

# Cheshire East Pre-Submission Core Strategy

## Summary and Assessment of Issues Raised During Consultation

Consultation of the Local Plan Pre-Submission Core Strategy took place between 5<sup>th</sup> November and 16<sup>th</sup> December 2013. This represented further preparatory work under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

This document presents summaries of the relevant issues raised for each section of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, gives a brief assessment of the relevant issues and details recommendations for proposed material changes to document.

In addition, the original consultation document and all consultation responses can be viewed online at the Council's Consultation Portal <http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/cspre>.

Please note that unless otherwise stated, references to chapters and paragraph numbers in this document refer to the chapters and paragraphs in the Local Plan Pre-Submission Core Strategy that was consulted on between 5<sup>th</sup> November and 16<sup>th</sup> December 2013. Changes to the document mean that these references may not now correspond to the references in the new document, the Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version.

## Methodology adopted for assessing responses to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy

### 1.0 Analysis

1.1 In addition to questionnaires, the Council received individual letters, standard letters, petitions and developer representations from stakeholders. In order to allow an analysis of the vast amount of comments received, CEC adopted the following methodology to review the comments received.

### 2.0 Consultation Points (support, objections, comments and suggested changes)

2.1 The Pre - Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) was divided up into approximately 170 individual consultation points. All issues raised through the consultation were recorded against all applicable consultation points as an objection, support, a comment or a suggested change to an individual policy, site or development principle.

### 3.0 Logging comments

3.1 Every comment received was logged against one or more of the appropriate consultation points and all comments and issues raised have been made available on the Cheshire East Council Consultation Portal at <http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/cspre> web site along with the names of individuals or agents that submitted them for complete transparency.

### 4.0 Proformas

4.1 A proforma was produced for each consultation point/ or subject heading. All objections, support, comments and suggested changes received for each point were quantified (giving a total number of

times the point was made) and summarised. In some cases, it was necessary to amalgamate very similar consultation points such as a chapter heading and a policy where the issues raised were one and the same (e.g. Sustainable Development and MP1). In these cases, the overall number of supporters, objectors and commentators and suggested changes were added together.

## 5.0 Issues raised

5.1 Whilst the issues raised were many and various, at this stage of the plan making process all comments had to be assessed against the objective of ultimately producing a 'sound' Local Plan at Inspection. Cheshire East Council will need to demonstrate to an independent Planning Inspector that the Core Strategy meets the tests of 'soundness'; these are that the plan has been;-

**Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

**Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

**Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

**Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework

5.2 To this end, it was necessary to ensure that all comments received and issues raised that related to the issue of soundness were addressed and responded to.

## 6.0 Peer Review

6.1 Each consultation point proforma was reviewed and the issues raised were looked at objectively by a panel of Planning Officers to decide if specific wording changes or a material changes to policy should be made to the PSCS.

## 7.0 Recommendations

7.1 A Council response was added to each proforma setting out the reasons for accepting or rejecting suggested changes. Issues relating to "soundness" of policy wording were given very careful consideration to ensure that the next iteration of the Local Plan Strategy has responded appropriately to the points made and will be considered sound.

7.2 Where legitimate, "material considerations" were raised, "material changes" were made to the Local Plan Strategy policy wording, along with specific wording changes requests in the related chapters. In some cases, it was felt that issues raised about a particular consultation point had been adequately covered elsewhere in the document and therefore a material change was not required under that consultation point.

7.3 It should be noted that due to changes in the PSCS and the Local Plan Strategy, the numbering has been slightly altered; however the ordering of the document remains the same.

## 8.0 Recording the changes

8.1 All minor and major changes taken forward in the PSCS are recorded at the end of each individual Consultation Proforma in a shaded 'Recommendation' box.

