town Centre Strategy. However, the approach lacks response to environmental issues/opportunities identified at consultation. |
| | Comprehensive assessment of all brownfield sites should be undertaken, and a Green Belt review |
| | The policy as set out in the document entails some loss of Green Belt in Wilmslow but does not set out principles for deciding which areas are worthy of preservation. |
| | Change to green belt boundary contrary to national planning policy |
| | Heathfield Farm should be allocated – does not perform any of the functions of Green Belt land |
| | Allocate Rotherwood, Rotherwood Road (SHLAA site 3667) |
| | Land adjacent to Harefield Farm, Wilmslow should be removed from the Green Belt as it does not serve a greenbelt purpose. |
| | Land at Stockton Road, Wilmslow should be allocated |
| | Instead of Adlington Road site suggest land off Dean Row Road (site Bb in Wilmslow Town Strategy) – same number of houses, footpath/cycle lane, on a bus route, short walk to shops |
| | Support – seem to have listened, is acceptable, important to exploit/get synergy with proximity to Airport new Free Trade City development and Woodford BAe redevelopment. |
| Figure 8.9 Preferred Strategic Sites around Wilmslow 51 representations by 47 people 3 support 46 object 2 comment | Development on green field land unacceptable. Greenbelt boundaries should not be changed – once gone, its gone; no exceptional circumstances or need; no evidence for amount of homes required; there are ample brownfield sites (at least 400) including over 150,000 sqft empty offices – use these first. |
| | Ignores wishes, evidence and alternatives of residents – 80% called for no building on Green Belt. Localism. |
| | Contrary to Wilmslow Vision. |
| | No evidence of working with Greater Manchester and Stockport as required by government policy – needs to be restraint to encourage redevelopment in Greater Manchester. |
| | No account taken of range of job opportunities within 5 minutes drive of Wilmslow |
| | No evidence to justify number of homes needed – population predictions show only increase of 100 for Wilmslow and 100 for Handforth. Development will benefit Manchester. |
| | Roads will be gridlocked with all the new development including impact of Woodford development. |
| | Development will merge settlements and they will lose their unique character – proposed loss of “strategic open space” between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge |
| | Need properties for older generations – consider ageing population |
| | Object to safeguarding land - implies it may be developed in the future |
| | Green Belt sites serve the 5 greenbelt functions including preventing urban sprawl. Provide productive agricultural land. |
| | Infrastructure has no capacity for more development |
| | Propose land at Sunnybank Wilmslow for allocation (adjacent to land fronting |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Upcast Lane) |
| | Site at Dean Row would perform well |
| Site Wilmslow 1 Adlington Road 123 representations by 115 people 7 support 103 object 13 comment | Sustainable location - close to provision of facilities and public transport; low quality Green Belt; longterm safeguarded land therefore time to allocate; identified as 'deliverable' in the SHLAA; and a logical place to extend Wilmslow. Preferable to some other sites identified. |
| | Adopted Local Plan safeguards the land until 'well beyond the plan' ie well beyond 2011 and the Wilmslow Town Strategy safeguards it until at least 2025, giving time for impact of development to be assessed, especially at Dean Row, ie no development until then. |
| | Object to use of Green Belt/green land when there are brownfield sites available to build all 400 dwellings, including empty homes, empty shops and 150,000sqft empty offices. No special circumstances to use green fields/Green Belt. |
| | It provides a green space separating Handforth from Wilmslow |
| | Area is used extensively for walking – it contains a right of way |
| | Object - would create adverse traffic problems and danger, particularly with nearby Woodford development. Inadequate pedestrian provision. |
| | No justification/evidence of need for housing or employment land on Green Belt, greenfield or safeguarded sites. Housing need is not based on firm evidence, arbitrary and on out-of-date statistics and overly high population projections. 225 homes are too many, out of character with surroundings. |
| | No need to build a place of worship, public house/takeaway and sports and leisure facilities on this site - out of character and contrary to Policy Principles |
| | Land unsuitable for housing development – clay soil, constantly marshy, frequently flooded. Development would create flood risk for adjacent properties. |
| | Existing pond and land may contain protected species – important green corridor for wildlife. |
| | North-east Wilmslow has seen vast development over recent years: Summerfields, west of Handforth Road, Oaklands. Combined with Woodford, Handforth East will result in continuous urban sprawl and risk of serious oversupply in light of nearby Handforth East and Woodford developments. |
| | Infrastructure: no capacity at primary school or high school. |
| | Private garden land included within the site boundary |
| | Site fails Policies CS3, 8 and 9, Green Belt protection, distance from amenities, sustainable development and of a rural nature. |
| | The Wilmslow Town Strategy shows the site received less support than other sites in the area - 85% objected. |
| | Density too high – should be about 150 / reduced to 25dph to recognise local character. |
| | Before more housing is added, significantly improve facilities and infrastructure which couldn't cope with development. |
| | The site, to the east of the town centre, is only available from 2015 and would not meet the short-term requirements for executive housing west of the town centre. |
| Site Wilmslow 2 Land at Royal London 171 representations | A sustainable location for much-needed additional housing and employment in a central, accessible location for the young priced out of the local housing market. Proposed playing fields for the high school are a bonus. |
| | The Royal London site is already partly developed, not accessed by the general public. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>by 159 people 7 support 154 object 10 comment</p> | <p>Planning Statements prepared that demonstrate sustainability and suitability, availability and deliverability – could create 1,000 new jobs on 2 hectares and 75 new homes.</p> |
| | <p>Site should not be considered valuable Green Belt. Barely recognisable as such, surrounded by development. Instead, defend more sustainable Green Belt south and east of bypass.</p> |
| | <p>Existing designation as Major Developed Site is not recognised by the NPPF. Withdraw site from Green Belt.</p> |
| | <p>Wilmslow Vision consultation showed massive objection to use of this site</p> |
| | <p>Unnecessary, oppose all greenbelt development and safeguarding in Wilmslow – there are no exceptional circumstances; tens of thousands of sqft of empty units in Wilmslow; and sufficient brownfield sites for over 400 houses but CEC has failed to identify them - no evidence that CEC has any strategy, interest or intention to invest in brownfield sites or vacant units. Contrary to the NPPF, local and town policies.</p> |
| | <p>Oppose. Proposal has been made without any local knowledge as it would complete continuous ribbon development from Manchester to Alderley Edge.</p> |
| | <p>Maintain as productive agricultural land</p> |
| | <p>No need for this development: enough industry already; overprovision of employment land; job opportunities at Waters, AstraZeneca, Airport City, Cargo Terminals; over 150,000 sq feet empty offices in Wilmslow including at Royal London.</p> |
| | <p>The site performs the 5 functions of Green Belt; is an important area of greenspace; prominent, attractive entrance to Wilmslow; gives character to southern approach to Wilmslow; prevents urban sprawl linking Wilmslow to Alderley Edge.</p> |
| | <p>Wildlife concerns: protect as an essential wildlife corridor</p> |
| | <p>Choosing which sites to release from Green Belt should be carried out via a full Green Belt study to identify first of all which sites do not perform the functions of Green Belt.</p> |
| | <p>Not suitable for development as infrastructure could not support it: congestion especially on A34; schools oversubscribed, parking insufficient; site is flooded for 75% of the year;</p> |
| | <p>Infrastructure will not support this scale of housing; cumulative impact alongside 850 houses proposed at Woodford. Housing must be spread on brownfield sites to be well integrated.</p> |
| | <p>Build new affordable housing in Wilmslow town using brownfield sites and redundant office property.</p> |
| | <p>Hotel and sports and leisure facilities not needed</p> |
| | <p>Taking into account the 179 empty homes in Wilmslow, we only need 221 new houses.</p> |
| | <p>No evidence of working jointly with Greater Manchester and Stockport</p> |
| | <p>Assessment of population incorrect. Does not consider ageing population.</p> |
| | <p>Safeguarded land between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge should be designated 'Strategic Open Gap'.</p> |
| | <p>Any further office development in Wilmslow should be hi-tech and science based, positioned around the (brownfield) Waters business centre on Altrincham Road.</p> |
| | <p>Support use for employment and extension of playing fields but not needed for housing. Adlington Rd and brownfield sites can provide the required 400 units.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | No evidence that the site is deliverable or viable: requires significant re-design of access through existing office complex. |
| | Treat site sympathetically, retain it as a high quality, landscaped business park. |
| | Object to safeguarded land - visual appearance and separation of Wilmslow from Alderley Edge, it acts as a green area between the 2 settlements. |
| | Housing development should have a low density – 28 dwellings per hectare due to the environment. |
| | Adjacent to railway line, requiring consultation with Network Rail. Developer must mitigate railway noise and vibration due to existing and potential future intensification of routes. |
| | Support green infrastructure provision and pedestrian and cycle links |
| | Should be 5ha of B1 employment for 1,000-1,500 jobs. Is 2ha of employment land a drafting error? |
| | Area proposed for safeguarding is unsuitable: prone to flooding; underlying geology leading to shrinkage, drainage and runoff issues. Leave as Green Belt/parkland, residents need the open space and it balances greenery of the Hall. |
| | Take great care regarding post-2030 intentions for safeguarded land. Cannot take high density or low cost housing. Must be substantially less than 30dph, distanced from existing houses. |
| Figure 8.10 Alternative Strategic Sites around Wardle 13 representations by 13 people 7 support 3 object 3 comment | I support development of this site for increased employment |
| | Not sustainable due to lack in transport infrastructure and the need for car travel to work. Traffic impacts must be adequately assessed and planned for. This will impact our local communities. |
| | Lacks justification or sustainability. Seems wholly piecemeal. |
| | Provide 1,000 new homes to keep workers local |
| | Providing jobs in Wardle would reduce the need to commute to Warrington |
| | Revisit the option of a new settlement at Wardle, including new railway station. |
| | Visual intrusion of development should be mitigated from the A51 |
| Site Other 1 Wardle Employment Improvement Area 11 representations by 10 people 1 support 4 object 6 comment | Development for employment will generate major congestion. |
| | Development needs to contain a new settlement/housing for employees to make it sustainable |
| | What are the guarantees for the jobs used to justify this concept? Unresolved issues of safety, pollution, light and noise, amenity destruction, legal uncertainty about future expansion of site and type of buildings, future housing, and boundaries. |
| | Avoid increasing traffic on a proven dangerous road. |
| | Seek developer contributions to positively develop the canal frontage |
| | Wardle is isolated and unsustainable. Allocate sites on the edge of Nantwich. |
| | The site is unsustainable, poorly located in relation to homes, services and facilities |
| | Support intensification of employment opportunities |
| | Use brownfield sites in sustainable locations, not green fields. |
| | Include within the site the land between the A51 and the railway. Is available, suitable, no environmental constraints. |
| | Requires masterplan and development brief. GI Action Plan for Crewe doesn't cover this area. |
| Figure 8.11 | Case not well made for a large development on northern edge of borough. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Potential Concept for a New Settlement at Handforth East 45 representations by 45 people 3 support 40 object 2 comment | Previous "Dean Row" development was rejected. |
| | Reallocating northern Green Belt to the south is ridiculous: there is much less open space in the north. |
| | No exceptional circumstances for loss of precious local Green Belt. Build on brownfield instead. |
| | Need a comprehensive Green Belt review. |
| | Will merge Handforth into urban spread of Manchester and Stockport |
| | Object. Handforth has been selected as the easy option and is being "dumped on". |
| | Increased risk of flooding around Bollinfee Bridge on Dean Road and the Stanley Green Industrial Estate. |
| | Endangers protected wildlife species and destroys habitat. |
| | Infrastructure inadequate. Traffic generated plus extra traffic from airport link road will saturate and undermine the bypass |
| | Takes farmland out of production. |
| | Increases carbon footprint. |
| | No evidence to support 2,300 houses here and no business case for so much new-build. Disproportionate, concentrates massive overdevelopment in a small area. No sharing of a proportionate development load across the authority. Process is seriously flawed. Unsustainable, does not comply with the NPPF. Inequitable and undemocratic. |
| | Reduces long standing amenity space |
| | Needs cross boundary co-operation. Lack of publicity about the scheme in neighbouring but affected areas within Stockport. |
| | The proposal is not meeting local needs but providing for overspill from other areas. |
| | The consultation is flawed. What is rationale for including settlement now, not in first draft? Only two thirds of sites were consulted on in the Town Plan; numbers jumped by ten from 200/500 to 2,500. |
| | Strongly support the Green Belt, open spaces and the green buffer on the map |
| Site New Settlement 1 Handforth East 273 representations by 244 people 13 support 219 object 41 comment | Do not let development remove the banks adjacent to the A34 which are there to mitigate the noise. |
| | Proposing sites that are not linked to established settlements might lead to the Core Strategy being unsound. |
| | A sustainable location for additional housing, close to jobs and services, ideal for high quality housing for commuters close to HS2, Manchester and airport. |
| | Could be a reasonable site if done in isolation, with no development at Woodford or Wilmslow. |
| | If a large need exists, a large development is totally appropriate. Scattered small sites will be inefficient and infrastructure support is likely to prove inadequate. |
| | Pg 25 Fig 5.2 key diagram is incorrect. There is no gap between Handforth north boundary and Stockport. |
| | Do not support building on Green Belt. Nothing to justify why Green Belt in Handforth East should be released and that in Wilmslow saved. Use brownfield first. |
| | Green Belt Swap is flawed as it seeking to protect one location at the expense of another, entirely unrelated location |
| | Site is precious open space and important ecologically with protected |

