

ANNEX 1C Development Strategy and Policy Principles: Sustainability Appraisal Report 2013

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
General	The Sustainability Appraisal in its present format does not provide any useful information. If anything, it shows the proposals to be unsustainable. The high growth strategy only goes against all other KPIs and green belt development is unacceptable especially if you take into account sprawl from Greater Manchester to the south. The plan ignores impacts on environment, climate change, ecology, the list goes on.
General	The Sustainability Appraisal appears to have designed to justify a strategy that has already decided on, rather than to determine what the most sustainable strategy is in environmental, social and economic terms.
1.1	The appraisal is wordy yet superficial. It appears designed to tick mandatory boxes rather than shed light on the proposed strategy. CEC need to do some real work on sustainability to get any credibility.
1.1	The Sustainability Appraisal is very long and repetitive without actually shedding light on whether proposals are likely to be sustainable in absolute terms (positive or neutral effects overall) or only in relative terms (negative overall even if mitigated to some extent by positive effects).
1.1	Goostrey should not be listed as a Local Service Centre. Goostrey is a village of its own and should be treated as such. It should be listed as Sustainable Village, with maximum 3% increase in buildings.
1.1	Owing to Cheshire East Council putting four unnecessarily wordy documents (comprising in excess of 1681 pages) out for consultation at the same time, I have been unable to comment on this document. As such my democratic rights, and those of other residents, have been ridden over rough-shod and this consultation is flawed. It should be re-run as a result.
1.1	Over wordy document and it is not clear whether we are commenting on rejected data or current proposals.
1.1	This appraisal is long and repetitive, whilst at the same time superficial. Looks like someone ticking boxes in an office, with no regard to the real world on the ground. Much of it is just plain wrong.
1.1	This appraisal is very wordy yet superficial and generic. I could have ticked the boxes from here. It adds little to an understanding of the effects of the plans.

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
1.1	I object to the proposed designation of Goostrey as a Local Service Centre in the Settlement Hierarchy. The population of 'Goostrey' which is used as the main justification for awarding it LSC status is significantly overstated. The Parish of Goostrey is a Sustainable Village and its categorization should accurately reflect its status. To do otherwise is to disregard the rural heritage and status of the village.
1.1	I object to the proposed designation of Goostrey as a Local Service Centre in the settlement hierarchy. Residents in the local parishes rarely, if ever, come to Goostrey for their local services preferring to use the larger centre of Holmes Chapel. The proximity to Holmes Chapel limits the potential of Goostrey to develop into a Local Service Centre in its own right. Cranage is also listed in the Policy Principles report as a 'Sustainable Village' despite being included with the notional 'Goostrey Local Service Centre'. I request that you review the analysis of your data and separate the Parish of Goostrey to correctly categorise Goostrey as a Sustainable Village.
1.1	The appraisal is long but superficial. It has little relation to what I see on the ground. It is difficult to see any logic in many of the ++ ratings.
1.1	The excessive volume of Housing proposed for Somerford will destroy Somerford's locally distinct character - Somerford will lose its identity and will cease to exist as a small rural parish if the proposed strategic development plan is adopted in its present form. This amount of new housing represents a wholly disproportionate contribution of housing by the parish of Somerford to the regional development strategy.- Housing development should be more evenly distributed around the town of Congleton to lessen the impact on any one particular area.
1.1	I support the principles of this document
1.1	<p>Gladman note that the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out in five stages alongside the preparation of the Local Plan. Gladman also note the criteria contained within Table 4.1 relating to the sustainability objectives that are used to test the sustainability of the Cheshire East Local Plan.</p> <p>The sustainability objectives are listed from 1 to 20 and cover a range of social, economic and environmental factors. It is unclear as to whether each objective carries equal weight in terms of analysis, specifically when looking at strategic sites, or whether some factors should be considered to carry more weight than others.</p> <p>The following section of the Sustainability Appraisal aims to test the Objectives for Cheshire East set out in the Policy</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Principles Document against the sustainability objectives. The method used to carry out this task is fairly basic and many of the sustainability objectives are deemed 'not applicable' when testing against the objectives for Cheshire East. This task seems to only provide a description on how the objectives of the two documents broadly relate to one another, rather than an analysis to understand how the objectives will impact upon the Borough.</p>
1.1	<p>Gladman understands the need to undertake a sustainability appraisal in order to assess the sustainability of the different elements of the Cheshire East Local Plan. However this Appraisal has been carried out in a very discursive manner and much of the information is repeated several times. This makes the document difficult to read and to interpret the information contained within it.</p> <p>2.6.2 The main concern Gladman raises relates to how the information contained within the Sustainability Appraisal has been used to inform the Development Strategy and Policy Principles Document. It is unclear as to how this information has been used as an evidence document, particularly in relation to selecting strategic sites as the above examples highlight, the most sustainable options have not always been selected as preferred sites.</p> <p>2.6.3 Whilst it is noted that an appraisal of each site has been carried out, it is unclear as to whether any detailed comparative analysis has taken place. This leads to further uncertainty as to which documents have been used by the Council as an evidence base for their Local Plan.</p>
1.1	<p>I'm concerned that the developments planned in north Knutsford are not sustainable. Land in this area is subject to water logging and building in the area will make this worse by having less run off.</p> <p>The current sports facilities must be improved and supported ensuring easy access to all in Knutsford. Moving sports fields to an area further outside the current Knutsford zone will lead to more Knutsfordians having to travel further to use these facilities. The facilities should remain open to all rather than being associated with a hotel facility reducing access to all.</p> <p>The current Manchester Road and Mereheath Lanes are congested every morning and cannot support further development. For sustainability major improvements are required.</p> <p>Primary schooling for those in the north Manchester area is full. Further school places will be required. Development</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	of the park gate sites allows for school places in the east of Knutsford to be better utilised.
1.2	My house currently backs onto the Dig Lane/ Stock Lane triangle and a bird of prey (rare goshawk possibly) has been nesting in the trees where the development is possibly going to be built. The goshawk actually brought down a pigeon above our garden and ate it in our back garden before flying off! We have camera evidence of this if needed. Newts have also come through into the garden as well as frogs. Whilst walking in the field I have also seen toads and am very concerned that the natural habitat will be destroyed especially when so close to the moss. At the moment the fields are very damp and boggy and I am concerned that as my garden is not south facing and already damp in the summer my garden will face flooding if houses are built behind the house. Additionally I have a 3 year old child and have to apply for primary school places this year and the schools are already oversubscribed so that I am worried I will not get a local school. I am concerned about the safety of the roads already in this area and safety aspects, particularly when there are few pavements leading into Wybunbury for parents to take their children to school. Why build here when there is a development near Stapeley, 2 mins down the road being built? Equally, houses built down Millstone lane have been left facing a building site as the affordable housing was not selling. Why destroy an area which is part of Wybunbury-a protected site so close to the moss?
1.2	The projected housing numbers are based on inaccurate data. Large numbers of houses in the borough are sitting unsold, with many more sitting unfinished due to lack of buyers. CEC should forget government housing premium and CIL payments from developers and live in the real world.
1.2	The projected numbers and sites look like they were picked with a pin Most unprofessional. Has the council never heard of greenbelt and its' function?
1.2	The over development in the Back Lane and Somerford area will destroy the distinct character of the area.
1.3	The report looks like it has picked some of the lager sites with a pin. The Handforth East site in particular is well known to me and its sustainability assessment is laughable.
1.3	I support the principles of these sites with minor amendments
1.3	How can you suggest major strategic development sites that are within the greenbelt and would therefore contravene legislation and guidelines?

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
1.3	The sustainability appraisal has to be objective - for Handforth East it is not. If proceeded with it will promote the need to travel and by car, encourage commuting and by allegedly off-setting some of the need for housing in Wilmslow promote in-commuting there.
1.4	My house currently backs onto the Dig Lane/ Stock Lane triangle and a bird of prey (rare goshawk possibly) has been nesting in the trees where the development is possibly going to be built. The goshawk actually brought down a pigeon above our garden and ate it in our back garden before flying off! We have camera evidence of this if needed. Newts have also come through into the garden as well as frogs. Whilst walking in the field I have also seen toads and am very concerned that the natural habitat will be destroyed especially when so close to the moss. At the moment the fields are very damp and boggy and I am concerned that as my garden is not south facing and already damp in the summer my garden will face flooding if houses are built behind the house. Additionally I have a 3 year old child and have to apply for primary school places this year and the schools are already oversubscribed so that I am worried I will not get a local school. I am concerned about the safety of the roads already in this area and safety aspects, particularly when there are few pavements leading into Wybunbury for parents to take their children to school. Why build here when there is a development near Stapeley, 2 mins down the road being built? Equally, houses built down Millstone lane have been left facing a building site as the affordable housing was not selling. Why destroy an area which is part of Wybunbury-a protected site so close to the moss?
1.4	If you have policy statements you must then have a council officer that details the local projects to go forward to ensure that any development is sustainable. The detailing in the plans is just focusing on delivering numbers of houses and sites.
1.4	I object in relation to Crewe 6 site which was always significantly rejected by the communities of Wybunbury, Shavington and Hough. It therefore does not reflect the comments received during community consultation and involvement to date.
1.4	I support the principles of this document
1.4	I wish to comment on the Congleton area development, which I generally agree that development should be concentrated to the north of the borough. I wish to object to the areas 4016 and 2321 to the east of Fol Hollow/Meadow Ave., Congleton on the development plan. The development is in green field site and good

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	agricultural land, there are adequate brown field sites not developed with the town. The existing road structure will not take any additional traffic, also the infrastructure schools etc. are full within the area, and these will have to be extended at cost to the council. If the development is allowed the town will move closer to Astbury with no green field buffer between the towns, wildlife habitat e.g. badgers etc will have an adverse impact. I feel that the above areas should be amended to Green Belt status to protect the natural beauty of the area.
1.4	I support the principles of this document
1.5	I trust that government legislation will not find this Sustainability Appraisal document adequate. I most certainly do not.
1.5	I cannot believe that this is in any way compliant with government requirements.
1.5	If the Government guidance and legislation relating to the planning system finds this appraisal adequate, then I fear for the future.
1.8	I don't know what is meant by 'a positive impact on the achievement of sustainability' - where is that on a scale of 1-10 with 10 being an actually sustainable outcome?
1.9	Without environmental sustainability long term economic and social sustainability won't be possible, so negative environmental impacts are very significant, especially if irreversible.
1.10	You must detail whether the site specific development housing proposed will put a strain on community infrastructure. The lack of detail on community infrastructure undoubtedly means you are bolting on housing estates that will result in unsustainable communities.
1.11	The Sustainability Appraisal Report is unreadable. The SAR is a major part of the consultation document, particularly in the context of the "sustainable" new settlement proposed in Handforth. However, the report is over 1,000 pages, and it is only available online, not in paper form: and over 800 of those pages are at 90 degrees to the screen, so the whole report is, to all intents and purposes, not available to residents.
1.11	The Sustainability Appraisal Report is a major part of the consultation, particularly in the context of the "unsustainable" new community proposed in Handforth. However the report is over 1000 pages long and on line, 800