## **Consultation Responses by Consultation Point:**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Cheshire East Pre-Submission Core Strategy .....   | 1   |
| Summary and Assessment of Issues Raised During Consultation .....  | 1   |
| Methodology adopted for assessing responses to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy .....  | 1   |
| Consultation Responses by Consultation Point: .....  | 3   |
| Foreword .....   | 8   |
| Your Views and How to Comment .....  | 11  |
| Chapter 1: Introduction .....  | 16  |
| Chapter 2: The Context of the Core Strategy .....  | 21  |
| Chapter 3: Spatial Portrait .....  | 23  |
| Duty to Co-Operate .....   | 33  |
| Chapter 4: Vision and Vision Statement .....   | 38  |
| Chapter 5: The Case for Growth .....   | 44  |
| Chapter 6: Strategic Priorities .....  | 49  |
| Strategic Priority 1: Promoting economic prosperity by creating conditions for business growth .....   | 51  |
| Strategic Priority 2: Creating sustainable communities, where all members are able to contribute and where all the infrastructure required to support the community is provided..... | 54  |
| Strategic Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality .....   | 58  |
| Strategic Priority 4: Reducing the need to travel, managing car use and promoting more sustainable modes of transport and improving the road network.....                            | 61  |
| Chapter 7 and Policy MP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development .....   | 64  |
| Chapter 8 and Policy PG1: Planning For Growth.....   | 67  |
| Settlement Hierarchy and Policy PG2.....   | 72  |
| Green Belt and Safeguarded Land and Policy PG3: Green Belt .....   | 76  |
| Policy PG4: Safeguarded Land.....  | 90  |
| Policy PG5: Open Countryside .....   | 95  |
| Spatial Distribution and Policy PG6: Spatial Distribution of Development .....   | 99  |
| Key Diagram.....   | 105 |
| Chapter 9 and Policy SD1: Planning for Sustainable Development .....   | 106 |
| Policy SD2: Sustainable Development.....   | 111 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Chapter 10 Infrastructure and Policy IN1: Infrastructure .....                  | 116 |
| Policy IN2: Developer Contributions .....                                       | 120 |
| Chapter 11: Enterprise and Growth .....   | 125 |
| EG1 Economic Prosperity.....  | 127 |
| EG2: Rural Economy.....   | 129 |
| Policy EG3: Existing and Allocated Employment Sites .....                       | 130 |
| Policy EG4: Tourism.....  | 132 |
| Policy EG5: Promoting a Town Centre First Approach to Retail and Commerce ..... | 134 |
| Chapter 12: Stronger Communities .....  | 136 |
| SC1: Leisure and Recreation.....  | 138 |
| Policy SC2: Outdoor Sports Facilities .....                                     | 140 |
| Policy SC3: Health and Wellbeing .....  | 142 |
| Policy SC4: Residential Mix.....  | 145 |
| Policy SC5: Affordable Homes.....   | 147 |
| Policy SC6: Rural Exceptions Housing for Local Needs.....                       | 152 |
| Policy SC7: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople.....                  | 154 |
| Chapter 13: Sustainable Environment .....                                       | 157 |
| Quality of Place and Policy SE1: Design .....                                   | 158 |
| Policy SE2: Efficient Use of Land .....   | 162 |
| Policy SE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity.....                                  | 165 |
| Policy SE4: The Landscape.....  | 169 |
| Policy SE 5: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland .....                                | 173 |
| Policy SE6: Green Infrastructure .....  | 176 |
| Policy SE7: The Historic Environment .....                                      | 179 |
| Policy SE8: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy .....                               | 183 |
| Policy SE9: Energy Efficient Development.....                                   | 186 |