| | |
|--|---|
| | species. |
| | High density developments on greenfield sites will greatly diminish the attractiveness of the area to high skilled businesses |
| | Development will result in Handforth being swallowed by Manchester and Stockport, merging into it and losing community identity. This, with or without development at Woodford, will result in loss of buffer land. |
| | Traffic modelling required identifying the wider effects of such a massive new settlement, particularly on the A34, plus development at Woodford. |
| | Contrary to national and local policy including CEC Policies CS8, CS9, SC4, SE3, SR13, EG5 and C01. |
| | Needs cross boundary co-operation: this settlement will benefit neighbouring authorities more. It will meet needs of Manchester, not Cheshire East. |
| | No evidence of need for this scale of development in this locality. |
| | Object to the proposed commercial development immediately to the east of the historic Handforth Hall. |
| | Seek Section 106 contributions to enhance Handforth Station |
| | Constraints to development include contamination issues. |
| | Proposals will destroy the last open view from Wilmslow to the Pennine Hills. Handforth is intimately connected with Wilmslow. |
| | The phasing of the new settlements do not relate to the draft 2012 SHLAA. |
| | Barthomley proposals are unacceptable: this is Green Belt land. NPPF does not support Green Belt proposals. What are the exceptional circumstances? |
| Figure 8.12 South East Crewe 33 representations by 32 people 3 support 24 object 6 comment | Cannot be sustainable if built on Green Belt and inhabitants have to travel to Manchester/elsewhere for work. |
| | Green Belt amendment should be underpinned by a comprehensive borough-wide Green Belt review process with recognised methodology which has been subject to consultation. |
| | Prefer sites which link to existing established settlements before considering 'new settlements' |
| | If any of the dwelling proposals comes to fruition, the road infrastructure including B5077 will be totally inadequate. |
| | Far too many proposals for this area to make development supportable. Four significant sites within a few miles is over-development and abuse of green gap land. |
| | Village A or B would potentially damage existing communities and the local environment. |
| | Support the new settlement based on conditions: ensure continuing and future separation of Alsager and Crewe; restrict settlement size and ensure appropriate road infrastructure. |
| | Designate strategic open gap between Crewe and Alsager. |
| | There is a very well established equine community in this area. No provision has been made for potential relocation of 100s of horses if this development is allowed. |
| | No evidence of need for the proposed number of houses or that infrastructure can support population and traffic increase. |
| | What is the extent of this proposed Green Gap? Clarify map. |
| | Take into account SEMMS road development and housing to be built at Woodford. |
| | Proposals are fundamentally flawed, document approach is unsound, contrary to national policy and its own objectives. Inadequate evidence has |

| | |
|--|--|
| | been provided to justify disregarding the alternatives in favour of a new distant settlement. |
| | Dualling the A500 and enhancing J.16 of the M6 are not reliant on development of new settlements in the A500 corridor. Can be funded by development elsewhere in/near Crewe. |
| | The Duchy must not be able to use its Crown Immunity (no CPO possible) to hold the Council and its communities to ransom. |
| | The new settlement would drain the existing people, resources and jobs out of surrounding settlements (specifically Crewe) need to demonstrate good connections with Crewe. |
| | Need more information on site constraints |
| | Land owned by Co-op at Snape Farm should be considered. |
| | CEC should consider this alternative: Site Phase 2 and 3 Employment Villages adjacent to each other on the East side of the M6, site Village B away from Barthomley on the East & North of the M6 where the Green Belt is of a lesser landscape value. Retain the Barthomley Green Belt. |
| Site New Settlement 2 South East Crewe 91 representations by 84 people 3 support 80 object 8 comment | Strongly opposed to the proposed new settlements. We contest the benefits listed at para 5.85. |
| | Area does not meet infrastructure accessibility standards |
| | Site is too far from Crewe to provide its employment/housing. Development near Crewe would be more appropriate. The industrial development will be poorly connected to Crewe and will have a greater relationship with the M6 corridor. |
| | Lack of evidence, particularly for Green Belt review. No exceptional circumstances. To propose greenbelt development without strong justification would render plan preparation unlawful in the context of Strategic Environment Assessment. The proposal is unsound and destabilises the DDS. |
| | Green Belt should be protected, not developed. 'Improvements' cannot compensate for the loss of an asset formed over thousands of years. Contravenes CEC's commitment to protect Cheshire countryside and develop on brownfield sites. |
| | Object to the loss of agricultural land for future food production |
| | Development will negatively impact the thriving equestrian economy which supports rural pastimes and provides jobs. |
| | The Duchy of Lancaster proposals are completely out of line with the character and infrastructure of the local area. |
| | No reference to Barthomley or the Crewe Green Conservation Area. Should not be development in or adjacent to these. |
| | Extra traffic will worsen air quality, causing health problems. Work with South Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group to improve environmental conditions of children at risk of respiratory disease. |
| | The proposed expansion of road systems and development of industrial units will not assist Government goal of reducing carbon emissions. |
| | The only justification is Duchy release of land to dual A500. Barthomley should not be sacrificed to pay for rectifying the problems with the A500. Need for dualling has not been proven; it may compound congestion; at best would provide a negligible short-term solution. |
| | Planning process undermined by Duchy influence. Objective assessment in accordance with regulations and SEA Directive would not substantiate the claim that the Duchy land is the only viable, available and deliverable |