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	are at 90% making it unavailable for residents to comment
1.15	Which email address is valid ldfconsultation@cheshireeast.gov.uk or planningpolicy@cheshireeast.gov.uk or what?
2.1	This sustainability appraisal has been produced separately to the development plan and as such is theoretical and the Development plan is lacking in robust community facilities appraisal for the future needs which will result in bolt on housing estates being approved not sustainable communities shaped by true local engagement.
2.1	This Sustainability Appraisal has not been integrated with the Local Plan. It is also separated from the Habitats Appraisal. As it is, local communities have no way of assessing the sustainability of development proposals for their area. It reads largely as a desk exercise full of broad generalisations and, coincidentally, it is extremely difficult to comment on it because it is broken up into tiny segments. The paucity of responses indicates that many people could not spare the time or thought it less than worthwhile.
2.2	It would have been better to use this explanation in the main document rather than a simplified quote from Brundland 1987
2.2	Not much chance of living within environmental limits if we go on carpetting the countryside and productive agricultural and arboreal plantations with tarmac and bricks and mortar.
2.2	The removal of agricultural land inevitably compromises 'the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' by sacrificing long-term food supply to short-term "growth" targets. England is now overpopulated. What we should be doing is developing strategies to continue to draw economic benefit through contraction. Developers should pay the true market cost of building on productive land i.e. calculate what the losses will be to food supply and environmental damage in the future not just its market value at the present. What we are seeing in Cheshire is the equivalent of the loss of the Amazonian rain forest. We shall wake up when it is too late.
2.3	What processes do you have in place to assess the social impact of development? The 106 travel plan format is a token attempt at improving environmental impact.
2.6	My house currently backs onto the Dig Lane/ Stock Lane triangle and a bird of prey (rare goshawk possibly) has been nesting in the trees where the development is possibly going to be built. The goshawk actually brought down a

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>pigeon above our garden and ate it in our back garden before flying off! We have camera evidence of this if needed. Newts have also come through into the garden as well as frogs. Whilst walking in the field I have also seen toads and am very concerned that the natural habitat will be destroyed especially when so close to the moss. At the moment the fields are very damp and boggy and I am concerned that as my garden is not south facing and already damp in the summer my garden will face flooding if houses are built behind the house. Additionally I have a 3 year old child and have to apply for primary school places this year and the schools are already oversubscribed so that I am worried I will not get a local school. I am concerned about the safety of the roads already in this area and safety aspects, particularly when there are few pavements leading into Wybunbury for parents to take their children to school. Why build here when there is a development near Stapeley, 2 mins down the road being built? Equally, houses built down Millstone lane have been left facing a building site as the affordable housing was not selling. Why destroy an area which is part of Wybunbury-a protected site so close to the moss?</p>
2.6	<p>"Development and its infrastructure on greenfield sites will be required to demonstrate that they will not impact on designated SSSI/Ramsar sites". Demonstrate requires validated evidence not just emails between parties. You may say that supplying re with some information for them to interpret is obtaining evidence but I would have to disagree especially when an area such as Wybunbury Moss is considered where they should have been employed to undertake an independent assessment to their standards.</p>
2.8	<p>Failed again on actually providing any sustainability assessment you still talk about numbers of housing and sites - this is only half the picture required of sustainable communities for the future.</p>
2.11	<p>Infrastructure is wider than transport and highways you must consider community facilities to adequately appraise the social impact of proposals and there is no sign of that in your processes.</p>
2.12	<p>Great policies - now follow through with detail to deliver alongside building houses and employment sites.</p>
2.13	<p>Tremendous detail, now follow through with local strategies detailing infrastructure projects necessary to ensure any development is sustainable.</p>
2.15	<p>Wouldn't it be better if these were integrated? It is very difficult for most people to keep track of what is being proposed.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
3.1	No you have carried out as an academic exercise independent of the local plan which has to date focused on numbers and sites for houses not their social impact or future sustainability.
3.1	I don't have time to comment on this massive document and argue many points (I have done that elsewhere in the strategy and policy consultations), but seriously have my doubts about the worth of sustainability appraisals such as these. Low density piecemeal development is being proposed on the edge of many settlements which encourages car use, as well as major road building proposals. If a new development is not within easy walking distance of a school, shop or public transport, it should not be allocated land, yet the strategy appears to be doing just that. I hate to keep going on about this, but there is a serious and basic contradiction in many of the objectives and policies for healthy living, sustainability and design vs economic policy, land allocation and strategy of the Council. Does this appraisal address this and will anyone actually pay any attention?
3.6	This was such a load of waffle in 2012 no one knew it was a separate doc to be responded to and to be honest didn't know where to start!
3.8	Problem 2010 consultation was the suits - Council officials and commercial interests- so not local engagement but interestingly a huge number of planning applications for supermarkets have been processed.
3.11	Stakeholder panels not necessarily representative of residents - being mainly councillor, officer and commercial interest led. Stakeholders need serious reconsideration going forward.
3.12	The Congleton Town Strategy had a very undefined status. At one point it was presented as part of the 'neighbourhood planning' initiative, and then it reverted to being a town strategy. People didn't understand what was going on and few commented. It has no real mandate.
3.13	The draft Congleton Town Strategy with its ring of potential housing sites made people feel the town was under attack, not that they were in control. The northern link road was added after the consultation without wider discussion.
3.13	Re Crewe. The consultation suddenly had the Triangle in it when earlier the Crewe plan documents confirmed Shavington was not part of Crewe! The site is 75% in Wybunbury, objected to by communities in Shavington, Wybunbury and Hough. So the whole of the area objected on many levels including sustainability and what happens....really makes a

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	mockery of the whole process
Table 4.1	Looking forward to CEC moving off objective 1! I.e. moving on from focus to identify numbers of houses and sites and onto the clever stuff - delivering sustainable communities with investment in community facilities.
Table 4.1	Well Crewe 6 only passes objective 1. A shame it fails objectives 2-7 for the local community
Table 4.1	Crewe 6 I forgot it also falls down on most of objectives 8-20
Table 4.1	A number of these objectives will require the preparation and submission of supporting technical reports/studies to inform the conclusions, notably water quality, pollution, biodiversity. Accordingly, our Client would expect that the sustainability ranking for each of these at present would be “unknown”, unless technical reports have already been prepared. Secondly, some further definition of each of the criterion is required to provide greater clarity. For example, “will it protect any species at risk” – what species is this referring to, and how has the assessment been made without any evidence? It is our Client’s view that the SA would benefit from a scoring measurement by which the performance of each site can be differentiated, with more points aligned to performance (i.e. ++ = 2, + = 1 etc.). By adopting this approach, each site can then be given a total score by which they can be appropriately measured and assessed.
Table 4.1	Thirdly, there is no indication of how the cumulative scoring of each of the criteria produces the overall score against each objective. There are instances whereby some sites perform better against some objectives than others, but without any clear explanation as to how this conclusion has been reached. Some criteria could be considered have a greater weighting than others. Some sites may score better against one criterion than another for the same objective. The approach in itself is unclear and should be transparent so that sites can easily be compared like for like. In conclusion, it is our Client’s view that the SA would benefit from a scoring measurement by which the performance of each site can be differentiated, with more points aligned to performance (i.e. ++ = 2, + = 1 etc.). By adopting this approach, each site can then be given a total score by which they can be appropriately measured and assessed.
Table 4.1	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) examines each of the strategic sites identified in the Development Strategy document against 20 sustainability objectives. Table 4.1 of the SA document sets out a series of criteria questions related to determine how each site will satisfy each objective, however there are a number of issues with this

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	methodology. Firstly, a number of these objectives will require the preparation and submission of supporting technical reports/studies to inform the conclusions, notably water quality, pollution, biodiversity. Accordingly, our Client would expect that the sustainability ranking for each of these at present would be “unknown”, unless technical reports have already been prepared.
Table 4.1	Some further definition of each of the criterion would be required for the purposes of clarity. For example, “will it protect any species at risk” – there is no definition of these species.
5.1	Blah Blah - the sad thing is you actually think all these words are achieving something.
General	The statements in the whole of this document are not supported by any evidence and are lacking in the methodology or how things are measured or assessed. My suggestion is that you guessed what the situation was rather than gathered any evidence. If you gave a report, in each section summarising the research you had done, the agencies that were consulted and their comments, I may start to have some confidence that you have assessed the environment, the sustainability or the impact of what you propose. The documents are way too long and complex, so only those who can assimilate the 100's of pages and be able to compare between all of them can ever hope to make any sense of them. In general, the impression I get is that there is little difference between any of the options, just a few marginal bits here and there. How can you then say one option is better than another when you may lose heritage in one section and habitat in another and housing needs in another? Cheshire residents know what they want: considered gradual evolution to a better environment, better transport, amenity and leisure opportunities and the development of brownfield sites first. The use of greenfield and green open spaces is not what any of the people want, all the comments are negative and objections to the land and housing proposals. If it has to be done, then a new village may be the best option for me, at least it is all new and properly designed rather than ruin everyone's lives in the smaller towns and villages.
5.2	Really looking forward to objectives 2 and 4 being covered - no progress yet from focus on housing numbers and infrastructure in its traditional highways transport sense.
5.3	No plans, policies or strategies will work unless there is a strong educational basis. The schools should be supported by CEC and where necessary, should be reintroduced to poorer pupils

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
Table 5.1	Objectives must be SMART these stated here are in fact aims or ambitions.
5.5	These are not objectives they are aims and as such will not be realised because you cannot target and measure from them.
6.4	<p>In terms of the total number of dwellings proposed for the plan period, Table 6.2 of the Sustainability Appraisal looks at the three levels of growth considered at the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy. The three options have been tested against the sustainability objectives, however once again it is unclear as to whether any analysis has taken place.</p> <p>2.2.2 The table simply describes that an increase in housing numbers will lead to an increase in impacts on the Borough. There is also a lot of repetition within the table and it is difficult to see whether this task provides any purpose as the information contained within the table is purely a description of the presumed impacts of each option.</p> <p>2.2.3 There are no reasons given to justify why each option may be considered better or worse for each objective, or whether the impacts can be mitigated, or whether the delivery of housing is considered to carry more weight than any of the other objectives.</p> <p>2.2.4 Table 6.4 outlines the impact of the phasing options and it is suggested that the impact of all phasing options would be equal and have a 'neutral effect' on sustainability. Again there is no evidence or justification given to understand why all of the phasing options would have the same impact and again the table gives little useful information.</p>
6.4	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers the impact of the four options for spatial distribution previously established in the Issues and Options Core Strategy against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>2.3.2 Three additional options have also been included in the study, which have been added due to additional evidence that has emerged and comments that have been made during the Town Strategy consultation stage. It would be beneficial to include specifically which evidence base documents have been produced since the Issues and</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Options Core Strategy that support the additional options, particularly including the option of a new settlement. This data is displayed in several tables in section 6 of the Appraisal.</p> <p>Option 7 the Hybrid Growth Option is defined as a combination of Options 2, 4, 5 and 6. There is no evidence to suggest why these options have been combined to create Option 7. This would be important information to include at this stage of preparation to gain a further understanding of the justification for the Council's decisions.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal offers little evidence to suggest why Option 7 is preferred or even how Option 7 has been created. By looking at the above table it is clear that the impacts of all of the options are very similar.</p> <p>2.3.6 The impacts of Options 1, 2 and 3 are all considered to be the same so it is unclear as to why Option 2 has been taken forward to become part of Option 7 and not Option 1 or 3.</p> <p>2.3.7 Option 4 is considered to have a more positive effect on the quality and quantity of housing than all of the other options, but there is little justification as to why this is. The impact on pollution in Option 4 is considered to be more negative than in all the other options and again there is no justification as to why this would be more harmful in Option 4 than the other options.</p> <p>2.3.8 This section of the Appraisal is also very repetitive and much of the information is identical across the various options. It is unclear why for some options, the objectives are considered to have a more positive or negative impact on the sustainability objectives when there is no justification or evidence given to explain it.</p>
Table 6.1	Object – This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns
Table 6.1	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.1	This would aim to develop villages like Goostrey, plus the neighbouring hamlet of Twemlow, at too high a rate and