| Minerals and Policy SE10: Sustainable Provision of Minerals.....                | 189 |
| Waste and Policy SE11: Sustainable Management of Waste .....                    | 198 |
| Pollution and Policy SE12: Pollution and Unstable Land.....                     | 201 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Flood Risk and Water Management and Policy SE13: Flood Risk and Water Management ..... | 204 |
| Policy SE14: Jodrell Bank.....   | 208 |
| Policy SE15: Peak District National Park Fringe .....                                  | 210 |
| Chapter 14: Connectivity .....   | 212 |
| Policy CO1: Sustainable Transport and Travel .....                                     | 214 |
| Policy CO2: Enabling Business Growth Through Infrastructure .....                      | 219 |
| Digital Connections and Policy CO3: Digital Connections.....                           | 223 |
| Policy CO4: Travel Plans and Travel Assessments .....                                  | 224 |
| Chapter 15: Core Strategy Sites and Strategic Locations .....                          | 226 |
| Crewe.....   | 234 |
| Strategic Location SL1 Central Crewe .....   | 239 |
| Site CS1 Basford East, Crewe.....  | 241 |
| Site CS2 Basford West, Crewe.....  | 244 |
| Site CS3 Leighton West, Crewe .....  | 248 |
| Site SL2 Leighton, Crewe .....   | 254 |
| Site CS4 Crewe Green, Crewe .....  | 258 |
| Site CS5 Sydney Road, Crewe.....   | 262 |
| Site SL3 South Cheshire Growth Village .....   | 264 |
| Site CS6 Shavington/ Wybunbury Triangle .....  | 269 |
| Site CS7 East Shavington .....   | 271 |
| Macclesfield.....  | 274 |
| Strategic Location SL4: Central Macclesfield.....                                      | 278 |
| Site CS8: South Macclesfield Development Area .....                                    | 281 |
| Site CS9:Fence Avenue, Macclesfield.....   | 284 |
| Site CS10: Land Between Congleton Road and Chelford Road.....                          | 288 |
| Site CS11: Gaw End Lane, Macclesfield .....  | 293 |
| Alsager .....  | 296 |
| Strategic Location SL5: White Moss Quarry .....  | 299 |
| Site CS12: Twyfords and Cardway, Alsager .....   | 308 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Site CS13: Former MMU Campus, Alsager .....   | 310 |
| Site CS14: Radway Green Brownfield, Alsager .....                                   | 313 |
| Site CS15: Radway Green Extension, Alsager .....                                    | 315 |
| Congleton .....   | 318 |
| Strategic Location SL6: Back Lane / Radnor Park, Congleton .....                    | 323 |
| Strategic Location SL7: Congleton Business Park Extension .....                     | 327 |
| Site CS16: Giantswood Lane South, Congleton .....                                   | 330 |
| Strategic Location SL8: Giantswood Lane to Manchester Road, Congleton .....         | 332 |
| Site CS17: Manchester Road to Macclesfield Road, Congleton.....                     | 334 |
| Handforth .....   | 336 |
| Knutsford.....  | 338 |
| Site CS 18:North West Knutsford .....   | 342 |
| Site CS19:Parkgate extension, Knutsford.....  | 346 |
| Middlewich.....   | 349 |
| Site CS20: Glebe Farm, Middlewich .....   | 352 |
| Strategic Location SL9: Brooks Lane, Middlewich .....                               | 354 |
| Strategic Location SL10: Midpoint 18 Extension, Middlewich.....                     | 356 |
| Nantwich .....  | 358 |
| Site CS21: Kingsley Fields, Nantwich .....  | 359 |
| Site CS22: Stapeley Water Gardens, Nantwich .....                                   | 365 |
| Site CS23: Snow Hill, Nantwich .....  | 368 |
| Poynton .....   | 371 |
| Sandbach .....  | 374 |
| Site CS24: Land adjacent to J17 of M6, South East of Congleton Road, Sandbach ..... | 377 |
| Wilmslow .....  | 380 |
| Site CS25: Adlington Road, Wilmslow .....   | 383 |
| Site CS26: Royal London, Wilmslow.....  | 386 |
| Site CS27: Wilmslow Business Park.....  | 390 |