| | |
|--|--|
| | alternative. |
| | Since the submission, an Arup report for the local authority has been published. It makes no case for 73ha of additional employment land. |
| | Consider effect of stormwater from 1,000 roofs and tarmac drives on existing marshland, and damage to railway. |
| | Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact on nearby settlements in Newcastle and North Staffordshire. Alternative sites are considered more sustainable/appropriate. |
| | No reference to the development of new settlements in earlier Core Strategy consultation documents |
| | Do not allow Crewe and Alsager to merge |
| | Village A is generally OK |
| | Village B is too far from Crewe. |
| | This proposition is contrary to national policy, contrary to the stated Vision and Objectives of the emerging Core Strategy. |
| | Widen the area of search beyond the Duchy land |
| | Consider land at Gorsty Hill as an alternative |
| | Support inclusion of sports and leisure facilities, but scale, type and location must be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and an Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy |
| | Good infrastructure can be built here with links to the A500, M6 and HS2 railway |
| | The development of this site would directly compete with the preferred strategic sites of Basford East and West which are in the Draft Crewe Town Strategy and Development Strategy. |
| | Support the proposed new villages south-east of Crewe and north of the A500 link. Crucial to the dualling of the A500 and the development of business in this area. |
| Site New Settlement 2a Village A: Crewe Hall / Stowford 24 representations by 22 people 0 support 22 object 2 comment | Stowford will become connected to Crewe. Its identity, and that of Weston village, will be lost |
| | Object to the loss of farmland |
| | Complete disregard for the current Green Belt, green gap and conservation areas |
| | Insufficient definition of the need for the additional housing and employment area |
| | Limited consideration of alternatives. Clarify the logic that justified the selections you have made |
| | You allowed the Duchy to dictate your planning strategy. You reached an immoral arrangement that if CEC allows Duchy land sale for development, Duchy will provide CEC with land and fund A500 dualling. |
| | The council can provide no evidence that the A500 improvements will solve the peak time congestion. |
| | Contradicts the Weston and Basford Parish Plan, Development Strategy principles and draft Crewe Town Strategy |
| | Additional constraints: listed buildings, archaeology, flooding, peat deposits, biological and ecological interest including bats |
| | Infrastructure requirements including secondary school provision |
| | Crewe needs affordable housing centrally located to revitalise the town centre and attract businesses. No evidence of need for housing of this nature in open countryside. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Significant deliverability concerns. Can it meet its intended purpose? Risks the CS being found unsound. |
| | Unique landscape, not typical. Contains the “distilled essence” of a Cheshire Landscape |
| | Village A not too far from existing services and adjacent Basford |
| | No consideration of potential adverse impact of developments to the South East of Crewe on neighbouring parishes through congestion and erosion of the Green Belt |
| | Object to Village A: highways infrastructure issues, grade 2 agricultural land, urban sprawl, impact on village character, high landscape value, development containment issues due to few physical boundaries |
| Site New Settlement 2b Village B (Area of Search): Barthomley 65 representations by 64 people 1 support 55 object 9 comment | Will ruin the village. |
| | Complete disregard for the Green Belt and conservation areas. No evidence of exceptional circumstances to allow amendment to greenbelt boundaries. Consider and use all alternative brownfield and greenfield sites before building on Green Belt. Contrary to NPPF. |
| | This area is only of interest because of its links to the M6 and proposed HS2 line |
| | Will deny farmers their livelihoods as their land is taken away |
| | Too many proposals in this area - development is not supportable. Four significant sites (all greenfield) within a few miles of each other is over-development. |
| | Centre the new village around the railway line |
| | Straighten Butterton Lane into Old Park Road. |
| | A large livery yard would need to be relocated |
| | No wildlife survey |
| | Compensation would be required if this happens |
| | Unsustainable location and size. Lack of justification for this site and scale of development in light of constraints |
| | No infrastructure in the area of search to sustain a development of this size. Roads are in a dreadful state as a result of current traffic use. |
| | Limited consideration of other options and the logic that justified the selections. |
| | Supporting plans for proposal 2b |
| | Development is well outside Crewe so will not support town regeneration. |
| | Will be a commuter village adding thousands of cars to the already-congested roads. |
| | Need good transport links (footpath, cycleway, road and rail) between "Village B" and Alsager. Alsager needs additional infrastructure. None of this appears in the plan. |
| | Adverse impact on regeneration efforts in Stoke and Newcastle. |
| | More innovative solutions needed rather than over-reliance on "dualling A500", which will not work. |
| | Village B should be a strategic site of 2,604 dwellings - not an Area of Search and not referenced as Barthomley. |
| | Village B is remote. Provide transport links/improvements, new local centre etc in conjunction with residential development |
| | With regard to Village B and the proposed industrial allocations within the A500 corridor - if absolutely necessary, Phase 3 should be moved east of the M6; Village B should be moved north and east distancing it from Barthomley |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and reducing impact on the Green Belt. |
| | Acknowledge the brownfield proposal for 1,000 houses at White Moss Quarry rather than greenbelt Barthomley. |
| | Junct.16 redevelopment could be less expensive by taking slip roads from before the roundabout straight to the M6. Cardway Business Park could be in a position to be redeveloped. |
| Site New Settlement 2c Employment Area 1 17 representations by 16 people 0 support 15 object 2 comment | Councillors have put on record their determination to see this proposal through, making a mockery of consultation. |
| | Compensation must be a condition of the proposal |
| | National policy states that Green Belt should only be developed in exceptional circumstances if there is no viable alternative. Also contrary to the emerging Core Strategy. By no means the appropriate option amongst alternatives. |
| | The arrangement reached with the Duchy is immoral. Planning process undermined by Duchy influence |
| | Loss of farmland does not meet sustainability requirements. |
| | No need for additional service area. Junction 16 improvements must include an underpass for the A500 major east-west trunk route. Existing roundabout very dangerous and congested. |
| | Dualling of A500 alone will not remove terrible congestion on this road. Need to widen A500 not explored, let alone proven. |
| | The Duchy's case for strategic employment land allocations to the extent of 124ha is underpinned by the overall need for circa 323ha identified in the Employment Land Review (2012) and the Economic Benefits Report (2013) |
| | |
| Site New Settlement 2d Employment Area 2 21 representations by 20 people 0 support 19 object 2 comment | Feels like a done deal. |
| | Make sure those who are impacted are taken care of with specific agreed mitigation measures and/or compensation as a condition of the proposal going ahead. |
| | There has been no evidence provided to support a need for such a development, especially on Green Belt. |
| | Exceptional circumstances to develop Green Belt don't exist. Whole proposal unsound, unjustified, contrary to national policy and the emerging Core Strategy. Not the most appropriate option, thus destabilising the DDS |
| | The development of the Radway Green Strategic Site would support and establish this area as a sustainable strategic employment location close to Junction 16 of the M6. |
| | Removal of farmland does not meet sustainability requirements |
| | Use alternative brownfield sites which are available including empty employment sites around junction 16 first; also empty employment sites in Crewe and Staffordshire. |
| | Too close to BAE systems |
| | Existing employment areas in Alsager are being conceded for housing. Not sustainable. Keep better located established employment sites. |
| | Consult with Staffordshire on the most effective way to meet local needs without building on farmland and greenbelt |
| | Planning process undermined by Duchy influence. Economics of the proposal won't work. |
| | Need to widen A500 not explored, let alone proven. |
| | More investigative work must be done on Junction 16 eg underpass, dedicated lanes, use of Junction 17 for northbound traffic in and out of Crewe (saving approx 6 miles). |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The Duchy's case for strategic employment land allocations to the extent of 124ha is underpinned by the overall need for circa 323ha identified in the Employment Land Review (2012) and the Economic Benefits Report (2013) |
| Site New Settlement 2e Employment Area 3 20 representations by 19 people 0 support 19 object 1 comment | Feels like a done deal |
| | Make sure those who are impacted are taken care of, with specific agreed mitigation measures and/or compensation as a condition of the proposal going ahead. |
| | There has been no evidence provided to support a need for such a development, especially on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances to develop Green Belt don't exist. Whole proposal is unjustified, contrary to national policy and the emerging Core Strategy. It is not the appropriate option. It is unsound and destabilises the DDS. |
| | Need to widen A500 not explored, let alone proven. Will be negated by scale of proposed development |
| | Removal of farmland and livelihoods of current/future farmers does not meet sustainability requirements. |
| | Use alternative brownfield sites eg empty employment sites in Crewe and Staffordshire. |
| | Consult with Staffs regarding the most effective way to meet local needs without building on farmland and Green Belt |
| | Planning process undermined by Duchy influence. |
| | Economics of the proposal won't work. |
| | Green Belt swap is a preposterous concept |
| | More investigative work must be done on Junction 16 e.g. underpass, dedicated lanes, use of Junction 17 for northbound traffic in and out of Crewe (saving approx 6 miles journey). |
| | The Duchy's case for strategic employment land allocations to the extent of 124ha is underpinned by the overall need for circa 323ha identified in the Employment Land Review (2012) and the Economic Benefits Report (2013) |
| | Radway Green's redevelopment already delayed for 5 years. Noise and light pollution would spoil Barthomley. Is no justification for this development in Green Belt when alternatives eg Basford |
| | Too close to Barthomley's conservation area. |
| | Industrial estates should be nearer to Crewe to reduce need to travel by car and generate less CO2 emissions |
| | Local infrastructure will be unable to cope with extra traffic |
| | Affordable homes - a recent survey indicates over 1,500 properties within a five mile radius in the range up to £200k, with over 1,000 in the £50k to £150k range. |
| Committed Strategic Sites 21 representations by 21 people 0 support 1 object 20 comment | Question the justification for including units on sites that are not currently under construction in the period 2010-15. This is due to the Council's lead in times set out in the 2012 SHLAA Update (2 years for sites with full planning permission and 2.5 years for sites with outline permission.) |
| Site Crewe 9 Coppenhall East and Maw Green 5 representations | Development is likely to result in substantial traffic increases affecting Warmingham village. Need traffic management plans to mitigate the impact on the village, loss of amenity and character. Need S106 or CIL funds to develop infrastructure in/around Warmingham i.e. highways, traffic calming |

| | |
|---|---|
| by 5 people 2 support 1 object 2 comment | etc. |
| | Support – include the site on Strategic Sites map (Figure 8.1) & Growth Distribution Table 8.1 as it is of strategic importance to the delivery of the Local Plan and has a resolution to grant planning permission, subject to Section 106 agreement |
| | Site will not provide 30% affordable housing – question its sustainability |
| Site Crewe 10 Parkers Road 2 representations by 2 people 0 support 1 object 1 comment | Development is likely to result in substantial traffic increases affecting Warmingham village. Need traffic management plans to mitigate the impact on the village, loss of amenity and character. Needs S106 or CIL funds to develop infrastructure in/around Warmingham i.e. highways, traffic calming etc. |
| | Doubt that site will provide 30% affordable housing |
| Site Middlewich 4 Warmingham Lane 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 3 object 0 comment | No reference to Town Strategy |
| | No reference to infrastructure required. Concern over impact of increased traffic; demand on local services |
| | Must secure CIL/S106 contributions to ensure provision of infrastructure |
| | No justification for loss of agricultural land |
| Site Midpoint 18 (phase 3) 3 representations by 3 people 1 support 0 object 2 comment | Completion of the bypass will enhance Middlewich |
| | Hotel design must be high quality |
| | What is the justification to make more employment land available when existing employment land is not being taken up? |
| Site Sandbach 3 Sandbach South West (Fodens Factory and Test Track and Canal Fields) 5 representations by 5 people 1 support 2 object 2 comment | Impact of traffic from development |
| | Impact of development on existing services (schools, health etc) |
| | Hotel development must be of high quality design |
| | Impact of development on the village of Warmingham |
| Site Holmes Chapel 1 Former Fisons (Sanofi Aventis / Rhodia) 6 representations by 5 people 4 support 0 object 2 comment | Impact of traffic and parking arising from new development |
| | Hotel development should be of high quality design |
| | A good use of a brownfield site |
| | Impact on Cranage and Goostrey |
| Proposed Growth Distribution 7 representations | Either plan and build at a substantial scale and sustainable density (new settlement of 5-8,000 homes) or not at all. |
| | What are the sources of figures? I suspect they would not withstand close |

| | |
|---|--|
| by 7 people 1 support 4 object 2 comment | scrutiny. |
| | The scale of flexibility and contingency should have been transparent [some unexplained inconsistency]. 8.65 reads suspiciously like a get-out clause to impose even more development |
| | Identify Village A and B as site allocations; increase the scale of development to 1,650 dwellings for Village A and 2,600 dwellings for Village B. |
| | 836 homes is an unreasonable addition to small towns |
| | Tables 8.1 to 8.6 - The sites include identified Strategic Sites and Site Allocations. Does this imply that sites have been allocated before this strategy has even been adopted? |
| Table 8.1 Principal Towns 11 representations by 10 people 3 support 3 object 5 comment | Disproportionate focus on Crewe – there should be no more than 5,000 dwellings there. 40% of all new build will be within 6 miles of Crewe and Nantwich. |
| | Object to the housing on the Basford employment sites. |
| | Disproportionate focus on the Green Belt. |
| | New housing should be focused on our Principal Towns and linked to local business workforce requirements |
| | The number of 'site allocations' between Crewe (1,500+) and Macclesfield (0) appears totally inconsistent. |
| | Does not attempt to show brownfield contributions or allowance to meet totals |
| | The figures have no reliable source and are unlikely to stand up to scrutiny. There has been no detailed, in depth, objective assessment of needs and impact before developing a strategy |
| Table 8.2 Key Service Centres 15 representations by 14 people 1 support 9 object 5 comment | The number of 'site allocations' for each town seems wildly inconsistent, with no evidence to support how they have been derived. Surely 0 is too low, but where do the 600 site allocations to Congleton come from? |
| | The table states that there are 7 Site Allocations in Knutsford without linking those sites to the 2 sites in the description of the Strategic Sites section (8.37 to 8.41). If there are indeed 7 sites, they should be named and shown on a map. |
| | Overall numbers for Handforth, Knutsford, Poynton and Wilmslow are too low. Fails to meet NPPF guidelines on this. |
| | Does not show any brownfield contribution to totals |
| | The figures need to build in a greater level of flexibility for Congleton and to incorporate an appropriate buffer. |
| | The negative figure of -36 completions for Poynton does not reflect the real situation. These now-demolished flats had been largely empty for many years. |
| | Objection to housing numbers in Alsager - should be 1,300. |
| | Updated figures are required to reflect the SHLAA report and Queens Drive, Nantwich approval. |
| | Growth in Wilmslow seems low in comparison to Service Centres such as Alsager & Congleton |
| Table 8.3 New Settlements 3 representations by 3 people 1 support 2 object 0 comment | Object to the 2 new villages in Crewe. If it is impossible to develop the Basford employment sites without additional funding, only village A should be considered. |
| | Object to inclusion of these proposals which occupy strategic greenbelt sites contrary to national, regional and existing local policies. Will be detrimental to vitality and viability of nearby towns in Cheshire East, Stoke and Newcastle-under-Lyme |