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	would ruin their rural character. A greater focus should be put on development in small and large towns
Table 6.2	The assessment shows virtually identical results for Options 1 and 2, and hence provides no basis to inform the option selection. Option 3 is shown as having significant positive and negative impacts on a number of different criteria. Some of these seem questionable such as -- for water quantity, quality and flood risk; given East Cheshire has no major flood plains or water courses, and no history of water shortage! It's difficult to see why waste management should have so much greater impact than for option 2 (or option 1).
Table 6.2	Blah Blah you would say that wouldn't you - no evidence.
6.7	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
6.11	The selection of option 3 is not informed by the sustainability assessment at all, since it shows no difference between the different phasing options. If option 3 is adopted, there is a higher risk of failure to deliver in the second half of the plan timescale. Any attempted recovery to plan is more likely to have a more negative impact on long term sustainability. It would be better to plan on option 1, so any shortfall to plan can be managed more sustainably. If option 3 is retained in the plan, then an evidence-based justification needs to be put forward. This is not it.
6.14	Here we go again focus on housing numbers and sites I don't see any numbers of extra community facilities identified.
6.17	Does this mean you have no intention of investing in these areas?
Table 6.5	If Goostrey remains classed as a Local Service Centre this will result in significant over-development. Development should be focused on the larger towns which have the infrastructure to support this.
Table 6.5	7% is far too high a percentage to develop Goostrey, it would completely change the rural village and ruin its character forever. Sustainable villages are proposed 3% which is a more realistic figure for Goostrey. It should not be classed as a Local Service Centre like Holmes Chapel etc. The focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.5	Object – This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns. Goostrey is too small and without the services to be a LSC.

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
Table 6.5	Larger villages such as Goostrey should not be developed at this rate. More sustainable to develop our small and large towns.
Table 6.5	The growth rate for villages like Goostrey is far too high. This is a one road village that will not support the volume of traffic generated, and other aspects of services are not available. I would expect to see more emphasis on small and large towns that have the relevant infrastructure. towns
Table 6.5	Goostrey is far too few services (no doctors, no dentists, no secondary schools etc) to be a LSC and therefore 7% growth is too much
Table 6.5	Classification of Goostrey as an LSC is unrealistic as it has few of the qualifying services when compared with other LSCs such as Holmes Chapel. Should reclassified as a Sustainable Village
Table 6.5	Goostrey should not be developed at this rate. Its population compared to its services has been misconstrued. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.5	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey (incorrectly classified as a Local Service Centre) at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on the towns ensuring the development is backed up by the necessary infrastructure improvements.
Table 6.7	Such a high percentage would develop Goostrey too much and lose its rural village character forever. It is in the wrong classification and the population figure should be checked. Such development should be restricted to towns. Don't ruin Goostrey village.
Table 6.7	This far too high a growth rate for Villages like Goostrey. More focus is needed in areas where there is already the availability of employment and education facilities as well as developable housing land.
Table 6.7	Object – This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns. Goostrey has too few services and too small to be a LSC - no secondary education, no doctor, no dentist, few shops, little employment
Table 6.7	Goostrey is too small to qualify as an LSC and has few of the services specified. Would be more appropriate as a Sustainable Village

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
Table 6.7	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey (incorrectly classified as a Local Service Centre) at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on the towns ensuring the development is backed up by the necessary infrastructure improvements.
Table 6.7	This would aim to develop villages like Goostrey and the neighbouring hamlet of Twemlow at too high a rate and would ruin the rural character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
6.24	Goostrey does not have the infrastructure of places such as Alderley Edge, Holmes Chapel and Chelford.
6.24	Development should be very limited in Goostrey, which is a rural village - it should not be treated as a small town as it is unsustainable to imagine that anything other than small development should take place. It is out of place that it is being treated as a Local Service Centre and should be a sustainable village under the criteria.
6.24	Limited growth in rural villages would help to preserve their character and amenity to the population as a whole.
6.24	Goostrey - very limited growth (very limited facilities) it is much much smaller than Alderley Edge or Holmes Chapel
6.24	Support – but only if the limited growth of Goostrey is very limited, thereby maintaining its charm and character.
6.24	Limited growth in Goostrey would help maintain its charm and character. It should not be a Local Service Centre, Cheshire East have classified it wrongly.
6.24	Restricting growth in rural villages (i.e. Goostrey) would help to maintain their charm and character.
6.24	Impossible to support or object to this section without a clearer definition of "moderate growth" and "limited growth" that can be measured. I do agree main focuses should be on the larger towns in the county, including improving the infrastructure in line with housing development. I do not classify Goostrey as being able to take the same absolute "limited growth" as somewhere like Alderley Edge or Holmes Chapel. Goostrey does not have the infrastructure and is a village, whereas Holmes Chapel and Alderley Edge are small towns with significantly more services - so surely "limited growth" must be made a relative statement to the size of the area being described (e.g. limited growth is x% increase in population - with associated plan for services improvement / uplift)
6.24	Object to subjective terminology i.e. limited / moderate.

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
6.24	Limited growth of Goostrey - and the neighbouring hamlet of Twemlow - would help maintain their charm and rural character.
Table 6.9	9% for Local Service Centres is too high. Development at this rate will be forced upon villages like Goostrey which do not have the infrastructure to cope.
Table 6.9	This rate of development is too high for Goostrey; its character would be spoiled forever and would not be sustainable. Jodrell Bank consultation zone should be protected by planners not constantly contested. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.9	Object – This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns. Goostrey has too few facilities to be a LSC it is much smaller than Alderley Edge or Holmes Chapel - no secondary school, no doctor, no dentist, no garage, few shops, and little employment - development here is unsustainable locally.
Table 6.9	9% growth would kill the rural nature of villages; more focus on towns large and small should be made.
Table 6.9	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns. Classification of Goostrey as an LSC is inappropriate - it should be categorised as a Sustainable Village.
Table 6.9	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey (incorrectly classified as a Local Service Centre) at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on the towns ensuring the development is backed up by the necessary infrastructure improvements.
Table 6.9	I support this Option where towns of Crewe, Macclesfield, Alsager, Congleton, Nantwich and Sandbach, which have good standards of accessibility by rail and bus, will be the main focus for development in this option. Moderate growth would take place in the towns of Wilmslow, Poynton, Handforth, Knutsford and Middlewich.
Table 6.9	This would aim to develop villages like Goostrey - and the neighbouring hamlet of Twemlow - at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and rural character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.9	I support this Option where towns of Crewe, Macclesfield, Alsager, Congleton, Nantwich and Sandbach, which have

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	good standards of accessibility by rail and bus, will be the main focus for development in this option. Moderate growth would take place in the towns of Wilmslow, Poynton, Handforth, Knutsford and Middlewich, whilst limited growth would occur at Alderley Edge, Holmes Chapel, Chelford, Goostrey and Mobberley.
Table 6.11	This option delivers the worst of all worlds. We will get the development but not the investment. This can't be done without building on open countryside, which will create urban sprawl. Villages like Hough and surrounding villages will be completely overrun with infill development and we lose the rural nature of our environment. It's inconceivable that development of this sort will be sustainable - it would be too costly to make it so.
Table 6.11	A growth of this scale is not realistic for Goostrey, CEC should preserve the rural nature of the village, a growth of 17% of local service centres is far too high. More focus should be on small and large towns, Goostrey village is out of place as a Local Service Centre and would be spoiled for ever if this were to take place.
Table 6.11	Object – Growth of 17% for Local Service Centres is far too much. This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.11	Growth for LSC's at 17% is not sustainable and would destroy communities. To accommodate this you would need to invest heavily in every type of infrastructure and this would not be cost effective. More emphasis on towns is needed.
Table 6.11	Growth of 17% for Local Service Centres is far too much. This aims to develop villages like Goostrey (incorrectly classified as a Local Service Centre) at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on the towns ensuring the development is backed up by the necessary infrastructure improvements.
Table 6.11	Growth of 17% for Local Service Centres is far too much. This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns. Classification of Goostrey as an LSC is inappropriate - it should be re-categorised as a Sustainable Village.
Table 6.11	Growth of 17% for Local Service Centres is too much. More focus should be on small and large towns with more services.
6.29	This option increases assignment to sustainable villages from 3% to 5%, and reduces assignment to Crewe by about 7%. The sustainability of this option depends on where the settlement is located. If it's near Crewe, then its

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	sustainability will be questionable for the same reasons as options 1, 2 and 3 fail.
Table 6.13	1 % for Handforth with 2,500 new homes planned versus a current population of 6,000?
Table 6.15	Knutsford is at capacity on all its community infrastructure at present- CEC must recognise this, identify projects that are necessary to be sustainable going forward. This may require investment greater that Levy can deliver in new development.
Table 6.17	Too high a percentage for Goostrey, a rural village. It would be spoiled forever, but should be protected with focus on small towns not villages. Cheshire should be proud of its villages.
Table 6.17	Hybrid option has no evidence and totally flawed in process.
Table 6.17	Object – This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns
Table 6.17	This is simply too much for a village such as Goostrey, are you trying to ruin Cheshire?
Table 6.17	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.17	This would aim to develop villages like Goostrey and the neighbouring hamlet of Twemlow at too high a rate and would ruin their rural character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
Table 6.17	This aims to develop villages like Goostrey at too high a rate and would ruin their charm and character. More focus should be on small and large towns.
6.40	The impact on the loss of identity and over development in the south of Crewe is understated. You will create unmanageable urban sprawl with this option
6.40	Where does this comment come from? This infers this option is unsustainable because of traffic capacity issues, but this is not brought out in the sustainability assessment. Brings into question this whole sustainability assessment process.

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
6.43	Why is insufficient traffic capacity not brought out in the assessment?
6.44	At least this option creates a bit more balance in where development is concentrated.
6.44	We need to limit development in villages such as Goostrey to preserve their charm and character
6.46	The infeasibility of option 3 is not surprising if it's not feasible for options 1 or 2, as the proportion of development proposed for Crewe is the same. Not brought out by sustainability assessment.
6.47	This is the worst of all worlds. You will lose the rural villages with no gain. We can't conceive under what circumstances this would be considered sustainable
6.50	New settlement close to Local Service centre would help to prevent the merger of larger towns by taking some of the development pressure away from already overloaded facilities and infrastructure
6.55	You should not underestimate the benefit of retaining the character of rural areas. It takes centuries to create this and a development plan that ignores it will make Cheshire East a soulless place to live.
6.55	The shortfall to need appears to be small (although difficult to tell, as figures quoted on different basis) particularly as commitments in villages and areas not covered by town strategies nearing 50% only 3 years into plan period. Variant of option 6 to match need appears only sustainable option.
6.58	As with option 5, sustainability depends on where these new settlements may be located. If they are near to Crewe, then the objections to options 1, 2 and 3 are probably equally relevant. Consideration of options 5 and 7 does not appear to reflect the more difficult access to secondary schooling; assuming new secondary schools are not included in these settlements.
6.60	This shows that the whole assessment is a bit of a nonsense! Options 5 and 7 are shown by the assessment to be similar to the other options (except 4) but with a more negative impact on strength of rural communities. In practice the report rejects options 1 to 4 because of traffic capacity limits in Crewe and option 6 because it does not meet the need. Options 5 and 7 are just as unsustainable if new settlements near Crewe. The only likely sustainable option would be a modest adjustment to option 6 to deliver need.