| Site CS28: Wardle Employment Opportunity Area.....                                  | 392 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Site CS29: Alderley Park Opportunity Site .....   | 394 |
| Site CS30: North Cheshire Growth Village.....   | 397 |
| Committed Strategic Sites .....   | 401 |
| Safeguarded Land .....  | 402 |
| Site CS31: (Safeguarded) Gaw End Lane, Macclesfield .....                                 | 405 |
| Site CS32: (Safeguarded) Land Between Congleton Road and Chelford Road, Macclesfield..... | 407 |
| Site CS33: (Safeguarded) North West Knutsford .....                                       | 411 |
| Site SC34: (Safeguarded) North Cheshire Growth Village, Handforth East.....               | 414 |
| Site CS35: (Safeguarded): Prestbury Road, Wilmslow .....                                  | 417 |
| Site CS36: (Safeguarded) Upcast Lane, Wilmslow .....                                      | 419 |
| Chapter 16 – Monitoring and Implementation .....  | 421 |
| Chapter 17: Glossary.....   | 423 |
| Appendix A: Housing Growth and Distribution .....   | 425 |
| Appendix A: Employment Land Growth and Distribution.....                                  | 427 |
| Appendix B: Saved Policies .....  | 428 |
| Appendix C: Car Parking Standards .....   | 429 |
| Appendix D: Evidence and links .....  | 431 |
| Appendix E: Housing Trajectory .....  | 432 |
| Appendix G: Evolution of the Core Strategy.....   | 433 |
| Appendix H: Partners and Initiatives .....  | 434 |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Foreword</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 50 (Support: 3 / Object: 26 / Comment Only: 21)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the non-inclusion of the Gorsty Hill Golf Course site in the Development Plan</li> <li>• Sandbach Town Council generally support the Pre Submission Core Strategy</li> <li>• Real concerns over the extent of speculative developments and support CEC in completing the Local Plan at the earliest opportunity</li> <li>• South Knutsford Residents Group supports CEC's Local Plan Core Strategy and is aligned with the North Knutsford and Nether Ward Community Groups.</li> <li>• There has been effective engagement with community groups and welcome the reduction in housing numbers from within the Green Belt and the use of Brownfield Sites</li> <li>• Still a number of Infrastructure issues which need to be dealt with before the final plan is produced</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the difficult consultation procedure</li> <li>• Concern about the lack of public consultation</li> <li>• Reduce housing figures to 20,000 in line with ONS</li> <li>• Remove proposed allocations from the Green Belt</li> <li>• Proposal should have a Brownfield first approach</li> <li>• Plan has been produced for the benefit of the developers and not the local residence</li> <li>• The document is riddled with mistakes and inaccuracies and should be withdrawn</li> <li>• Object to the failure of CEC to take on board the objections from Wilmslow and the need to develop Brownfield sites first</li> <li>• The evidence base was created after the document was published and therefore does not inform the choices put forward</li> <li>• NW Transport Roundtable object to high growth strategy and the unsustainably large road building programme</li> <li>• NW Transport Roundtable object to the claim that 'a generation of jobs' have been focussed around the M6 corridor – as there is no evidence to support this statement</li> <li>• Aspirations should be to achieve a genuine level of sustainable development housing and employment growth which meets identified need and recognises economic and environmental constraints which take account the quality of life of those people who already live in the Borough as well as future generations</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstances have been shown which explain the need for development within the green belt</li> <li>• Infrastructure is at full capacity</li> </ul> |