| | |
|--|---|
| Table 8.4 Local Service Centres 7 representations by 7 people 2 support 3 object 2 comment | This appears to be too high for Local Service Centres |
| | Agree that growth needs to be accommodated in all settlements including Local Service Centres. However, it is not clear how the requirement of 2,000 dwelling over the Plan period will be apportioned. |
| Table 8.5 Sustainable Villages 4 representations by 3 people 0 support 4 object 0 comment | Delivery of 175 dwellings for 2010-12 in SVs is evidence that delivery won't be met where policies are too tightly constrained. Greater flexibility should be provided by increasing/removing dwelling limits for Infill in Policy CS6 and recognising value of market housing to meet local needs. |
| Table 8.6 Totals 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 2 object 1 comment | The focus on sites around Crewe and Nantwich feels too dominant. |
| | The predominance of allocations around Crewe is just as unsustainable for this preferred option (option 7) as it was acknowledged to be for most of the other options considered. |
| | The proposal is not sustainable within the NPPF |
| 9 Your Views 207 representations by 199 people 1 support 182 object 24 comment | Our views will not be taken into account |
| | Include aspiration for 20mph default speed limit in residential areas |
| | Hard to reconcile your emphases on road building, sustainability and safety |
| | All comments on Town Strategies have been swept aside |
| | Not enough publicity – you have hidden the document. Extend the consultation period while more publicity is undertaken and the process is made more accessible |
| | Previous consultations were not fair either |
| | Why is 'no development' not presented as an option? |
| | For reasons of democracy, planning applications should have been suspended while this consultation took place. How else can they be addressed? |
| | Consultation is only accessible to those with internet access, language skills and internet skills. Document stresses the ageing population but does not have a consultation to cater to it |
| | Level of response to this vital document is disappointing and suggests there has not been enough promotion |
| | The most difficult consultation I have ever participated in |
| | Does not align with the Government's 'Consultation Principles' of July 2012 and hence the outcome will be subject to legal challenge |
| | Online questionnaire does not allow us to express exactly how we feel about proposals – support/object/comment on long sections of the document is far too simplistic |
| | Hard to access, even for the IT literate. Portal was difficult to use. |
| | Badly structured document |
| | Designed to discourage comment – was this done on purpose? |
| | Lack of transparency |
| | How will you use text contributions? |
| | Should not have withdrawn Freepost address |
| | CEC should work in partnership with local groups who really represent their |

| | |
|--|---|
| | communities, have local knowledge and will have to live with the proposals |
| | Proposals are not sustainable |
| | Proposals do not comply with the NPPF |
| | Proposals will be a disaster for quality of life and the countryside |
| | We require the plan to include quantifiable mechanisms for local involvement |
| | Consultation process has been too short for the number and complexity of documents |
| | Only one reference paper copy provided in the Congleton Library – what about those who work or have disabilities which prevent them from using a computer? |
| | The portal and web imply that comments can only be made online – will postal comments be accepted? |
| | It has taken too long to get this far – lack of a strategy would not be acceptable in a commercial environment. Stop the ‘open door’ for developers by using the Strategy now. |
| | Too many consultations have angered and confused the population. |
| | Suspicious that South East Crewe, Shavington and Wybunbury, were deemed not in the Crewe area for the Town Strategy, but are considered in Crewe for the Development Strategy |
| | No evidence of cross-boundary cooperation with other Councils |
| | The plan would not at present pass the NPPF tests of soundness |
| | The website should allow for comments on the Summary Document |
| | The Summary Document is far too long |
| | Pre-filled in forms distributed by Congleton Town Council are skewing the comment process |
| | The plan lacks detail |
| | The Plan process should empower local people to decide on their area’s future. It contravenes the NPPF and Aarhus Convention |
| | Plan is very biased in favour of development |
| | The properties proposed will not be built due to funding issues |
| | Language used is too complex |
| | Little or no objective rationale for the exclusion of some sites, and the promotion of others |
| 10 Glossary 8 representations by 8 people 0 support 1 object 7 comment | Definitions not the same as previous documents, within other Local Plan documents and between the two consultation documents including omissions, wording differences. Need consistency, completeness and same coverage. |
| | Definition of affordable housing is too limited – see NPPF |
| | Add reference to NPPF |
| | Add terms: Small Scale and Meet Local Need, Village Plans |
| Appendix A: Summary of Consultation So Far 8 representations by 7 people 0 support 3 object | Question/complain of process of the consultations particularly on the Town Strategies and who was involved |
| | Town Strategy (Knutsford) should be finalised |
| | Inadequate advertising of this consultation |
| | Poynton was the largest single source of comments on the 2010 Core Strategy document, with more than from Crewe. Poynton residents express strong support for the Green Belt and opposition to further development around the village |

| | |
|--|---|
| 5 comment | |
| Appendix B: Cheshire East Strategies 8 representations by 8 people 4 support 2 object 2 comment | Ambition for All Strategy is fundamentally weak on the sports, leisure, play, open space, community buildings angle |
| | Prospectus for Crewe – does not mention significant number of houses outside Crewe boundary. Crewe strategy confirmed sufficient brownfield sites available for housing and employment development. |
| | Cheshire East Visitor Economy Strategy is a vital document to the growth potential and has links to many other strategies |
| | Development Strategy does not link well with the LTP nor the Economic Strategy (particularly in terms of Handforth East – will promote the need for travel particularly by car). Jobs and homes must be better related to each other and to existing service and town facilities. |
| | Essential rights of way are protected and improved |
| | Superficial account of Make it Macclesfield |
| | |
| Appendix C: Evidence Base 62 representations by 57 people 1 support 53 object 8 comment | Support Green Space Strategy but attention should be first placed on existing green space. |
| | Query how the open space and green space evidence has been translated into findings. |
| | Difficult to locate and navigate to Appendix C and the Evidence Base |
| | How will Cheshire East mitigate against the intrusive and deleterious effects of HS2 on the canal network |
| | Development Strategy and medium growth strategy does not reflect the SHMA. SHMA indicates the enormous unsatisfied demand and need for housing (market and local needs) |
| | The process for identifying sites for development is flawed. A survey of existing built up areas should have been undertaken before considering altering Green Belt Boundaries |
| | Question the Employment Land Review and interpretation into the Development Strategy. Employment land proposed will require more houses than proposed. |
| | Questions are raised regarding the availability, validity and robustness of the evidence that underpins the Development Strategy, particularly housing growth and distribution, need full Green Belt review, full Landscape Appraisal. Failure to undertake this work would raise significant concerns regarding the robustness/soundness of the evidence base. |
| | Evidence is unsound. Evidence base unsatisfactory, not robust and is inconsistent, including settlement hierarchy, Gypsy and Traveller Assessment out of date therefore evidence is fundamentally flawed. |
| | Population projections are too high and based on out of date data. Occupancy rates flawed, impact of ageing population not considered |
| | New SHLAA is incorrect / deeply flawed |
| | Too much information for people to digest and comment upon or navigate. |
| | Cheshire Retail Study flawed and needs updating including with regard to internet shopping and deficiency in the qualitative offer of main food retail. |
| | No evidence of working jointly with adjacent authorities |
| | How can you identify 27,000 houses are to be built but not where gypsy/traveller pitches are to be located? |
| | Affordable housing must be affordable |
| | Object to inclusion of specific sites around Congleton due to areas of special landscape interest/importance |
| | No justification for development of the scale proposed in the Green Belt |

| | |
|--|--|
| | around Knutsford |
| | Urgent need for publication and adoption of playing pitch strategy for Alsager |
| | Need a robust, up to date Playing Pitch strategy. The NPPF excludes playing pitches from being previously-developed land. A playing field includes the whole site in which the pitch is located. |
| | New settlement concept introduced at a late stage in the plan preparation and is not supported by evidence base |
| Table D1: Growth Strategy Options 10 representations by 9 people 0 support 10 object 0 comment | Low growth is preferred – only increase if economic growth returns/is demonstrated |
| | Evidence does not support medium growth choice |
| | High growth strategy should be adopted in line with evidence in the SHMA and ONS projections |
| | Start with the revitalisation of Crewe |
| | Growth options should vary by town not one for whole of Cheshire East |
| Table D2: Phasing Options 6 representations by 5 people 4 support 1 object 1 comment | Growth Strategy is unlikely to realize this amount of growth |
| | Projections have no credible basis |
| | Development must be phased |
| Table D.3 Option 1: Growth in Crewe and Key Service Centres Outside the Green Belt 6 representations by 6 people 0 support 5 object 1 comment | Odd to see the more affluent, middle class - and dare I add vocal - communities will be the least affected! |
| | Options 1-3 all show 37% of the planned growth going to Crewe. Not a proper consideration of alternatives. More growth should be diverted to Macclesfield and less to Crewe. |
| | More focus for housing should be on our Principal Towns where sustainable housing and job creation can be demonstrated and less on Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages where the argument for additional sustainable housing is less convincing |
| | Where is the Council's preferred Hybrid option 7 and which villages does it include? Assume the Council wants to ensure the percentage of housing increase does not unbalance the village population within its boundary. The village of Wybunbury will have a 45% increase in houses within its boundary. |
| | In the absence of a proper objective assessment of needs, you cannot produce reliable projections |
| | A higher % of development should go to the smaller villages eg the Hubs and Clusters approach used by Shropshire Council |
| Table D4 Option 2: Growth in Crewe and Macclesfield and Key Service Centres outside of the Green Belt 3 representations by 3 people 0 support | More focus on Principal Towns and Key Service Centres and less on the Local Service Centres and sustainable villages where requirement for additional housing is less convincing |
| | Macclesfield has not had recent economic success - the 2011 Cheshire Retail study shows it has declined over the last decade. An in-depth assessment of needs and impact assessment of proposals are required |
| | 9% to Congleton is far too much |