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
6.60	Totally flawed argument but will of course 'allow' the councils of the future to just join everything up. No evidence that this had valid argument just filling your wish list so can do what you like when you like regardless. We already have seen your information stating that growth in South Cheshire is being pushed by landowners and developers so all rather transparent.
6.60	Option 7 states 1 % growth for Handforth, how does this sit with 2,500 new houses proposed versus current resident population of around 6,000?
7.1	Table 7.3 of the Sustainability Appraisal provides a brief description of the effects of the policies contained in the Policy Principles Document against the previously defined sustainability objectives. This table gives very little analysis of the document and there is no detailed information as to why certain policies are believed to have positive, negative or neutral effects on the objectives.
Table 7.3	Broadly the sustainable community policies are well intentioned but a roadmap outlining all the investment needed should be created. For example - leisure policy - you want lots of things how are you going to deliver?
Table 7.5	I fail to see how increasing the population equates with better pollution and other sustainable criteria as the roads if already gridlocked at times and most people aspire or have a car, they are unlikely to change their habits whilst the dangers and road traffic are at the current levels. When the Council can show some real commitment to putting cyclists and pedestrians first by improving the cycle ways and paths, you may start to get an improvement in take up. I am one of only a few who would ever get on a bus with a bike, and at least have been told to not get on. Is that any encouragement? I cycle to work 6 miles each day and the worst parts are in Nantwich and along Nantwich Road in Crewe where you are constantly being pushed to one side by the motorists. The attempt at cycle lanes is a start, but they are incomplete and poorly maintained line marking and pot hole wise. I would mark the pollution section - - - - - on this basis. How have you made these assumptions, they look like guesswork.
8.13	I haven't seen any sustainability assessments for sites in Knutsford.
8.1	Section 8 of the Sustainability Appraisal aims to analyse the social, environmental and economic impacts of the strategic sites. It is Gladman's view that neither a thorough analysis nor a comprehensive comparison of the sites has

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>been undertaken. The information listed on each site consists of a brief summary and the table testing the sites against the sustainability objectives as previously used throughout the study.</p> <p>2.5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal is listed as a key evidence document for the Development Strategy and Policy Principles Document. However there are clear discrepancies between how the sites have performed against the sustainability criteria and whether or not they are considered to be preferred sites in the Development Strategy.</p> <p>2.5.3 For example in Nantwich, 'Site 5 - Land south of Queens Drive' performs better than 'Site 1 - Kingsley Fields' as: The rating for 17 of the 20 objectives is identical for both sites. For Objective 2, Site 1 has a higher rating (++ compared to +) For both Objectives 8 and 9, Site 5 has a higher rating (+- compared to -)</p> <p>2.5.4 In the Development Strategy Land south of Queens Drive is considered an alternative site and Kingsley Fields is preferred, when on this assessment alone it could be expected that 5 would be considered preferable to Site 1.</p> <p>2.5.5 This is also the case for some of the other settlements in the Borough. For example in Crewe, 'Site 12 - South West Crewe' outperforms preferred 'Site 6 - The Triangle', 'Site 3 - Basford East' and 'Site 4 - Basford West' when tested on the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>2.5.6 In Macclesfield, 'Site 7 - Land east of London Road' is considered more sustainable than preferred 'Site 4 - Land east of Fence Avenue'. There is no justification as to why sites that have been considered more sustainable have not been included as preferred.</p>
Table 8.1	We don't think the scoring takes into account the significance of rating the negative impact of building on the Triangle (which has a SSSI on it) compared to a greenfield site that doesn't have this. A minus isn't sufficient to show the extent of the negative impact.
Table 8.1	You have a way over optimistic appraisal. Until Crewe is properly re-developed in its Town Centre, it will remain an

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>underinvested miserable area. It is a pity that the plans to sort out the shopping and transport have all failed in the last 20 years, what is the change you can bring now in the age of austerity and shortage of cash? Have you some magic plan we are not aware of? I suspect another 20 years of gradual change, hopefully generally for the better. Just take a walk down the shuttered up shops in West Street; that is what visitors see on the way into Crewe, what a disgrace. Don't get me wrong, I like Crewe and have lived and worked there for all my working life, I only wish it could be better and you promise so much that I can't see you deliver.</p>
8.4	<p>This site is >70% within the Wybunbury parish and this village is not part of Crewe. You itemise factors but I can see no definition of what is required to be a preferred site.</p>
8.4	<p>Strategic Site 7 – East Shavington</p> <p>It is stated that the site could be phased for delivery after 2020. We have objected to the phasing proposal in recent representations to the Development Strategy on the basis that the reason for the phasing, to enable the housing elements of Basford East and West to get under way, is fallacious given the sites are in completely different market areas. Basford East and West are associated with a built up and industrial environment of Crewe south east whereas Shavington has a village environment. Shavington cannot substitute for Basford and vice versa and in any event, East Shavington is needed to sustain local shops, services and facilities in Shavington village and provide for homes that Shavington and the Crewe area needs in line with the Development Strategy.</p> <p>Although the site is outside the maximum recommended distance to a range of forms of open space, these will be provided on site, making up a shortfall in Shavington village, and to be shared with the village community.</p> <p>It is stated that the site could jeopardise remediation of brownfield sites. However, there are no brownfield sites, other than minor infill, in Shavington or the area around it. The nearest listed building, Shavington Lodge, is at some distance to the north east and has only glimpsed views of the site. Important buildings in the village centre do not have a view of the development site.</p> <p>It is stated that the agricultural land quality of the site is Grade 2 and 3 (about 50% Grade 2, 50% Grade 3). Agricultural consultants have undertaken an Agricultural Land Classification (December 2012) which reveals Grade 2 (20%), Sub-Grade 3a (30%), Sub-Grade 3b (50%). The Grade 2 land will be difficult to work as it is inter-mixed with Sub-Grade 3b.</p> <p>Development of the site will contribute towards the provision of improved education opportunities in the area. Shavington High School has a considerable number of vacant pupil places which will be filled by children from East</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Shavington.</p> <p>Development of the site will provide additional local facilities for Shavington residents, particularly open space and childrens' play. It will also help to support local facilities in Shavington where shops and local services have closed in recent years. Some years ago Shavington Primary School had to close one classroom because of lack of pupils. The site does contribute to the achievement of Crewe's economic vision, its sustainable community strategy (Ambition for All) and the other spatial housing objectives set out in the Development Strategy for the Crewe area.</p>
Table 8.2	<p>There are instances whereby some sites perform better against some objectives than others, but without any clear explanation as to how this conclusion has been reached. For example, Site 3 in Macclesfield (Land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road) is ranked as ++ on sustainability, whilst all others are ranked as +. The same applies to sites when assessed against objective 18. Our Client's land forms part of Site 10 (Land between Chelford Road and Whirley Road), which is ranked as + against objective 18, yet sites 1-3 are ranked as ++. As a site with mixed-use potential, it is our Client's view that Site 10 should also be ranked as ++.</p>
Table 8.3	<p>With the potential for considerable population growth for Alsager it is important that the public transport needs of residents are properly met both from an environmental and social perspective. Improved walking access to the railway station, particularly from the Twyfords site (redeveloping the walkway already in place), would encourage use of rail services and potentially bring improved services and investment in the station.</p>
8.10	<p>We are generally supportive of the need to develop the Back Lane and Radnor Park sites although there is the option to use existing brown field land nearby without the loss of local amenity</p>
Table 8.5	<p>Why only the one strategic site considered. Where is the impact assessment for Handforth New Town? Found it later in the document - please cross reference as it is supposed to be Handforth's strategy!</p>
Table 8.6	<p>This + and - system is too simplistic.</p>
Table 8.6	<p>Unfortunately, this tick box exercise remains just that. Someone else could come along and with justification insert a completely different series of + and - . All it achieves is that someone higher up can tick their box 'CEC has done its sustainability assessment'.</p>
8.14	<p>Knutsford is at capacity in its infrastructure at present. 400 houses will not give enough investment to deliver all</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	school, retail, sports etc improvements. Retail is definitely not needed as Town Centre is vacant.
8.14	<p>Knutsford 2 is not just greenfield it is Green Belt. It may be 'small' to administrators but not to the residents. It will result in the loss of open country and woodland and substantially modify the landscape character. It may be grade 2 and 3 agricultural land but it is in cultivation and the output contributes to food production and animal husbandry. The infrastructure is already at breaking point. The road system is not amenable to the radical realignment that it would require for extra housing because the nodal points where congestion occurs are locked in by buildings and a complex over-railway road bridge. Where did these 'initial proposals' come from that 'indicate that services and facilities may be provided or a contribution made towards the provision of them'? Isn't this a consultation about whether development should occur? Or is it already a 'done deal'?</p> <p>'Development process may increase carbon emissions' - it may indeed as the majority of residents in the proposed estate will drive out to Manchester, Stockport or Warrington because that is where the employment is. The houses may be sustainable in relation to older houses but not in relation to the agricultural land they occupy.</p> <p>The site is within the Brine Compensation Board and not far from the salt flash in Tatton Park Melchett Mere. Some indication of subsidence and a rising water table is present on the site.</p> <p>Knutsford is a significant tourist destination and tourism contributes significantly to the local economy. Apart from its literary and historical significance, it is attractive to tourists because of its setting: the visitor does not have to travel through suburban housing because the town is largely set in the countryside, especially on the north. It is not true to say that the site does not contain any historic sites. That would be so if only buildings are considered. However, Knutsford is one of the few towns in England where the grip of local landowners in the 18th century meant that townsfolk could not expand beyond the strict confines of the settlement. They could only expand up their crofts and tofts, hence the narrow pathways that run east and west off King Street. Removal of the historic landscape on the northern approach to Knutsford would be a serious degradation of its setting. The plans threaten to kill the tourist goose that lays the golden eggs of visitors and their spends.</p> <p>Employment land on this site would be even more disastrous. No analysis has been done on the type of employment that would fit with the educational and technical profile of Knutsford's population. Most of the work force works outside the town. Hundreds of square feet of office space are already on the market unsold and un let in the town. The speculation that it 'could provide increased employment opportunities and could provide housing for employees working in the local area' is wishful thinking not the hard-edged commercial foresight that is required.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
Table 8.8	According to a consultation response by Gladman or their agents (ID Nant 539) to the Draft Nantwich Town Strategy (DNTS) consultation, Nantwich South 'is eleventh out of all thirteen sites' contained in the Draft Nantwich Town Strategy Sustainability Appraisal. If Gladman are correct and this site ranks 11th out of the 13 sites contained within the DNTS it clearly has very poor sustainability credentials and is unlikely to be sustainable. Furthermore, this site is remote from Nantwich town centre and the proposed local centre would pose a threat to trade within the town centre and potentially the viability of a number of town centre businesses, to the detriment to the town as a whole.
Table D.18	The sustainability appraisal for Nantwich Site 1 states 500 houses, with development avoiding flood risk zone. Yet the plan allows for 1000 with some development in the flood zone. Will the sustainability appraisal need to be redone? Do comments about reduced fragmentation take account of the river and associated connectivity?
Table 8.8	According to a consultation response by Gladman or their agents (ID Nant 539) to the Draft Nantwich Town Strategy (DNTS) consultation, Nantwich South 'is eleventh out of all thirteen sites' contained in the Draft Nantwich Town Strategy Sustainability Appraisal. If Gladman are correct and this site ranks 11th out of the 13 sites contained within the DNTS it clearly has very poor sustainability credentials and is unlikely to be sustainable. Furthermore, this site is remote from Nantwich town centre and the proposed local centre would pose a threat to trade within the town centre and potentially the viability of a number of town centre businesses, to the detriment to the town as a whole.
8.18	The development of land to the South of Queens Drive is poor choice due to the limited road access. The losses to wildlife, amenity and heritage are far more important in Nantwich than some other areas and the full impact will be horrific. The access to the Wonderful historic Welsh Row and the failed traffic management that is already in place can only get worse if this plan is taken. The views of open countryside and the overuse of the only viable residential road will make it a nightmare for the residents on Queens Drive, to use, cross or live near. The developers have submitted plans to develop this area and the Council appears to take at face value the reports that they have purchased. The plans will make a bigger impact than has been estimated and cannot be reversed once decided. I fail to see how any industry would build here as it would be better placed say at Wardle or one of the already developed and still expandable areas of industrial sites nearby. One or two jobs in a shop isn't going to save the area from its chronic lack of decent jobs.
Table 8.10	Sandbach option 5 should be shown as +- on criteria 8 and 9, same as for option 4. The detailed assessments in Appendix B are near identical, correctly identifying both positive and negative aspects.