| | |
|--|---|
| 3 object 0 comment | |
| Table D5 Option 3: Growth in Crewe and Macclesfield and Accessible Towns 2 representations by 2 people 0 support 2 object 0 comment | <p>Macclesfield has not had recent economic success - the 2011 Cheshire Retail study shows it has declined over the last decade. An in-depth assessment of needs and impact assessment of proposals are required.</p> <p>Need more focus on Principal Towns and Key Service Centres</p> |
| Table D.6 Option 4: Rural Variant 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 3 object 0 comment | <p>This option should be taken forward – would encourage sustainable growth. Flexible policy could allow development where it meets local needs or delivers local improvements.</p> <p>Macclesfield has not had recent economic success - the 2011 Cheshire Retail study shows it has declined over the last decade. An in depth assessment of needs & an impact assessment of proposals are required.</p> <p>Need more focus on Principal Towns and Key Service Centres and less on the Local Service Centres and sustainable villages where requirement for additional housing is less convincing</p> |
| Table D.7 Option 5: A New Settlement and the Principles of the Town Strategy Documents 1 representation by 1 person 0 support 1 object 0 comment | In the absence of a proper objective assessment of needs, you cannot produce reliable projections |
| Table D.8 Option 6: Growth Reflecting the Principles of the Town Strategy Documents 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 3 object 0 comment | <p>Why isn't this shown in the same way as the other options? Where is the table that shows the percentage of the proportion of development by town for the proposed option?</p> <p>In the absence of a proper objective assessment of needs, you cannot produce reliable projections</p> <p>There should be no building in the Green Belt around Poynton: the village cannot cope with more than 200 new dwellings by 2030. This was supported by the Town Strategy consultation.</p> |
| Strategic Open Gaps and the Open Countryside: Alternatives Considered 3 representations | <p>Both these options open the door to speculative developments absolutely anywhere</p> <p>Each Green Belt area stands on its own merit - the existing Green Belt should be preserved as well as creating new sites. The latter shouldn't be created at the expense of the other.</p> <p>Option 2, removal of the green gaps, should be strongly opposed to avoid exploitation by speculative developers.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| by 3 people 0 support 2 object 1 comment | |
| Appendix E: Strategic Sites - Alternatives 40 representations by 35 people 2 support 7 object 31 comment | This section has a misleading title. It should be made clear that "alternative" should read alternatives considered and rejected. It should state that applications on these sites will be rejected. |
| | Agree, a new settlement at Wardle should not be pursued |
| | Agree, such sites should not be brought forward in the Local Plan |
| | Provide reasoned justification for not including the alternative sites as 'Preferred Options'. |
| | Not sufficient justification for exclusion of a number of sites around Crewe that could be developed instead of Green Belt sites near Newcastle and Stoke-on-Trent. |
| | Disregards new settlement sites at Wardle, Siddington and Chelford without sufficient justification |
| | Network Rail is concerned that in addition to the proposed areas of development, the alternative sites may also be the subject of planning applications |
| | Need to be able to understand which alternative sites would be required in the plan period in the event the overall housing requirement is increased to correctly reflect the evidence base. |
| | Sandbach Road North (phase 1), Alsager should be allocated for 155 dwellings and phase 2 for 62 dwellings |
| | The site at Audlem Road, Audlem should be allocated for 95 dwellings |
| | The 194 consented dwellings at Warmingham Lane, Middlewich should be included as a commitment in the Core Strategy |
| | Peckforton Estates land ownerships in Bunbury and Peckforton should be identified for housing |
| | Church Lane, Wistaston, Crewe should be considered for allocation |
| | The following sites should be identified for development in the new Local Plan: Land off Warmingham Lane, Middlewich; Land off Holmes Chapel Road and Sandbach Road, Congleton |
| | Newbold Astbury-cum-Moreton Parish Council is 100% opposed to Appendix E. |
| Figure E.1 Alternative Strategic Sites around Crewe 4 representations by 4 people 2 support 1 object 1 comment | Within the Coppenhall East Extension, the Broughton Road site provides a logical first phase of residential development |
| | Sustainable location for additional housing |
| | Support the inclusion of the Coppenhall East extension |
| Site Crewe 11 (Alternative) Coppenhall East Extension 7 representations by 7 people 2 support | Area should be designated Green Gap. Waldron's Lane is an area for walking, cycling, bird watching etc. If this area remained green it would stop Coppenhall running into Leighton and Warmingham. |
| | Logical area to develop. Sustainable location, within Crewe area; available amenities and employment. Adjacent land has permission for 650 dwellings. Constraints can be mitigated. |
| | Non-selection requires further justification. Site could accommodate |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 object 1 comment | development with a lesser impact on the regeneration of North Staffordshire, more sustainable |
| | Adjacent to railway line. Developers must contact Network Rail to ensure protection from development impacts; mitigate railway noise and vibration considering any future intensification of routes |
| | Should show commitments within the context of the wider Strategy on a plan base |
| | Site offers the opportunity for infrastructure north of the town ie northern section of ring road from the Haslington Bypass to Parkers Road (junction east of West Coast Mainline) using the Haslington Bypass; Crewe Green Link Road and the Shavington Bypass, providing access to locations including Leighton Hospital without going through Crewe town centre, relieving pressure on Middlewich Road. |
| Site Crewe 12 (Alternative) South West Crewe 6 representations by 5 people 1 support 5 object 0 comment | Any development must include removal of underground sewage tanks in the south east corner of this area which discharge raw sewage into Wistaston Brook |
| | High density housing - out of keeping with the rest of the area |
| | Infrastructure will not cope, especially with increased traffic volumes |
| | Development will increase drainage flow which will result in extra flooding downstream in places like Northwich |
| | This site is not in Crewe it is in the parish of Wistaston and should be listed as such. This deception invalidates this consultation |
| | Site could accommodate development which would have a lesser impact on the regeneration of North Staffordshire than other sites but would represent more sustainable development and growth |
| | Developing a site here would cause urban sprawl - Wistonians wish to keep the individual identity of their village |
| | Development would be detrimental to the Joey the Swan amenity by overshadowing it and spoil its visual appearance |
| | Overhead power lines cross the site which will need either a significant stand-off or alternatively diversion at significant cost |
| | The centre of the site is identified as being a former landfill site - the site may not be developable at all. |
| Site Crewe 13 (Alternative) Land South of Gresty Lane 8 representations by 8 people 1 support 3 object 4 comment | Within Crewe boundary. Logical infill. Sustainable. |
| | Do not support development on this site but it has fewer constraints than land at Barthomley and is more sustainable |
| | Building on green gap land would set a precedent for the rest of the green gaps in the Cheshire East area - defend the green gaps |
| | The rationale for exclusion of the site as a Strategic Site is not clearly expressed. Site could accommodate development which would have a lesser impact on the regeneration of North Staffordshire than other sites but would represent more sustainable development and growth |
| | Adjacent to railway line. Developers must contact Network Rail to ensure development does not impact the railway. Mitigate railway noise and vibration including consideration of potential future intensification of routes. |
| | Object to the exclusion of this site from the list of Strategic Sites - it is a more suitable and sustainable alternative. The site is residential led; available; deliverable; more suitable and sustainable; Crewe and Shavington will remain separate; the A500 is a logical, long term defensible boundary. Site is free from any major site constraints. |
| | Part of the site which is not Green Gap is subject to appeal after refusal of |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>application for 165 dwellings, contrary to Officer recommendation. This area has a close affinity with Crewe Town Centre and Basford West.</p> <p>Too many sites for Crewe left to be identified at the Site Allocations stage.</p> <p>Unsuitable site due to its location; separated from the rest of Crewe by railway lines. Access is 2.7km away and is circuitous.</p> |
| <p>Crewe 14 (Alternative) Land at Sydney Road Crewe East</p> <p>8 representations by 7 people 1 support 6 object 1 comment</p> | <p>This area of Crewe should not be put forward for development. The constraints far outweigh the benefits. The Sydney and Maw Green areas are already very congested and cannot cope with the existing amount of traffic</p> <p>This site is in the Green Gap and would significantly reduce the gap between Crewe and Haslington.</p> <p>Brownfield first not green gap</p> <p>Logical area to develop, within Crewe boundary, close to employment and sustainable</p> <p>The rationale for exclusion of the site as a Strategic Site is not clearly expressed. Site could accommodate development which would have a lesser impact on the regeneration of North Staffordshire than other sites but would represent more sustainable development and growth</p> <p>If the site is developed, the A534 would provide a very strong, defensible boundary to limit the development of Crewe to the east.</p> <p>Too many sites for Crewe left to be identified at the Site Allocations stage</p> <p>Re constraints, studies will be carried out and mitigation carried out as appropriate. At this stage, there are no constraints which indicate potential prejudice or delay to development of the site</p> <p>The proposed development will contribute towards CEC's highway schemes, assisting in capacity improvements.</p> <p>The site is available, achievable, and developable</p> <p>Local people need this open land, for health benefits</p> <p>Traffic is a concern - additional housing would make this worse</p> |
| <p>Figure E.2 Alternative Strategic Sites around Macclesfield</p> <p>10 representations by 10 people 4 support 0 object 6 comment</p> | <p>Use brownfield sites first or town centre before considering greenbelt sites</p> <p>Do not develop the sites north of Macclesfield ie 5, 6,8 as they are unsustainable, there are current traffic issues/infrastructure inadequacies that will be exacerbated</p> |
| <p>Site Macclesfield 5 (Alternative) Land west of Priory Lane</p> <p>39 representations by 36 people 17 support 9 object 13 comment</p> | <p>Develop/redevelop this site – suitable, sustainable site, green belt equal to others being proposed, will allow the Rugby Club to establish a sustainable long term future</p> <p>Retain Rugby Club/do not develop this site – Green Belt serves greenbelt functions, important sports facility, impact on infrastructure including road network and on local schools). Supporters of the redevelopment do not understand the implications of this.</p> |
| Site Macclesfield | Retain/do not develop this site – due to impact on ancient woodland, |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 (Alternative) Land north of Birtles Road 10 representations by 9 people 6 support 1 object 3 comment | drainage issues, and ecological value |
| | Develop area around existing Leisure Centre as a sports village |
| | Develop for housing – sustainable location and better than some of the other options/sites |
| Site Macclesfield 7 (Alternative) Lane east of London Road 10 representations by 9 people 1 support 5 object 4 comment | Develop site – is available, suitable and achievable and greater deliverability than other Strategic Sites. Possible to form a defensible greenbelt boundary. |
| | If developed will require mitigation measures having regard to proximity to railway. |
| | Retain/do not develop this site – compound existing traffic problems, site serves important greenbelt function which is narrow here, flood risk potential, working farm with no defensible greenbelt boundary |
| Site Macclesfield 8 (Alternative) Land north of Prestbury Road 34 representations by 32 people 15 support 10 object 9 comment | Develop site as it is suitable for development and sustainable and would have less impact than other greenbelt areas. |
| | Retain/do not develop this site – serves the greenbelt functions, area is important for environmental, landscape, ecological/wildlife reasons, it is unsustainable and would have detrimental impact on infrastructure including traffic issues |
| Site Macclesfield 9 (Alternative) Land at Gaw End Lane 6 representations by 6 people 1 support 3 object 2 comment | Develop north of Gaw End Lane only – site is available now and development is achievable in early stages of plan period. |
| | If developed will require mitigation measures having regard to proximity to railway. |
| | Retain/do not develop – site serves important greenbelt functions which is narrow here, it would exacerbate current traffic issues |
| Site Macclesfield 10 (Alternative) Land between Chelford Road and Whirley Road 9 representations by 9 people 2 support | Develop – site is available, suitable, viable and deliverable. The strategy fails to allocate enough sites. |
| | Retain/do not develop – site serves important greenbelt functions which is narrow here, site is of high ecological and landscape value including protected trees and contains power lines |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 object 6 comment | |
| Figure E.3 Alternative Strategic Sites around Alsager 15 representations made by 14 people 3 support 6 object 6 comment | <p>Support for the fact that these alternative sites have not been included in the Plan: should have been excluded from document altogether and only be in SHLAA; areas used for recreation; sites should be referred to as “ alternative sites considered then rejected”</p> <p>There should be no permission for housing in the area south of Crewe Road - in munitions blast zone</p> <p>MMU site should be considered for development: would round off town and provide housing, employment plus infrastructure</p> <p>Alternative sites put forward: land at Lady Farm Bungalow, off Dunnocksfold Road; area H in the former Draft Alsager Town Strategy document; land to rear of 52-68 Close Lane, Alsager</p> |
| Site Alsager 4 (Alternative) Fanny’s Croft 16 representations made by 15 people 1 support 9 object 6 comments | <p>Site should not be developed - unsustainable; outside current boundary of Alsager; encroaches into countryside; no development south of brook; amenity space/green lung; public rights of way across site; manage as parkland for Alsager and wider catchment area; support rejection of the site; should be described as Green Belt</p> <p>Development would put pressure on roads and level crossing and infrastructure generally; some flood risk</p> <p>Alternative view – natural urban extension site</p> <p>Adjacent railway line so Network Rail need to be informed re mitigation, noise and vibration</p> |
| Site Alsager 5 (Alternative) Former MMU extension land 12 representations made by 12 people 2 support 5 object 5 comments | <p>Site has always been fields and open countryside and should remain as such; many footpaths – used by local people; insufficient local demand for housing – only need to use MMU site adjacent; site should be called land to west of former MMU campus (site J Alsager Town Strategy) – good to see site rejected</p> <p>Site should be considered as provides a better western edge to settlement; could provide a mix of housing and other development to support Alsager as a key service centre</p> <p>Site better than site 4 – better road access, less used by walkers, closer to schools, scope for traffic free routes</p> |
| Fig E.4 Alternative Strategic Sites around Congleton 4 Representations by 4 people 1 support 2 object 1 comment | <p>No further development in Congleton West. Future developments should rectify the strange shape of the town and move the shopping centre back to the geographical town centre</p> <p>Congleton is constrained. Council should re-think distribution of housing and employment land and distribute the dwellings and employment land in a northerly and westerly direction.</p> <p>We support exclusion of these sites on accessibility grounds. They should be protected through Green Belt/Local Green Space designation as they enable access to open countryside from the town centre.</p> <p>Evidence must be more robust. Need full assessment of all SHLAA sites including infrastructure.</p> |
| Site Congleton 5 (Alternative) Congleton West 13 representations by 12 people | <p>The site potentially needs to include some older persons provision</p> <p>Deliverability is less reliant upon development of the link road</p> <p>Better site than Congleton 1 with access to A34 and A534. Much of land currently not used.</p> <p>Out of this list of so called constraints, none is material in its own right. Collectively they are less significant than a number of the preferred sites to</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 support 8 object 2 comment | the north |
| | There seems to be no basis for rejection of the site. It could be brought forward for 500 dwellings. Include as a strategic site. |
| | Part of the site (at Loachbrook) has already had planning approval granted, which has doubled the number of houses in Somerford. Hence it should be included. |
| | Future developments should rectify the strange shape of the town and move the shopping centre back to the geographical centre |
| | Congleton is constrained. Re-think present distribution of housing and employment land a northerly and westerly direction. |
| | Alternative sites are not accessible. They should be protected through Green Belt/Local Green Space designation as they enable access to open countryside from the town centre. |
| | Evidence must be more robust. Need full assessment of all SHLAA sites including infrastructure. |
| | Consider for inclusion in the Cheshire East Council Local Plan. |
| | Would support Loachbrook Farm development, but feel that development of the rest of Padbury Lane will mean no segregation between Astbury and Congleton. Should be seen as a last resort. |
| | 1,700 new homes and facilities would add significantly to existing daily road traffic and pollution problems on the A354 between West Heath and the Wagon & Horses roundabout |
| | Archaeological significance |
| | Poorly conceived alternative. Do not consider until traffic issues have been fully considered and plans approved to alleviate the current problems before adding to them |
| | Better site than Congleton 1. Not all prime agricultural land. |
| | Access links could be easily provided to the A34, A534 and the proposed bypass, which should link up with the A34 south of Astbury. |
| | We request the submission of a site to be considered for inclusion in the Cheshire East Council Local Plan. |
| | No basis for rejection. Include as a strategic site for 500 homes. |
| Site Congleton 6 (Alternative) Land north of Lamberts Lane 32 representations by 29 people 2 support 28 object 2 comment | This open countryside is only 400m from the High Street, unique in CE and found in few other English towns. Do not lose this unique USP to development. Should be protected by Green Belt or Local Green Space designation for benefit of future generations. Has been subject of investment by Council and charities to enhance beauty and preserve wildlife. Countryside of significant importance as stated by Congleton Southern Fringes Project. |
| | Development is unsuitable due to the adverse impact on the visual character of the area |
| | Proposals here have already been refused by town councillors. |
| | Woefully inadequate existing infrastructure. Requires a better traffic system at the bottom of Canal Road which cannot sustain any more traffic or housing. |
| | Logical – well-positioned re the town centre and amenities. Need a green corridor; improve footpath and cycleway between the town centre and any development. |
| | Wildlife |
| | Heritage value |
| | Very well-used amenity space, a rare asset highly valued by locals |
| | Very poor access, no bus stops, requires road improvements |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Develop this site before any Grade 2 agricultural land in Somerford. Sustainable site within the town boundary, in walking distance of the railway station & town centre. |
| | Too close to school, causing traffic chaos on busy roads with 6 x traffic calming measures to cope with existing heavy traffic. Serious traffic safety issues. |
| Figure E.5 Alternative Strategic Sites around Handforth 4 representations by 4 people 0 support 4 object 1 comment | Negative impact on infrastructure including traffic. |
| | No more destruction of Green Belt or agricultural land. Use brownfield sites and unused office space. |
| | Leave the newts alone. |
| | Handforth will merge into Greater Manchester and lose its community identity. |
| Site Handforth 1 (Alternative) Land between Clay Lane and the proposed Airport Link Road (A555) 9 representations by 9 people 1 support 7 object 1 comment | This proposal will merge it into Greater Manchester and it will lose its community identity |
| | Will create too much pressure on transport and other infrastructure |
| | This impacts Green Belt and agricultural land adversely. |
| | Concern regarding scale of development |
| | Brownfield first approach promised by Councillor |
| | The proposal to increase footfall at Handforth Railway Station should be a Section 106 Agreement of the planning permission |
| | No credible plans for employment growth exist here. |
| | Support development of this site for affordable houses for Handforth people. |
| | Add to the Preferred Strategic Sites. Far more sustainable than Handforth East. |
| Knutsford Figure E.6 Alternative Strategic Sites around Knutsford 5 representations by 5 people 0 support 3 object 2 comment | Why have these alternatives been rejected? Unacceptable to simply say that they are not considered suitable. No evidence that these sites have more material issues than the two sites now taken forward. |
| | Useless consultation without information being completely shared with the communities involved |
| | Parkgate sites are available and ideal locations to spread the burden of additional housing between NW and NE Knutsford. |
| | Investigate transport improvements to enable Parkgate. |
| | Take account of the contribution from other sites likely to be suitable for housing. Could enable reduction of remaining new housing figure. Parts of 2 rejected alternative sites may have merit for release. |
| Site Knutsford 3 (Alternative) Land to the South of Longridge 6 representations by 6 people 1 support 3 object 2 comment | Use land at Longridge before using Green Belt – more sustainable. |
| | No objective criteria have been applied to the selection of NW Knutsford over this site. |
| | I object to this site being rejected without explanation. There is a pattern of affordable housing in the area so development could be done. |
| | The exceptional circumstances for the proposed allocation of the site are as follows: significant contribution to meeting housing needs in Knutsford and Cheshire East; regeneration benefits; site allocation would not conflict with purposes of the Green Belt and would create a defensible Green Belt boundary. |
| Site Knutsford 4 (Alternative) Land | I object to this site being rejected without explanation |
| | Ideal locations to spread the burden of additional housing between NW and |

| | |
|---|---|
| to the west of Parkgate Lane 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 3 object 0 comment | NE Knutsford |
| | Improve access through CIL |
| Site Knutsford 5 (Alternative) Land between Gough's Lane and Chelford Road 5 representations by 5 people 4 support 1 object 0 comment | I object to this site being rejected without explanation |
| | Near employment area |
| | Suitable as non prime agricultural land |
| | Support rejection of this site – would increase urban sprawl south of Knutsford |
| | Ideal for development, has excellent road access |
| Site Knutsford 6 (Alternative) Land to the south and west of Beggarman's Lane 3 representations by 3 people 2 support 1 object 0 comment | I object to this site being rejected without explanation. It is unacceptable to say it isn't suitable, without reasons. |
| | Support rejection of this site. It would encourage urban sprawl south of Knutsford; remove high grade agricultural land from cultivation; impinge on wooded habitats; and contribute to a degradation of the local eco-systems and rural environment. |
| | Knutsford should not be allowed to grow any closer to the motorway |
| Site Knutsford 7 (Alternative) Land to the west of Blackhill Lane 4 representations by 4 people 2 support 1 object 1 comment | I object to this site being rejected without explanation. It is unacceptable to say it is not suitable, without reasons. |
| | Support the rejection of this site |
| | Would impinge on Bexton Primary School and make traffic worse |
| | Would materially degrade the landscape vistas on this side of the town. |
| | Knutsford should not be allowed to grow any closer to the motorway |
| | Developers must contact Network Rail Asset Protection Team to ensure mitigation. Consider noise and vibration. |
| Site Knutsford 8 (Alternative) Land to the south west of Knutsford High School 4 representations by 4 people 2 support 1 object 1 comment | I object to this site being rejected without explanation |
| | This site is close to the Town Centre and has good access |
| | Its use would bring Knutsford almost to the site of the M6 motorway services and its attendant traffic noise |
| | Railway issues (mitigation) would need to be addressed due to existing and future potential intensification of routes. |
| Site Knutsford 9 (Alternative) Land | If development is allowed in the Green Belt, ensure the lower grade agricultural land is used first |

| | |
|--|--|
| between Northwich Road and Tabley Road 5 representations by 5 people 1 support 3 object 1 comment | I object to this site being rejected without explanation. This site is so similar to the site identified as Site B on the Town Strategy that the rejection of one and inclusion of the other is hard to understand. |
| | Support rejection: prevents urban sprawl to the west |
| | No objective criteria have been applied to the selection of NW Knutsford over this site |
| | Partial development on a small scale could be considered. Close examination of the site required. |
| Figure E.7 Alternative Strategic Sites Around Nantwich 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 1 object 2 comment | Nantwich should not be developed in any of these three areas. They would make the town more unbalanced than it already is |
| | No account has been taken of the contribution from other possible sites that are likely to be suitable for housing, eg at site allocation stage. Estimate prior to Site Allocations Document to enable reduction of the remaining new housing figure |
| | Inconsistency. What of the other sites listed in the Nantwich Town Strategy, which are not listed in Appendix E. Site F is included but G and J, K, L, M are not. |
| Site Nantwich 4 (Alternative) Land to the south of Nantwich 64 representations by 64 people 1 support 61 object 2 comment | Object to proposed housing developments in the Stapeley area. |
| | There is not the infrastructure to support any more housing in Nantwich. |
| | I object to the use of this site on various technical grounds: traffic/infrastructure could not support it; lack of sustainability. Glad it has been moved to the alternative sites. Should be removed altogether. |
| | It is important to retain the rural character and atmosphere of Stapeley which is a significant gateway into Nantwich. |
| | 250 dwellings at Stapeley Water Gardens should be the absolute maximum housing allocation for Stapeley. |
| | Appropriate and deliverable mixed-use site that should be included as a site allocation in the submission Core Strategy. |
| | No specific justification, assessment or evidence as to why Kingsley Fields has been selected as a preferred option. Nantwich South performs better in the SA and is a better strategy option. Require relevant technical information to support site allocations. Concerning lack of transparency, plan is unsound. |
| | Nantwich housing requirement is far too low, especially in light of affordable housing backlog and its range of existing services. |
| | Proposed allocations will meet the needs of Nantwich – remove this site. |
| | Part of this site to the west of the Water Gardens across the Maylands on Broad Lane may have merit: greenfield but would round off town boundary without extending into open countryside and has existing access. |
| Site Nantwich 5 (Alternative) Land South of Queens Drive 6 representations by 6 people 1 support 2 object 3 comment | The site is outside the development boundary, in open countryside, and will introduce unacceptable traffic congestion. |
| | I was going to strongly object to this site as an alternative, but as it has already been approved, what is the point!!! |
| | As this site benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission (12/4654N), it should be included as a committed, strategic site for 240 dwellings. No additional policy is required; logical rounding off to the settlement. |
| | The farm site to the east is potentially suitable for housing. |
| Site Nantwich 6 (Alternative) Land | By reducing remaining housing figure accordingly, the proposed Kingsley Fields site could be curtailed totally or in extent and density. |
| | Site is adjacent to railway line. Contact Network Rail to ensure noise and vibration mitigation. Object to impact on level crossing. Require contributions |

| | |
|--|---|
| bounded by the Railway Line to the West and River Weaver to the East 3 representations by 2 people 0 support 1 object 2 comment | for an alternative crossing. |
| | Inconsistency: not selected as a favoured strategic site in the draft Town Strategy. Unclear why it was reconsidered in the draft Development Strategy. Consider it for greenbelt protection. |
| | CEC has just given permission for 240 homes in the north-west part, making the farm site to its east potentially suitable for housing. Although the site is greenfield, it would round off indentations of the town boundary, not leading to outward extension into open countryside [the part to the south would do so & accordingly is not being suggested] |
| Figure E.8 Alternative Strategic Sites around Poynton 3 representations by 3 people 1 support 0 object 2 comment | Insufficient allocations in Poynton |
| | Allocate land off Glastonbury Drive |
| | Land to east side of Poynton should be preferred to land to west |
| | Additional housing will increase traffic on A34 so then they will need another new road |
| Site Poynton 1 (Alternative) Land to west of Poynton 5 representations by 5 people 0 support 3 object 2 comment | Add to list of Preferred Strategic Sites. Accords with NPPF and would secure sustainable development. |
| | If developed will require mitigation having regard to proximity to railway. |
| | This land includes significant flood risk areas, protected woodland and a listed building. |
| | No need for industrial development on green field sites as brown field sites are available |
| | Poynton bypass is essential |
| Site Poynton 2 (Alternative) Land at Lower Park 3 representations by 3 people 0 support 2 object 1 comment | Object on grounds of access and traffic overload. |
| | Site potentially contaminated and polluted as parts previously used as gas works and brick works. |
| | If developed will require mitigation measures having regard to proximity to railway. |
| Site Poynton 3 (Alternative) Land to West of Poynton Coppice 19 representations by 17 people 0 support 19 object 0 comment | Brownfield sites should be considered before all others. |
| | Impact on the landscape setting and destroy ancient natural space. Proximity to Coppice SSI |
| | Evidence of underground workings. |
| | Inadequate infrastructure. Congestion already sustainable. |
| Site Poynton 4 | Retain/do not develop - site serves Green Belt functions keeping Poynton and |