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
8.22	<p>Comment re 5: Abbeyfields (land between Abbey Road and Park Lane) "Initial proposals indicate that pedestrian and cycle links to new and existing residential areas, services and facilities may be provided, potentially reducing reliance on private transport."</p> <p>To provide connectivity a cycle track connecting Abbey Road to Park Lane would be required. Accesses at Abbey Road are already incorporated into the design and a corresponding access at Park Lane could be created at the very end of Park Lane. This would allow access across this area and avoid the busy Middlewich Road</p>
8.26	<p>Changing the Fulshaw Park Field (across the road from the Royal London) from Green Belt to Safeguarded land is not a requirement of present Government legislation. Therefore it is not part of Wilmslow Town Council's remit. The Royal London is not currently increasing employment, and it is unlikely to in the current economic climate. Is the Royal London projecting growth and increased employment beyond the year 2030?</p> <p>The Wilmslow Strategy document says the "Least Worst Option" the Royal London site". This is not an acceptable reason for destroying Green Belt. There are plenty of alternatives in Brown Field sites and empty office space in the Wilmslow area. Investment must be made in the derelict sites.</p> <p>It makes no sense to destroy Green Belt when there is plenty of Brown Field sites and offices which are empty and can be developed for the good of everybody. If left as they are now, these disused sites will become even more dilapidated, whereas money invested in these areas will improve the overall appearance of Wilmslow, keeping Green Belt areas intact, both for us and for future generations to enjoy.</p>
8.27	<p>the concept of the new settlement is supported but the sites should be sustainable, deliverable, and be able to link in with other aspects such as leisure and re-use of reclaimed land which we consider is the attraction of Chelford</p>
Table 8.13	<p>Siddington village is currently a predominantly agricultural community comprising around 70 farms and houses spread over a reasonably wide geographical area. Although referred to as a village in point of fact there is no village centre. There is a part time post office and a village hall and church, but nothing else. The village is a rural community based on agriculture.</p> <p>The Plan states that the "best and most versatile agricultural land should be retained where possible" and also that "the character and identity of an area should be complimented by new development". The new settlement proposal envisages an increase in size of the village from its current 70 dwellings to over 700. This would obliterate the village as existing and incur the loss of top quality agricultural land.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Policy CS6 states that the only development to be permitted is that which is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry and outdoor recreation. Policy CS10 states that infrastructure should precede delivery of development. There is currently little infrastructure in the village and it would be completely unrealistic to expect the construction of a primary school, shops, health centre and pub in advance of the proposed new development reaching completion. A development of 700 units would have to be phased over several years and the earlier phases of construction would, for commercial reasons, not include the above facilities. I am highly doubtful that even when complete that the new settlement could sustain shops, a school, a health centre and a pub when all around businesses are failing even in larger rural communities.</p> <p>The village is not currently a sustainable settlement - there are virtually no existing facilities or local employment opportunities. Shopping is done following a car trip of several miles to the surrounding towns. Even in the unlikely event of the new settlement delivering a village shop, supermarket shopping will still prevail. Recently a major house builder stated that when appraising a new site they look for an existing supermarket within a maximum distance of two miles - that is the demand from purchasers and Siddington does not conform.</p> <p>The village currently has very limited utilities with no gas and only localised mains drainage. The cost of providing services will be very considerable and a significant deterrent to any developer.</p> <p>Similarly the existing road network is scarcely adequate for current traffic levels being of mainly restricted width or single track carriageways. Any new development would require a complete re-construction of the road system - all the way to Chelford in one direction and to the A34 in the other, including reforming the currently highly dangerous junction of Chelford Road with the B5392 (Salters Lane). The cost of doing this will be prohibitive but would be entirely necessary as 700 units could produce over 1,200 additional cars, all of which would be much used due to the remoteness of the settlement from shops, employment, secondary schools and leisure. Currently the nearest cinema is 10 miles distant.</p> <p>Public transport is non-existent in the village. The nearest station or bus route is in Chelford, which can only be reached by car. Additional bus services could be introduced but rural travel is predominantly by car.</p> <p>The proposal for a new large settlement in the village has no merit whatsoever; indeed it would be hard to find a less suitable location. On any objective assessment Siddington is not a realistic site for a new sustainable community.</p> <p>[Edited by admin].</p> <p>It is also my view as a property professional that it would be extremely difficult to attract house builders to develop in the area on this scale. The village is simply too remote from existing population centres and all they have to offer.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Additionally the exceptionally high development costs in providing new roads and services together with a commercially doubtful local amenity centre make the whole proposal unattractive. From a commercial point of view there are simply better located and easier developed sites becoming available, which are being released by reforms to the current planning system.</p> <p>There is also no requirement for a large number of affordable dwellings which would form part of this proposed development. Take-up of existing local affordable stock is poor and there is no requirement for further dwellings on the part of local social housing providers.</p> <p>I consider the proposal to be ill considered. It firstly has no regard for the existing community and its residents many of whom are now greatly concerned at what might happen to their village and its rural way of life. Secondly as a small agricultural village with high quality productive agricultural land the village's status as an important farming community should be protected. Thirdly the proposal is naive in assuming that the indicated local centre amenity facilities will lead to a sustainable settlement. People are no longer willing to support a local shop or pub - they require far more in the way of facilities and amenities, and they also wish to live close to their place of work.</p>
Table 8.13	<p>Any additional housing should be much closer to the centre area of Macclesfield within reasonable reach of transport, shopping and leisure facilities so as to limit the use of cars and have good public transport available.</p> <p>Siddington has won numerous awards in the best kept Village annual competitions in the under 400 population category. It was judged the best kept village in the whole of Cheshire again in 2009, as it had been before. One of the two dairy farms that would be threatened with closure -Broadoak Farm - has won the title "Supreme Farm Champion of Cheshire in the Cheshire Farms competition. The country can ill afford to lose good farming land when National food production is so important. (The loss of this milk output would probably have to be made up with imported milk from France).</p> <p>In the fields, shown for new housing around Brookfields Farm, there are the unmarked graves of the many cattle slaughtered and buried there following the Foot and Mouth Disease outbreak in 1967-8, when 430,000 animals were killed on 2,300 farms- with a lot in Cheshire. Wouldn't such land be described as contaminated?</p> <p>The map shown on page 220 is out-of-date. The sand quarry is already a lot further east than shown and Planning Permission was granted some years ago to allow the quarry to extend almost to the house named Chance, with the eastern end of the quarry to be restored as shallow Wet Land, a type of nature reserve.</p> <p>Disused sandpits are often dangerous for children and young people with drownings due to their depth and often</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>steep and unstable sides. When completed there will be a public footpath round the edge and, whilst normally on country walks children have adult supervision - as at Redesmere for example - if hundreds of children were to live nearby and there is unrestricted access to the public footpath there are bound to be tragic accidents. Water is a magnet for children.</p> <p>Siddington is not a Sustainable Village i.e. it has: no public transport of any kind - all car use; no local employment (except on two dairy farms, both of which would be lost if the development went ahead); no primary school or pub/restaurant unlike Chelford and Marton which have both and are better served for such facilities and services; no shops; no recreational facilities; no main drainage. A few houses share a small private sewage treatment plant (already full). All other houses have septic tanks or soak-aways; no mains gas supply; no street lighting; sometimes an unreliable power supply when there are strong winds in the area; occasionally an uncertain water supply; poor broadband availability.</p> <p>How can such a small settlement take a 12 fold increase in housing?</p> <p>Siddington is accessed by country lanes which are narrow, winding and without pavements or footpaths. Prams, pushchairs and wheelchairs cannot be used on the roads safely.</p> <p>The Plan says that at least 30% of all new housing has to be Affordable, i.e. of the 700 houses built in Siddington at least 210 would have to be affordable, for sale or rent only to local people.</p> <p>Originally instigated by the [edited by admin] Rural Housing Enabler, affordable housing in Siddington has been the subject of much discussion over the last 5 years with a needs survey 4 years ago which initially suggested a possible requirement for up to 16 such houses. There were public meetings and much debate but, on examination, it was thought that the real need was more likely to be about 8.</p> <p>However none of the people originally listed have shown renewed interest in the last 3 years suggesting that perhaps their needs have changed or that they are not urgent. Thus it seems likely that even 8 affordable houses might be difficult to fill.</p> <p>A number of years ago 10 affordable houses were built in the next village, Lower Withington, in Dooley's Grig. Some time ago one of these became available but it is only now, over 2 years later, that it has been possible to find a new occupant.</p> <p>With this recent local history, how can one contemplate filling over 200 such houses in Siddington?</p> <p>Social housing can bring both good and bad results. (Remember the Victoria flats in central Macclesfield?). There seems little justification for social housing in any area where there is no public transport. If a lot came here might we</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>become the rural Hattersley?</p> <p>If 700 new houses were built in Siddington this would probably mean an extra 1,200 cars in the vicinity. Currently those driving south or east, usually go via the B 5392, through Lower Withington to Holmes Chapel, for the M6 or Middlewich, Chester etc.</p> <p>Lower Withington have had a history of speeding traffic through their village and if this went ahead it would impose an intolerable burden on them.</p> <p>Those going to Macclesfield cross the busy, and dangerously fast, A34 and go, via, Pexhill Road, B 5392, which is itself narrow and winding and along which there are few, if any, places where it is safe to overtake. At the end of this road there is Broken Cross which could well be even more congested depending on where the new proposed east-west Macclesfield Link road joins it.</p> <p>Those going to Knutsford, Alderley Edge and Wilmslow, use Congleton Lane, which is very narrow and cars often have to slow down to pass each other.</p> <p>All Saints Church, Siddington, is half a mile away, and the village hall one mile away, from the village centre- both on the other side of the extremely busy A34 where there have been numerous accidents. These tend to happen at the cross roads to Pexhill Road, at the Z bend approaching Capesthorpe Hall and just past the hall by North Lodge.</p> <p>Currently there is a severe build-up of traffic during rush hours at Monk's Heath traffic lights, (junction of the A34 and the A577), with up to a 1.5 mile back-up of traffic towards the Capesthorpe Z bend.</p> <p>Already reference has been made to the fact that there are little local employment opportunities in Siddington and these would mostly disappear if the two dairy farms went. Houses have been planned for some time in Chelford, the nearest large sustainable village, at the Stobart's site and at the present Marshall's site used for the market.</p> <p>Stobarts and Marshalls employ several hundred and these jobs will disappear in the next few years. The Plan indicates that Congleton, (the nearest town to Siddington), is already short of jobs which would mean that any workers in Siddington would have to commute to Macclesfield, Wilmslow or Knutsford - if there were jobs there.</p> <p>On page 221 there is a list of Constraints with regard to a development in Siddington. Whilst Great crested newts, archaeological remains and other items get a mention there is no mention of the impact on the quality of life of the existing residents. Are newts more important than people?</p> <p>Siddington is well inside the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope Consultation Zone, (ref. Policy SE 14 on page 77 of Policy Principles). Why is there no mention of this under constraints, or have Jodrell Bank already given the proposal its blessing and agreed not to raise any objections?</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Because Siddington does not have such facilities, it is suggested that there could be a range of shops, a new mixed-use local centre with a new primary school, a community facility (village hall?), health facilities, public house, restaurant and leisure facilities. At the moment Siddington children have the choice of schools at Marton, Chelford and others - all of which will be looking for new pupils in the future. There is an excellent doctor's surgery and pharmacy at Chelford and a choice of restaurants and pubs very close to Siddington.</p> <p>Whilst an increase of 700 houses in Siddington might make certain such projects viable, what happens in the time it takes to reach critical mass? Such projects would not be viable and the lack of such facilities would present real difficulties to newcomers.</p>
Table 8.13	I cannot believe the so called appraisal for area 1 (Handforth East). E.g. More than 2 thirds of the area to be built on is farmed land, yet you claim it is positive for the rural economy. Likewise 'Vibrant rural community'. Most of 'boxes' should at best be 'negative'.
8.28	we consider that the benefits of the development at Chelford would outweigh those of the other alternative sites
8.28	Chelford 800 houses totally unsustainable population increase on any measure you care to use.
8.28	Handforth East: I find it difficult to reconcile much of this with the area I know and use on a frequent basis. The proposed settlement is far too big, should not be in the greenbelt and falls far short of sustainability.
8.28	<p>How will Handforth East actually benefit Handforth - please spell it out.</p> <p>2 new primary schools, plus the 2 already in existence, which secondary will they all go to?</p> <p>Loss of greenbelt and unknown biodiversity stated - well find out before you destroy it forever.</p>
8.29	'This sentence sums up the whole sustainability exercise: development will have 'varying impacts'. Stating the obvious? The majority of the sites have an overall positive impact' because someone put more + than - in the boxes not because they were necessarily valid.
9.3	Sport England, Sport Cheshire, Cheshire LTA, Disability groups should be included
9.6	We note that you have categorised Hough as a sustainable village. We cannot think what services and facilities are

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	provided here to meet the needs of local people. There is no shop, no Drs surgery, no school, no post office, no children's play area and no sports field. The bus service has been cut back to four buses per day starting at 9.45am - ending a 3.55 pm - insufficient for work or school runs. There are no employment opportunities, other than a local pub which was closed down for three months in 2012 and was closed down throughout a large part of 2010/11. Hough should be categorised as a rural village. We would ask that this change is made and that you notify us of such.
Table A.1	What a surprise - the sustainability appraisal supports the development that CEC wants! Just to take Infrastructure: how can it increase access to the countryside if it's just been built over? And ++ for maintaining or enhancing infrastructure! Not if the present state of the roads is anything to go by.
Table A.2	It has not been possible to comment on the reams of pluses [and hardly any minuses] because they defy rational analysis and are self justifying. Sorry
Table A.3	It has not been possible to comment on the reams of pluses [and hardly any minuses] because they defy rational analysis and are self justifying. Sorry
Table A.4	It has not been possible to comment on the reams of pluses [and hardly any minuses] because they defy rational analysis and are self justifying. Sorry
Table C.1	A more precise definition of 'sustainable access to jobs, services and facilities' might useful. Is the intention here to specify transport connection only, as opposed to communication technology including the quality of internet and broadband? This is raised in the event that the meaning of sustainable access might be considered more widely. Relationship with social inclusion objectives set out in draft policy CS20 and policy CO3 in the Policy Principles paper is recognised in this context.
Table C.2	Policy CS2 asserts an important key principle which allows homes, jobs and other facilities to be located close to each other so as to provide maximum opportunities to reduce reliance on transport and increase usage of sustainable alternatives (in particular public transport where available). The links with the overall aim of future proofing the realisation of a sustainable transport network, which should include, as well as maintaining the efficient operation and performance of major highway routes, and reducing the length and frequency or private car journeys in

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	particular.
Table C.8	The arguments in this section are circular and open to wide interpretation. If a rural exception site cannot be proved to be needed by the local parish and sustainable, it should not be allowed to go ahead,
Table C.9	It concerns us that interpretation is reliant on the implementation of draft policies CS 8 and CS 9 and Policy Principle SE 4, amongst others, which aim to respect and, where possible, enhance the natural environment and landscape. We can see that the gap in how it is applied will lead to little respect and likely destruction of the environment and landscape
Table C.11	These principles are admirable and get our full support. It is disappointing to see that they have not to date been applied with any rigour by the planners
Table C.32	The policy needs to make it clearer that the need should be local and the development sustainable. As it is currently written, it is open to wide interpretation and in the developers favour
Table C.60	Regarding “7: Infrastructure, services and facilities. The policy seeks to improve public transport, pedestrian and cyclist facilities” I agree with this in principle but would like to see cycle facilities built to the standard set out by the Department for Transport’s Local Transport Note 02/08 - Cycle Infrastructure Design. If the specification cannot be met then it’s often better to not install a particular cycle facility.
Table C.61	There is an inter-relationship between the two aims of reducing average journey distances travelled for jobs, facilities and the development of new technology to drive forward fully sustainable alternatives e.g. electric cars/vehicles. This is found in policy CO2 of the Policy Principles paper.
Table D.3	Strategic Site 7 – East Shavington It is stated that the site could be phased for delivery after 2020. We have objected to the phasing proposal in recent representations to the Development Strategy on the basis that the reason for the phasing, to enable the housing elements of Basford East and West to get under way, is fallacious given the sites are in completely different market areas. Basford East and West are associated with a built up and industrial environment of Crewe south east whereas Shavington has a village environment. Shavington cannot substitute for Basford and vice versa and in any event,

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>East Shavington is needed to sustain local shops, services and facilities in Shavington village and provide for homes that Shavington and the Crewe area needs in line with the Development Strategy.</p> <p>Although the site is outside the maximum recommended distance to a range of forms of open space, these will be provided on site, making up a shortfall in Shavington village, and to be shared with the village community.</p> <p>It is stated that the site could jeopardise remediation of brownfield sites. However, there are no brownfield sites, other than minor infill, in Shavington or the area around it. The nearest listed building, Shavington Lodge, is at some distance to the north east and has only glimpsed views of the site. Important buildings in the village centre do not have a view of the development site.</p> <p>It is stated that the agricultural land quality of the site is Grade 2 and 3 (about 50% Grade 2, 50% Grade 3).</p> <p>Agricultural consultants have undertaken an Agricultural Land Classification (December 2012) which reveals Grade 2 (20%), Sub-Grade 3a (30%), Sub-Grade 3b (50%). The Grade 2 land will be difficult to work as it is inter-mixed with Sub-Grade 3b.</p> <p>Development of the site will contribute towards the provision of improved education opportunities in the area. Shavington High School has a considerable number of vacant pupil places which will be filled by children from East Shavington.</p> <p>Development of the site will provide additional local facilities for Shavington residents, particularly open space and children's' play. It will also help to support local facilities in Shavington where shops and local services have closed in recent years. Some years ago Shavington Primary School had to close one classroom because of lack of pupils. The site does contribute to the achievement of Crewe's economic vision, its sustainable community strategy (Ambition for All) and the other spatial housing objectives set out in the Development Strategy for the Crewe area.</p> <p>The negatively assessed and unknown elements of the sustainability appraisal for East Shavington are almost all those which are associated with the type, layout and style of the development itself through planning application. All these matters have been assessed by experts in their respective fields and which can be satisfactorily achieved. Loss of greenfield character of the East Shavington site is of course a negative factor on the balance sheet, but the benefits that East Shavington will bring to Shavington village, to the Crewe area and to the Borough area in terms of sustaining local shops and services, delivering homes to meet local and Crewe area needs bringing construction jobs and other spin-off jobs in related trade and suppliers is considered to be a material consideration which outweighs the loss of open land in a village which as seen no major development, and therefore no loss of open land, since the Greenfield estate was built in the 1970s.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
Table D.7	Sustainable Objective 16 for Macclesfield proposed site 8, suggests that the development would reduce the need for private vehicles. That is nonsense - an additional 360 houses would mean an increase in traffic, with many houses having more than one vehicle. Shopping and parking in Sainsbury's would increase and Prestbury and Bollington roads, amongst, others would become even more congested that it already is particularly around rush hour times.
Table D.5	<p>Re: Macclesfield site 3</p> <p>I strongly object to the destruction of greenbelt land between Congleton Rd and Chelford Rd. It is against the current NPPF which states greenbelt should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. Brownfield sites have not been exhausted- they simply require the developer to realise less of a profit as they cost more to build on. The Kings school site at Cumberland St. has not been included in potential sites - if the Fence Ave site is to be developed as proposed then Cumberland St must be included as the entire school will move or not at all. Traffic would be horrendous as any additional residents would need to travel north for jobs and the congestion on the A536/A537 at peak times are already appalling. There is NO provision for low cost housing which is the main need in Macclesfield. Building higher cost homes on prime greenbelt is simply a payday for developers and a dereliction of duty by Cheshire East.</p>
Table D.5	There are instances whereby some sites perform better against some objectives than others, but without any clear explanation as to how this conclusion has been reached. For example, Site 3 in Macclesfield (Land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road) is ranked as ++ on sustainability, whilst all others are ranked as +. The same applies to sites when assessed against objective 18.
Table D.6	The presence of the Macclesfield Canal and its towpath adjacent to Site Option 4 should be taken into consideration in the Sustainability Appraisal for the site. More specifically, the canal and its towpath should be fully considered in respect of the potential impact of the development of the site in relation to Sustainability Objectives 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 16.
Table D.7	Please note Sustainable Objective 11 for Site 8 is incorrect. The site is known to have a residing bat population and Great Crested Newts
Table D.8	There are instances whereby some sites perform better against some objectives than others, but without any clear explanation as to how this conclusion has been reached. Our Client's land forms part of Site 10 (Land between