| | |
|---|---|
| (Alternative) Land to east of Poynton Industrial Estate 2 representations by 2 people 0 support 1 object 1 comment | Adlington separate. |
| | Traffic access poor. |
| | Risk of noise and other pollution affecting houses near the site. |
| | Poynton Industrial Estate has vacant units which should be developed first. |
| Site Poynton 5 (Alternative) Land to north of Middlewood Road and east of Towers Road 1 representation by 1 person 0 support 1 object 0 comment | Retain/do not develop – site serves Green Belt functions with current clear boundary. |
| | Numerous coal mining shafts nearby. Site possibly contaminated/polluted. Former landfill site adjacent. |
| | Impact on road network. |
| | Oil pipeline passes through the site. |
| Figure E.9 Alternative Strategic Sites around Sandbach 22 representations by 20 people 9 support 12 object 1 comment | I agree that these sites are unsuitable and unsustainable |
| | Object to erosion of open land between Elworth and Sandbach: use of such sites contravenes the Sandbach Town Strategy |
| | Further development on open land will detract from the uniqueness of Sandbach |
| | Loss of high quality agricultural land – required for food production |
| | None of these sites are sustainable – all are outside the settlement zone |
| | All sites will impact adversely on landscape |
| | Will worsen traffic, which is already dangerous |
| | Impact on infrastructure and services |
| | Many sites have planning permission already but have not been built on |
| | Several sites are not in the SHLAA |
| | None of these proposals are jobs-led |
| | Long list of alternative sites will encourage speculative planning, ruining the town |
| | Object to use of any greenfield sites |
| | Former Arclid Hospital site (SHLAA 2729) should be on this list |
| Site Sandbach 4 (Alternative) Land north of Marsh Green Road 37 representations by 36 people 26 support 5 object 6 comment | Gross incursion into open countryside, dragging the urban centre away from Sandbach town centre |
| | Forms a Green Gap between Elworth and Sandbach |
| | Grade 3A agricultural land |
| | Outside settlement zone |
| | Diverse, well-established wildlife |
| | Unsustainable location with poor access resulting in substantial traffic issues |
| | High water table, prone to flooding |
| | Contamination from former landfill site that had uncontrolled dumping |
| | Would place an unacceptable and disproportionate burden on Elworth, given the level of development already approved there – would compromise Elworth's village character/identity |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Close to a railway |
| Site Sandbach 5 (Alternative) Abbeyfields (Land between Abbey Road and Park Lane) 16 representations by 15 people 2 support 14 object 0 comment | Would erode the open land between Elworth and Sandbach which prevents the two settlements from joining into one town |
| | Site is an important link to open countryside, a valued open space for locals |
| | Outside the settlement zone |
| | High quality agricultural land – would reduce our ability to grow food |
| | Would adversely impact on local landscape and character |
| | Access road is only just within national standards for distance between two junctions – road safety concerns at recent were not dealt with satisfactorily |
| | Brine subsidence onsite means the topography changes from year to year |
| | Would result in traffic chaos – Hind Heath Road is already narrow and dangerous |
| | Pond |
| | Ancient trees |
| | We have too many takeaways already |
| | Proposed landscaped areas around the pond and a new conservation area will be too small to constitute viable open space and wildlife |
| | Maintain the site as open space and for wildlife – upgrade its status to Strategic Open Gap or Green Belt |
| | Grade II listed agricultural land |
| | This site benefits from a lawful planning consent and should be included as a committed site for 280 dwellings |
| Site Sandbach 6 (Alternative) Hind Heath 26 representations by 25 people 1 support 23 object 2 comment | This site has already been given planning permission |
| | Greenfield – retain the site as such, with additional protection |
| | Well-used grade 3 agricultural land |
| | Infrastructure and services cannot keep pace, including jobs, leisure, traffic etc |
| | Residents will commute to school and work, undermining the aspiration to increase use of public transport |
| | Outside the settlement boundary. Gross incursion into open countryside, dragging the urban centre away from Sandbach town centre |
| | The Secretary of State agrees that this site is unsustainable |
| | Site is 2.5km from Sandbach town centre |
| | Would result in a 40% increase in the size of Wheelock village – too large to be sustained locally |
| | Not jobs-led |
| | Not identified in the Sandbach Town Strategy nor the CEC SHLAA |
| | Access via a country lane – dangerous, and busy with proximity of football and cricket clubs |
| | Would erode open land between Elworth and Sandbach |
| | Impact on wildlife |
| | Flooding will result |
| | Close to sewage works |
| | The site is higher than the surrounding area so development will dominate existing properties |
| Site Sandbach 7 (Alternative) Yeowood Farm 16 representations | Would be a gross incursion into open countryside on a greenfield site, dragging the urban centre away from Sandbach town centre |
| | Would erode open land between Elworth and Sandbach |
| | Sustainable urban extension of Sandbach that would be integrated into the wider community and would not result in coalescence of Etilley Heath and |

| | |
|---|--|
| by 15 people 3 support 12 object 1 comment | Wheelock. It is low-grade agricultural land; has defensible boundaries to prevent urban sprawl; and can ensure protection/improvement of habitat. |
| | Widen Hind Heath Road and make this a preferred strategic site. |
| | Unsustainable – too far from main roads. Would result in terrible congestion of narrow, dangerous roads. No new roads can be built to cope with traffic increase – site is constrained by lack of access |
| | No need for another takeaway |
| | Outside settlement boundary |
| | Not included in the SHLAA |
| | Grade 2 agricultural land should not be lost |
| | Ecological loss to species and habitat |
| | Lack of evidence to demonstrate need for housing or mixed use |
| | No mitigation for the high levels of car use that will result |
| | Would result in wider traffic problems, felt in Sandbach |
| | The most balanced site proposal, recognising need for new infrastructure and encouraging new employment. |
| Site Sandbach 8 (Alternative) Land to the south west of A533 5 representations by 4 people 0 support 3 object 2 comment | Unsustainable, not in easy walking distance of town centre or facilities |
| | Would be a gross incursion into open countryside and Green Belt, dragging the urban centre away from Sandbach town centre |
| | No air quality issues here |
| | Site is unsuitable for the amount of traffic this proposal will generate |
| | Will ruin rural area |
| | Wildlife habitats |
| | Protect Sandbach as a market town |
| | Similar characteristics and constraints as other sites – why have others been preferred over this site? |
| | Sustainable location within walking distance of a range of services |
| | Proximity to listed building does not preclude development |
| | Development here would visually ‘round off’ the settlement boundary and is contained so as to minimise encroachment into the countryside |
| Site Sandbach 9 (Alternative) Land off Houndings Lane 9 representations by 8 people 0 support 6 object 3 comment | Constraints do not preclude development eg watercourse could be incorporated into a Strategic Green Amenity Area for residents; protected trees and footpaths will be retained |
| | A gross incursion into open countryside, dragging the urban centre away from Sandbach town centre |
| | Would create huge traffic problems |
| | Wildlife corridor and habitats |
| | Should incorporate a cycle link from Sandbach Heath to Townfields and the secondary school |
| | No need for retail development here |
| | Development is too big for Sandbach as a Market Town |
| | A feasible option |
| | Very poor access into this site – there should be no further access points onto the bypass |
| | Rural area |
| | This site should be allocated with the Old Mill Road site as it is more sustainable than the preferred sites |
| | Site can include the new supermarket which will address the qualitative deficiencies of Sandbach’s food retail offer |
| | Sustainable location |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The northern portion which links directly into the settlement is the most appropriate part |
| | Constraints do not preclude development, but would be used to shape it |
| | Would strategically link to and round off built form of Sandbach |
| Site Sandbach 10 (Alternative) Land to the west of A534 Wheelock Bypass 9 representations by 8 people 6 support 3 object 0 comment | A preferred mixed-use site in the Sandbach Town Strategy – this site should be a preferred site if the strategic sites do not proceed |
| | This land should not be considered as an acceptable alternative to development of Junction 17 site |
| | Most appropriate site |
| | Light industry here would complement Sandbach Site 1 and plans for Crewe |
| | Not suitable – located in a green corridor separating Wheelock from Winterley |
| | Would create severe traffic problems in Wheelock village |
| | Rural area |
| | Wildlife habitat |
| | Inappropriate in Sandbach, a market town |
| Site Sandbach 11 (Alternative) Land off Congleton Road 17 representations by 17 people 0 support 17 object 0 comment | Area of natural beauty and used for recreation. Should be designated as a Local Green Space |
| | Traffic safety problems on Congleton Road, a fast, busy main route with a school on |
| | Loss of views from public rights of way |
| | Land is of good agricultural value |
| | Would not create any employment opportunities |
| | May allow for further development of open countryside up to Middlewich |
| | Scale of development is unsuitable for a small market town and its infrastructure |
| | Wildlife |
| | Layout and design must match the scale, character and appearance of the surrounding area |
| | Demolition of 130 Congleton Road should not be allowed |
| | Pubs, takeaways and restaurants should be in the town, not in amongst residential properties |
| | Removal of parking opportunities will create problems elsewhere |
| | This should be a strategic site. No clear evidence why it is not. It is sustainable, can be integrated into the existing urban area and is within walking distance of various facilities. |
| Figure E.10 Alternative Strategic Sites around Wilmslow 5 representations by 5 people 2 support 3 object 0 comment | Support – good transport and infrastructure links |
| | No exceptional circumstances identified for altering the Green Belt – should be permanent, lost for ever once built on |
| | Use brownfield sites first – there are at least 400 brownfield sites that could be used |
| | No evidence - no demographic proof of need |
| | No evidence of working jointly with Greater Manchester and Stockport – contrary to planning guidelines |
| | Business use would destroy the character of this area |
| Site Wilmslow 3 (Alternative) Land off Prestbury Road | Support development here - links to high school, already houses in that area, non-intrusive, access to Wilmslow, sustainable location – access to railway station and town centre, will meet population needs of Wilmslow, new defensible greenbelt boundary could be created. A strategic release of Green |