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	Chelford Road and Whirley Road), which is ranked as + against objective 18, yet sites 1-3 are ranked as ++. As a site with mixed-use potential, it is our Client's view that Site 10 should also be ranked as ++.
Table D.12	<p>The amount of housing proposed for Congleton is disproportionate to its size, and does not take the distinctive urban morphology of the town, its sense of place and its geography sufficiently into consideration. The proposals also depend on a proposed northern by-pass which will have a disastrous impact on landscape & environment generally. It cannot be acceptable if sustainability is to be a meaningful concept, not just empty words. The case has not been properly put to local people, and I object to it being included in the local plan without a debate based on an objective assessment.</p> <p>I also object to housing site 6: Land north of Lamberts Lane being included. This area is held in very high regard by local people, and if it goes, the town centre and its two focal points, the Town Hall and St Peter's Church, will lose the current close connection with the countryside. The sustainability assessment has not ruled this site out - it dissects issues and scores them, but sometimes the whole is more than the sum of its parts, and this is one of those situations. I would like to see this area and Priestly Fields protected in order to conserve the distinctive townscape/landscape character of Congleton.</p>
Table D.17	The presence of the Trent & Mersey Canal and its towpath in close proximity to Site Options 1 and 2 should be taken into consideration in the Sustainability Appraisal for the sites. More specifically, the canal and its towpath should be fully considered in respect of the potential impact of the development of the sites in relation to Sustainability Objectives 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 16.
Table D.19	<p>I'm increasingly concerned that the green belt and areas of natural beauty are rapidly diminishing here in Nantwich and the surrounding villages.</p> <p>Every available space has been targeted for new housing estates (three-storey residences usually) and now these seem to dominate the once attractive tourist/historic market town.</p> <p>Green spaces are evolving in a negative way transforming into concrete eyesores and in my opinion not enough brownfield sites are being utilized. I'm extremely concerned at the impact on the environment and the potential flooding risks associated with the destruction such vast quantities of natural drainage.</p>
Table D.20	<p>Comments relate to area described as Poynton Option 3:</p> <p>1) Land is green belt</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>2) Access is currently limited and the road into the centre of Poynton is narrow and already congested.</p> <p>3) Lower part of site is subject to flooding</p> <p>4) Area was subject to mine workings and traces of spoil heaps can still be seen.</p> <p>5) Sports facilities are already available within 1/4 -1/2 mile</p> <p>6) Previous retail opportunities (supermarket) were unsuccessful as most people preferred to shop where there was greater choice.</p> <p>7) Use of this site is counter to the recommendations of the Town Council.</p>
Table D.22	<p>I support sites one and two. I believe the number of 700 houses on site one should be capped at a maximum of 200 subject to infrastructure improvements. Without improvements this should be limited to 50 houses</p>
Table D.23	<p>Will it provide good opportunities to access various forms of public transport? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) as the proposal at Yeowood Garden Village will provide a new bus route through the site to serve the new community and the existing community. Services will be to Sandbach town centre, the railway station, and on to destinations such as Manchester, Chester, and Crewe.</p> <p>Will it make sure that the rural environment - built and natural, is maintained or enhanced? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) as the proposal at Yeowood Garden Village will provide extensive enhancement to the natural environment. The existing environment is biodiversity poor and the proposal will create new environments to increase biodiversity and improve the landscape</p> <p>Will it increase the accessibility of the countryside? At present (?) this should be changed to (++) as the proposal at Yeowood Garden Village will provide new access through the site to the Trent and Mersey Canal towpath. It will provide links under-utilised footpaths and the addition of the Green Walkway and footpath around the Farm provides an additional interconnected loop into the existing network of footpaths.</p> <p>Will it positively contribute to the management of water pollution? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) as the proposal at Yeowood Garden Village will provide active water management throughout the site through SUDS and reed beds</p> <p>Will it protect or enhance biodiversity? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) Will it protect and minimise the fragmentation or cause enhancement of habitats? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) Will it help protect any species at risk? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) Yeowood Garden Village will protect and enhance the biodiversity of the site in advance of any development in order to protect the existing habitat and provide for a</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>wide range of habitat improvements to create areas of ecology that will accommodate the development. The proposal will put the landscape and ecology first and effectively create a sense of place, increase ecology, connecting people with nature, Positive biodiversity gain.</p> <p>Will it protect or enhance the landscape? Will it protect or enhance the townscape? Will it complement the existing built and natural environment, ensuring that the area remains distinctive? At present (-) this should be changed to (++) The overall anticipated Landscape Impacts of Yeowood Garden Village are considered to be as follows: Year 1:- Significance of Impact: Minor Beneficial Year 15:- Significance of Impact: Moderate Beneficial</p>
Table D.25	<p>The presence of the Shropshire Union Canal and its towpath adjacent to the site should be taken into consideration in the Sustainability Appraisal. More specifically, the canal and its towpath should be fully considered in respect of the potential impact of the development of the site in relation to Sustainability Objectives 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 16.</p>
Table D.29	<p>New Settlement 1 (Handforth East)</p> <p>I know this area well, but do not recognise it in this appraisal. 'Sustainability' is mostly negative, not the rose tinted picture painted here.</p>
Table D.29	<p>I know site 1 (Handforth East) well and most of this assessment is simply wrong. Most of the rankings should be +/- at best, with a large number being very definitely negative. The development would not be sustainable.</p>
Table D.29	<p>New Settlement Site 1 (Handforth East)</p> <p>The appraisal is full of planning speak and over interpretation, but actually says very little. A large number of the gradings should go down by at least one step. This site is far from 'sustainable'.</p>
Table D.31	<p>Siddington village is currently a predominantly agricultural community comprising around 70 farms and houses spread over a reasonably wide geographical area. Although referred to as a village in point of fact there is no village centre. There is a part time post office and a village hall and church, but nothing else. The village is a rural community based on agriculture.</p> <p>The Plan states that the "best and most versatile agricultural land should be retained where possible" and also that "the character and identity of an area should be complimented by new development". The new settlement proposal envisages an increase in size of the village from its current 70 dwellings to over 700. This would obliterate the village as existing and incur the loss of top quality agricultural land.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Policy CS6 states that the only development to be permitted is that which is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry and outdoor recreation. Policy CS10 states that infrastructure should precede delivery of development. There is currently little infrastructure in the village and it would be completely unrealistic to expect the construction of a primary school, shops, health centre and pub in advance of the proposed new development reaching completion. A development of 700 units would have to be phased over several years and the earlier phases of construction would, for commercial reasons, not include the above facilities. I am highly doubtful that even when complete that the new settlement could sustain shops, a school, a health centre and a pub when all around businesses are failing even in larger rural communities.</p> <p>The village is not currently a sustainable settlement - there are virtually no existing facilities or local employment opportunities. Shopping is done following a car trip of several miles to the surrounding towns. Even in the unlikely event of the new settlement delivering a village shop, supermarket shopping will still prevail. Recently a major house builder stated that when appraising a new site they look for an existing supermarket within a maximum distance of two miles - that is the demand from purchasers and Siddington does not conform.</p> <p>The village currently has very limited utilities with no gas and only localised mains drainage. The cost of providing services will be very considerable and a significant deterrent to any developer.</p> <p>Similarly the existing road network is scarcely adequate for current traffic levels being of mainly restricted width or single track carriageways. Any new development would require a complete re-construction of the road system - all the way to Chelford in one direction and to the A34 in the other, including reforming the currently highly dangerous junction of Chelford Road with the B5392 (Salters lane). The cost of doing this will be prohibitive but would be entirely necessary as 700 units could produce over 1,200 additional cars, all of which would be much used due to the remoteness of the settlement from shops, employment, secondary schools and leisure. Currently the nearest cinema is 10 miles distant.</p> <p>Public transport is non-existent in the village. The nearest station or bus route is in Chelford, which can only be reached by car. Additional bus services could be introduced but rural travel is predominantly by car.</p> <p>The proposal for a new large settlement in the village has no merit whatsoever; indeed it would be hard to find a less suitable location. On any objective assessment Siddington is not a realistic site for a new sustainable community.</p> <p>[Edited by admin].</p> <p>It is also my view as a property professional that it would be extremely difficult to attract house builders to develop in the area on this scale. The village is simply too remote from existing population centres and all they have to offer.</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>Additionally the exceptionally high development costs in providing new roads and services together with a commercially doubtful local amenity centre make the whole proposal unattractive. From a commercial point of view there are simply better located and easier developed sites becoming available, which are being released by reforms to the current planning system.</p> <p>There is also no requirement for a large number of affordable dwellings which would form part of this proposed development. Take-up of existing local affordable stock is poor and there is no requirement for further dwellings on the part of local social housing providers.</p> <p>I consider the proposal to be ill considered. It firstly has no regard for the existing community and its residents many of whom are now greatly concerned at what might happen to their village and its rural way of life. Secondly as a small agricultural village with high quality productive agricultural land the village's status as an important farming community should be protected. Thirdly the proposal is naive in assuming that the indicated local centre amenity facilities will lead to a sustainable settlement. People are no longer willing to support a local shop or pub - they require far more in the way of facilities and amenities, and they also wish to live close to their place of work.</p>
Table D.31	<p>Any additional housing should be much closer to the centre area of Macclesfield within reasonable reach of transport, shopping and leisure facilities so as to limit the use of cars and have good public transport available.</p> <p>Siddington has won numerous awards in the best kept Village annual competitions in the under 400 population category. It was judged the best kept village in the whole of Cheshire again in 2009, as it had been before. One of the two dairy farms that would be threatened with closure -Broadoak Farm - has won the title "Supreme Farm Champion of Cheshire in the Cheshire Farms competition. The country can ill afford to lose good farming land when National food production is so important. (The loss of this milk output would probably have to be made up with imported milk from France).</p> <p>In the fields, shown for new housing around Brookfields Farm, there are the unmarked graves of the many cattle slaughtered and buried there following the Foot and Mouth Disease outbreak in 1967-8, when 430,000 animals were killed on 2,300 farms- with a lot in Cheshire. Wouldn't such land be described as contaminated?</p> <p>The map shown on page 220 is out-of-date. The sand quarry is already a lot further east than shown and Planning Permission was granted some years ago to allow the quarry to extend almost to the house named Chance, with the eastern end of the quarry to be restored as shallow Wet Land, a type of nature reserve.</p> <p>Disused sandpits are often dangerous for children and young people with drownings due to their depth and often</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>steep and unstable sides. When completed there will be a public footpath round the edge and, whilst normally on country walks children have adult supervision - as at Redesmere for example - if hundreds of children were to live nearby and there is unrestricted access to the public footpath there are bound to be tragic accidents. Water is a magnet for children.</p> <p>Siddington is not a Sustainable Village i.e. it has: no public transport of any kind - all car use; no local employment (except on two dairy farms, both of which would be lost if the development went ahead); no primary school or pub/restaurant unlike Chelford and Marton which have both and are better served for such facilities and services; no shops; no recreational facilities; no main drainage. A few houses share a small private sewage treatment plant (already full). All other houses have septic tanks or soak-aways; no mains gas supply; no street lighting; sometimes an unreliable power supply when there are strong winds in the area; occasionally an uncertain water supply; poor broadband availability.</p> <p>How can such a small settlement take a 12 fold increase in housing?</p> <p>Siddington is accessed by country lanes which are narrow, winding and without pavements or footpaths. Prams, pushchairs and wheelchairs cannot be used on the roads safely.</p> <p>The Plan says that at least 30% of all new housing has to be Affordable, i.e. of the 700 houses built in Siddington at least 210 would have to be affordable, for sale or rent only to local people.</p> <p>Originally instigated by the [edited by admin] Rural Housing Enabler, affordable housing in Siddington has been the subject of much discussion over the last 5 years with a needs survey 4 years ago which initially suggested a possible requirement for up to 16 such houses. There were public meetings and much debate but, on examination, it was thought that the real need was more likely to be about 8.</p> <p>However none of the people originally listed have shown renewed interest in the last 3 years suggesting that perhaps their needs have changed or that they are not urgent. Thus it seems likely that even 8 affordable houses might be difficult to fill.</p> <p>A number of years ago 10 affordable houses were built in the next village, Lower Withington, in Dooley's Grig. Some time ago one of these became available but it is only now, over 2 years later, that it has been possible to find a new occupant.</p> <p>With this recent local history, how can one contemplate filling over 200 such houses in Siddington?</p> <p>Social housing can bring both good and bad results. (Remember the Victoria flats in central Macclesfield?). There seems little justification for social housing in any area where there is no public transport. If a lot came here might we</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>become the rural Hattersley?</p> <p>If 700 new houses were built in Siddington this would probably mean an extra 1,200 cars in the vicinity. Currently those driving south or east, usually go via the B 5392, through Lower Withington to Holmes Chapel, for the M6 or Middlewich, Chester etc.</p> <p>Lower Withington have had a history of speeding traffic through their village and if this went ahead it would impose an intolerable burden on them.</p> <p>Those going to Macclesfield cross the busy, and dangerously fast, A34 and go, via, Pexhill Road, B 5392, which is itself narrow and winding and along which there are few, if any, places where it is safe to overtake. At the end of this road there is Broken Cross which could well be even more congested depending on where the new proposed east-west Macclesfield Link road joins it.</p> <p>Those going to Knutsford, Alderley Edge and Wilmslow, use Congleton Lane, which is very narrow and cars often have to slow down to pass each other.</p> <p>All Saints Church, Siddington, is half a mile away, and the village hall one mile away, from the village centre- both on the other side of the extremely busy A34 where there have been numerous accidents. These tend to happen at the cross roads to Pexhill Road, at the Z bend approaching Capesthorpe Hall and just past the hall by North Lodge.</p> <p>Currently there is a severe build-up of traffic during rush hours at Monk's Heath traffic lights, (junction of the A34 and the A577), with up to a 1.5 mile back-up of traffic towards the Capesthorpe Z bend.</p> <p>Already reference has been made to the fact that there are little local employment opportunities in Siddington and these would mostly disappear if the two dairy farms went. Houses have been planned for some time in Chelford, the nearest large sustainable village, at the Stobart's site and at the present Marshall's site used for the market.</p> <p>Stobarts and Marshalls employ several hundred and these jobs will disappear in the next few years. The Plan indicates that Congleton, (the nearest town to Siddington), is already short of jobs which would mean that any workers in Siddington would have to commute to Macclesfield, Wilmslow or Knutsford - if there were jobs there.</p> <p>On page 221 there is a list of Constraints with regard to a development in Siddington. Whilst Great crested newts, archaeological remains and other items get a mention there is no mention of the impact on the quality of life of the existing residents. Are newts more important than people?</p> <p>Siddington is well inside the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope Consultation Zone, (ref. Policy SE 14 on page 77 of Policy Principles). Why is there no mention of this under constraints, or have Jodrell Bank already given the proposal its</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>blessing and agreed not to raise any objections?</p> <p>Because Siddington does not have such facilities, it is suggested that there could be a range of shops, a new mixed-use local centre with a new primary school, a community facility (village hall?), health facilities, public house, restaurant and leisure facilities. At the moment Siddington children have the choice of schools at Marton, Chelford and others - all of which will be looking for new pupils in the future. There is an excellent doctor's surgery and pharmacy at Chelford and a choice of restaurants and pubs very close to Siddington.</p> <p>Whilst an increase of 700 houses in Siddington might make certain such projects viable, what happens in the time it takes to reach critical mass? Such projects would not be viable and the lack of such facilities would present real difficulties to newcomers.</p>
Table D.31	<p>Dealing first with the site selection criteria, it is clear that the analysis applied to each area relies on the Councils Sustainability Appraisal findings. However, the Councils Sustainability Appraisal does not include a final 'sustainability 'score' based on the Council's approach for each area. Instead the assessment is based on subjective opinion, including for example, how the individual areas of search can assist 'climate change', 'pollution' or contribute towards 'equality and social inclusion' and 'energy efficiency and renewable energy'. As such, the methodology applied holds little weight as all of the potential New Settlements could or should result in a 'positive score', based on the Council's approach as all the potential New Settlements, with the appropriate investment, could contribute to 'climate change' or 'renewable energy' provision for example.</p> <p>Although the Sustainability Appraisal includes limited commentary relating to 'biodiversity', 'green infrastructure' and 'flood risk' within each area, the Councils sustainability assessment is fundamentally flawed as it results in three of the areas being omitted due to the findings of the 'Sustainability Appraisal', without any scoring assessment, detailed explanation or considered conclusions.</p> <p>To address these concerns a more detailed, thorough review of a range of site options should be undertaken based on the areas Green Belt / Open Countryside function, its biodiversity, flood risk, agricultural land quality as well as physical proximity to jobs, shops, transport services and health and education facilities. A more considered approach may reveal that those New Settlements taken forward in the 'Development Strategy' are not physically capable of accommodating the level of growth principle and scale anticipated or the least constrained.</p>
Table F.1	We would suggest that some areas of the policy will have a negative impact on health. The development strategy

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p>seems to place great importance on expanding road networks and highway infrastructure. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Cheshire East will be subject to increased pollution levels and associated environmental health issues.</p> <p>Development of Junction 16 and duelling of A500 will promote an increase in the use of motor vehicles within the Crewe corridor. We are concerned that it will also add a high volume of HGV traffic to urban road networks. High levels of pollution caused from engine exhaust and fuel vapours should be expected to accumulate within these areas. Many of the chemicals present in vehicle emissions are potentially toxic and can cause severe damage to health. Recent studies have cited traffic pollution as the possible culprit for an increase in the premature death rate within the UK.</p> <p>It is reasonable to presume that higher vehicle numbers will potentially facilitate further road traffic accidents within the area. Duelling the A500 and expansion of Junction 16 will almost certainly encourage an increase in vehicular speed.</p> <p>Figures obtained from Cheshire Police show that between 01/01/07 - 30/06/12 there were a total of 1.115 casualties reported on the M6 Junction 16 to Junction 19 (North and South bound traffic). These figures do not included vehicle damage only collisions. There were 1,032 casualties with slight injuries, 68 with serious life threatening injuries and 15 fatalities. We would like to remind Council of the most recent tragic incident that occurred on the M6 on 10th December 2012.</p> <p>Figures obtained from Department of Transport show that the A500, Junction 15 to Junction 16 corridor (duelled road network), there were 727 people injured in road traffic accidents 2005 - 2011 period. There were 15 fatalities within this period. Thirty two incidents occurred between Junction 16 and the Alsager/Audley exit on A500 during this period. One of these incidents was fatal. We therefore suggest that the proposed duelling of the A500 to Crewe will not offer any safety advantages.</p> <p>Leighton Hospital currently does not have the required capacity to deal with any substantial increase in A&E admissions. We note that policy proposals for expansion of Leighton Hospital may address some areas of concern but it must be recognised that the major trauma centre operating in the area is The North Staffordshire Hospital NHS Trust, which is also currently running at capacity and faces a debit of £10.5 million as a NHS Trust. Any further expansion of Leighton hospital must be financially viable to make sure current services are not affected. Funding for building development may be available but full funding for clinical treatment, staffing levels, estate maintenance and provision of equipment may prove a little difficult in the current/ future NHS economic climate</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
Table F.5	<p>We would like to make known the following objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have Health and Wellbeing concerns regarding addition of new public houses to proposed villages. Cheshire East has increased financial pressure placed upon NHS, Police and Community services due to alcohol related health issues. Further development/ provision of outlets will not ease current pressures and does not promote the Council's commitment to addressing alcohol related illness. 2. We believe existing plans to expand the current Leighton Hospital site may only be sufficient to deal with the increased "aging "population of the area. As Leighton Hospital is already working to capacity and has to maintain very tight control of finances, any increase on current services will almost certainly prove negative by result. A full impact assessment of health for our area should include the potential of the migration of a new workforce and their potential health requirements. We strongly believe this cannot have been taken into consideration given current local health service issues. 3. Increased carbon emission increase due proposed road developments. Development of A500, M6 and associated road networks do not champion working towards reducing carbon emissions but promote the use of road transport. <p>We also note Village B and its phased developments are not best placed for the development of a healthy community to either live or work (Sick Community Syndrome - community displays signs and symptoms due to common environmental cause.) The development is to be based in close proximity to major road networks. Pollution levels, light, noise, air and environmental run-off from road transport will be high in this area.</p> <p>Minor point but ...The development is also close to a service station and therefore possible further emissions are of potential hazard. We note that vapour recovery systems should be in place at such locations but operator error must always be taken into account given that increase in business is likely if road expansion/ network developments are carried out.</p>
Table H.2	<p>Site Crewe 7 – East Shavington</p> <p>We have appraised the accessibility assessment criteria for East Shavington and would please ask you to make the following corrections based on the findings of our traffic and transport consultants in the preparation of the Transport Assessment for this site. The measurements are centre to centre and take into account the pedestrian link to Crewe Road via the Church land:</p>

Document Reference	Consultee Comment Summary
	<p> Amenity open space – will be on site. Childrens' playspace – will be on site. Outdoor sports facility – will be on site. Convenience store 480m (Co-op) instead of 551m. Supermarket – 480m (Co-op) instead of 3,534m. Post box – 480m (Main Road) instead of 607m. Playground/amenity area – will be on site. Post office 480m (Main Road) instead of 607m. Bank or cash machine – 480m (Co-op and Nisa) instead of 714m. Pharmacy 1600m (Rope Lane) instead of 1829m. Primary School 500m instead 747m. Medical centre – 1600m (Rope Lane) instead of 1829m. Leisure facilities – 1300m instead of 1507m. Local meeting place/community centre – 300m (Village Hall) instead of 486m. Public house 700m (The Vine) instead of 855m. Public park or village green – will be on site. </p> <p>We note that by comparison with the other 13 Strategic Sites / Alternative Sites East Shavington is the most sustainable in terms of the accessibility criteria.</p>
Table H.14	<p>Table H14 indicates that Chelford 'ticks ' more boxes than any of the other alternative new settlement sites and therefore should be given further consideration as it is accessible, sustainable and all the land to the east of the railway is deliverable from one owner</p>