| | |
|--|--|
| 11 representations by 11 people 4 support 4 object 3 comment | Belt is necessary and area fulfils objectives of the Policy Principles document (including CS8 and CS9) |
| | Object to release of Green Belt – would add to uncontrolled urban sprawl, result in loss of gap between settlements, remove single identities of local townships, lost forever, contrary to national green belt policy, currently a defensible and clear boundary |
| | Use brownfield sites first |
| | Adjacent to railway line. Contact Network Rail to ensure protection of railway infrastructure; mitigation from noise and vibration from current and potential future intensification. |
| Site Wilmslow 4 (Alternative) Land off Dean Row Road (Western parcel) 7 representations by 7 people 1 support 3 object 3 comment | Area has been consistently demonstrated to be suitable, achievable and available for development - considered deliverable site; does not perform any of the five functions of Green Belt; is the most appropriate site to deliver the town's needs, fits well with policies CS8 and CS9 |
| | Object to use of Green Belt/green land when there are many brownfield sites available. Green Belt should not be considered until all brownfield solutions have been exhausted |
| | This area should be developed as playing fields with appropriate drainage, accommodation and parking facilities |
| | Site may contain protected species |
| Site Wilmslow 5 (Alternative) Land off Dean Row Road (Eastern parcel) 6 representations by 6 people 0 support 3 object 3 comment | Constraints specifies states listed building Unitarian Chapel is nearby - that should be Wilmslow 5 Dean Row Road (Eastern parcel) |
| | Object to use of Green Belt/green land when there are many brownfield sites available |
| Site Wilmslow 6 (Alternative) Land off Upcast Lane and to the rear of Cumber Lane 6 representations by 6 people 0 support 3 object 3 comment | Site should be developed as a strategic site – site assessed favourably in the Sustainability Appraisal; significant contribution towards Local Plan aims; strong physical, defensible boundary; close to services and amenities; sites suitable, and available in the short to medium term; not liable to flood risk; better than Handforth East new settlement |
| | Significant extension into Green Belt. |
| | Site must not be removed from Green Belt. Object to building on green land. Many brownfield sites available. |
| | Site access via Upcast Lane is not suitable for an additional 350 houses (ie 700 cars) using a lane to the local school. |
| | Not a sustainable location – distance from town centre, little public transport, primary school does not have capacity, few other facilities in the immediate area |
| Site Wilmslow 7 (Alternative) Land at Little Stanneylands 13 | Part of the site is deliverable, available, suitable, achievable (SHLAA site 3289) – technical assessments indicate it is capable of accommodating homes and open space, benefiting primary school, more appropriate than Local Plan proposal as better suited to delivering lower density housing on a smaller site |
| | Site does not fulfil any of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. |
| | Object to use of Green Belt/green land when there are many brownfield sites available |
| | No justification to build in Green Belt or destroying listed historic buildings |
| | Site is not flat as stated |
| | Valuable green gap between Wilmslow and Handforth |

| | |
|--|---|
| representations by 6 people 0 support 4 object 9 comment | Flood risk area – very costly to drain and foundations would be unsuitable |
| | Gross overdevelopment of area - would cause traffic congestion on already dangerous Stanneylands Road, would add to traffic congestion |
| | Would destroy what little green space and wildlife habitat Handforth has |
| | About 9.5 hectares of the total 15 hectare site is considered developable – remainder occupied by woodland cover and flood risk area |
| | Part of the site is already in the SHLAA (3296) - classed to be sustainably located, available, achievable and deliverable. |
| | Landowners, including operators of the garden centre, support the development of this site. |
| | Release of Green Belt would not harm the 5 purposes of including land in the Green Belt. |
| | There are very special circumstances for this release which would have less harm than other areas of potential release. Includes defensible boundaries. |
| | Detailed submission by landowner detailing capacity, access, sustainability, deliverability, mix of house types etc. |
| Site Wilmslow 8 (Alternative) Wilmslow Business Park 5 representations by 5 people 1 support 1 object 3 comment | Site suitable for development as it does not encroach on existing housing. |
| | Object to use of Green Belt/green land when there are many brownfield sites available. |
| | Adjacent to railway line. Contact Network Rail to ensure protection of infrastructure. Mitigate railway noise and vibration from current and potential future intensification. |
| | Land is underutilised; school confirms playing fields should be relocated. The site is well related to Royal London – join the sites to deliver comprehensive employment development. |
| | The land satisfies none of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. |
| Site Wilmslow 9 (Alternative) Land at Ryleys Farm 11 representations by 10 people 1 support 6 object 4 comment | This would further the Manchester urban sprawl into the Cheshire countryside. Rural area south of Alderley Edge already greatly impacted by the A34: cannot take further development. |
| | Would join Chorley to Alderley Edge. |
| | Strongly object to building on Green Belt when there are so many brownfield sites available. Would decimate a large area. |
| | Would have approximately 5 times the number of houses as Chorley: a new village in itself. |
| | No infrastructure to accommodate this scale of development. |
| | 1,000 homes would lead to at least 2,000 cars on the already busy roads. |
| | Will impact on several rural parishes |
| | The site would abut Nether Alderley, threatening its potential future development into the Parish and beyond. |
| | At the planning of the A34, the guarantee was made of no linear development along the bypass. Such a proposal would negate the intended environmental benefits of the bypass and be contrary to the original agreement. |
| | Development would materially change the nature of Alderley Edge. Requires a smaller, sympathetic affordable housing development with small selective Green Belt rollback |
| | Adjacent to railway line. Contact Network Rail to ensure protection of railway infrastructure. Mitigate railway noise and vibration from current routes and future intensification. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Appropriate scale of provision is 450-500 dwellings over a phased period. Refer to this. There are no constraints that prevent development of the site. Would contribute to meeting residential needs, boosting the local centre, providing public open space, nature reserve, land for community facilities and linkages. Can be contained within the new A34 bypass leaving a wide buffer for structural landscaping. |
| | Exceptional circumstances exist to justify Green Belt realignment and allocation for housing. No adverse impact on Green Belt purposes or gap between settlements. Will provide strong, defensible, logical greenbelt boundary. |
| | The site is assessed favourably within Sustainability Appraisal in terms of sustainable access to jobs, services and facilities, support for existing centres, and infrastructure provision: its allocation would make a significant contribution to the aims and objectives of the Local Plan. |
| | The land is effectively in single ownership and development on the site is achievable and deliverable. |
| Figure E.11 Alternative New Settlement at Wardle 4 representations by 4 people 1 support 3 object 0 comment | Would bring excellent development opportunities to the northern area of Nantwich |
| | Revision of 2008 ecotown, withdrawn after overwhelming opposition from surrounding hamlets. |
| | Creates commuting through rural Cheshire. Will have a serious detrimental impact on highway network especially A51. |
| | Unsafe for residential use - bisected by A51 trunk road |
| | Devalues Nantwich and Cheshire |
| Site New Settlement 3 (Alternative) Wardle 11 representations by 11 people 2 support 6 object 3 comment | A sustainable location for additional housing |
| | Strong case for growth. Supported. |
| | Has been disregarded without sufficient justification. |
| | These are specific, red-edged sites rather than the area of search at Barthomley |
| | IS UNSUSTAINABLE and GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE. Will meet massive, united, local resistance |
| | Should not be taken forward. There are sustainable residential and employment sites in Nantwich. Flawed strategy. |
| | Light industrial use would be a bad neighbour use in terms of light pollution and noise |
| | No guarantee of job creation |
| | Mitigation would be required before development |
| | Grow through organic expansion of existing settlements ie sensitive housing and employment, supporting amenity and improving infrastructure |
| | Makes no sense. One of CE's few remaining unspoilt areas of countryside. |
| | Site is adjacent to railway line. Developers must contact Network Rail to ensure mitigation of noise and vibration. |
| | Inconsistent with the document's principles on distance from conurbations, lack of infrastructure, minimal job opportunities. Lacks justification. Needs considered arguments. |
| Policy Figure E.12 Alternative New Settlement at Siddington 19 | Would result in destruction of beautiful, peaceful, historic village in Green Belt and Jodrell Bank consultation area. At odds with Council's policies and remit for sustainable development. |
| | Siddington is not suitable for development due to poor access, lack of public transport, unreliable energy, no mains drainage, mains gas, and sewerage |

| | |
|---|---|
| representations by 19 people 0 support 18 object 1 comment | and flooding issues. It would be too expensive to install it and it would destroy the historic environment. |
| | Scale of development will destroy village character and wildlife. |
| | Ignores the centuries-old heritage of the agricultural settlement |
| | The proposed new settlement sites are far stronger on all measures including existing consents, existing infrastructure and reduced environmental impact. |
| | Suitable location for provision of an addition 75 dwellings to maintain current level of village services. The site is free from known environmental constraints. |
| | Build a new settlement in one of the many more practical, less damaging and more sympathetic locations: not needlessly positioned in our beautiful village. |
| Site New Settlement 4 (Alternative) Siddington 116 representations by 113 people 4 support 110 object 2 comment | A 'claim for judicial review' includes a claim to review the lawfulness of a decision, action or failure to act in relation to the exercise of a public function, here, a planning decision |
| | Siddington is unspoilt, Green Belt, Best Kept Village. Will be totally ruined by huge development increasing its size by over 500%. Scale of development would completely alter village character – would no longer be a village. |
| | Destruction to wildlife habitat and loss of glorious countryside enjoyed by many. |
| | Proposals would shut 2 award-winning farms. |
| | In the Jodrell Bank Consultation Zone |
| | The existing narrow country lanes will be turned into busy thoroughfares. |
| | Infrastructure. No employment, no public transport and limited facilities - no shops, school, pub unlike Marton and Chelford. |
| | No demand, not sustainable. |
| | Localism - listen to the will of the local community to preserve Siddington. |
| | An exceptionally unlikely, damaging and inherently flawed suggestion |
| | Proposals contradict Councillors' assertions and policies in the Local Plan. |
| | The list of potential sites to accommodate an entire new settlement disregards sites at Siddington without sufficient justification. They are specific red edged areas, not areas of search as at Barthomley. |
| | The land is wet; once quarrying and pumping finish, the water table will rise further. |
| Figure E.13 Alternative New Settlement at Chelford 15 representations by 14 people 4 support 10 object 1 comment | A sustainable location for additional housing |
| | Question boundary of the SHLAA site 3308. Object to loss of Green Belt, building in the Green Belt. No logic to development taking place east of railway line or A535 |
| | Support development of the existing market and haulage yard. In principle, no objection to development of land east of railway |
| | Contrary to policy and stated aims and objectives |
| | Insufficient road and rail infrastructure |
| | Land east of the railway may be needed for HS2. May be rerouted around saltfields via Holmes Chapel and Chelford. |
| Site New Settlement 5 (Alternative) Chelford 42 representations | A sustainable location for additional housing |
| | Has potential for nearby leisure facilities after restoration of sand extraction land from Mere farm quarry. |
| | Objection to sheer scale and lack of forethought of this plan: wholly inappropriate for a rural community like Chelford and surrounding area and contrary to suggested modest growth for Local Service Centres. Would ruin |

| | |
|--|--|
| by39 3 Support 35 object 4 Comment | Chelford and existing facilities. |
| | Little prospect of employment |
| | Little prospect of adequate transport to facilities. Insufficient road and rail infrastructure |
| | Will increase traffic on rural roads |
| | Strongly oppose any further development on the Green Belt. |
| | Development in Chelford must be based on plans already agreed by Chelford Parish Council |
| | Council should seek a Section 106 agreement to include developer-funded enhancements at Chelford Railway Station, as a consequence of the potential increased footfall. |
| | Inconsistent with the document's principles on distance from conurbations, lack of infrastructure, minimal job opportunities. Lacks justification. Needs considered arguments. |
| | Don't create a split village |
| | We welcome developments on Marshall's and Stobart's sites which bring sustainability, vitality and quality of life to the village, but are strongly opposed to further development beyond the village core and into the Green Belt |
| | Chelford is disregarded without sufficient justification. It is a specific red-edged site as opposed to the area of search identified around Barthomley. |
| | The development of the Chelford Market site ONLY is a significant part of the forward plans. Clarify specific plans on timely replacement and continuity of function of this facility. Substantive farming community is concerned. |
| Appendix F: Empty Homes and Commitments 12 representations by 12 people 5 support 1 object 6 comment | I support the re-use of empty homes. |
| | Bring empty business premises into employment use |
| | Commit to bringing empty business units back into use or developing them for housing in priority over developing other open areas |
| | If empty homes are seriously brought into use one would expect this to reduce the need for new developments. |
| | Updated figures are required to reflect the SHLAA report and Queens Drive approval. |