- The strategy is not driven by a jobs led growth and will not retain the character of the region
- Object to the designation of the parcel of land BLG09 in the Green Belt assessment being 'contribution' and the possible future development of the site
- This plan should explain that this is the first opportunity for consultation on the Green Belt/Green Gap review
- Many people think that the comments they have made on previous documents have been carried over into this consultation process
- The Strategy has not been positively produced and is not 'pro-growth'
- Housing requirement should be a minimum of 1,800 dwellings per annum, with 2,050 dwellings per annum required to support 23,000 jobs forecasted
- Further release of the Green Belt is required to meet the actual housing need in the area
- Plan is unjustified as the plan suggested a new isolated village within the Green Belt when other acceptable sites are available on the edge of settlements

**Comment Only**

- Process the Plan as soon as possible
- Allow development where needed as soon as possible
- Ensure development is carried out as soon as possible
- Support should be given the CEC to ensure development is directed to the right places to ensure there is a 5 year housing supply and stop 'land grabbing' by developers
- The document is not sound and will not be effective and does not accord with the NPPF – document is too long and does not provide succinct robust guidance
- Difficult document to assimilate – with many contradictions between objectives and detailed strategies
- Little evidence throughout the document of the 'jobs led' approach - more focussed on housing
- General public are suffering from consultation overload, and the process of commenting on the document online is very complicated
- Amount of safeguarded land taken out of the Green Belt is excessive
- Discontent with the length of time it has taken to produce a plan
- Any reduction in level of response should not be considered as acquiescence this is due to the difficulty in commenting on the plan
- Make the plan easier to understand, 'less planner speak'
- Improvements to the road infrastructure needed
- Draft Infrastructure plan was not available to comment on
- Not enough time was given to produce a meaningful response to the consultation
- Level of housing proposed is not justified and open to challenge
- Only 20,000 new houses needed, and 9,000 have already been approved since 2010
-

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebalancing of housing and employment numbers</li> <li>• A shorter more succinct and robust document</li> <li>• More local input required</li> <li>• Reduce level of safeguarded land, Brownfield first approach, and regeneration of town centres</li> <li>• Ensure that consultation responses from the public are listened to and actioned</li> <li>• The plan should be put to a referendum – like a neighbourhood plan</li> <li>• Remove new settlement from the plan – Handforth East and include the re-development of Alderley Park</li> <li>• Remove White Moss Quarry from the Plan</li> <li>• Previous comments and objections should be carried over onto this consultation process</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Foreword is the Portfolio Holder’s introduction to the consultation document and does not form a formal part of the Plan. The comments which have been allocated against this consultation point are not relevant to the Foreword itself, and have been considered against other relevant consultation points within the Plan.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>The Portfolio Holder’s foreword should be updated to reflect the next stage of production of the document.</p>   |

| Consultation Point              | Your Views and How to Comment  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 84 (Support: 6 / Object: 23 / Comment Only 55)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the local plan and core strategy. Support the status of Yeowood Farm Sandbach as a non preferred site for development as it is unnecessary, inappropriate and the residents are strongly opposed to it.</li> <li>• Any plan will, inevitably, attract widespread criticism and objection. It is essential for the future continued prosperity of the region that a formal development plan is implemented without further delay.</li> <li>• Support the contents but would encourage the use of brownfield sites and support eco-friendly houses; for example, solar panels, rain-water harvesting, heat pumps etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The designation of green belt land should only be removed in special circumstances which have not been demonstrated.</li> <li>• A southwest ring road is referred to in relation to site CS10 in Macclesfield, but no proposal has been submitted for public consultation. The impact of a road between Congleton Road and the A537 has not been assessed in relation to traffic on the A537.</li> <li>• CEC is ignoring people of Macclesfield and the wider County's views as the last consultation was thoroughly objected to.</li> <li>• Comments submitted to this website have not been shown. The website does not seem fit for purpose.</li> <li>• A large amount of the information is very difficult to understand. There should be a separate summary of the plan accompanied by presentations in all towns of the impact of the plan on that town.</li> <li>• CEC has ignored the views of residents as expressed in the earlier consultation.</li> <li>• The documents are full of mistakes and inaccuracies.</li> <li>• Routes of response are even more limited and convoluted than previously.</li> <li>• The portal is very poor. Fear that CEC will assume a low response rate equates to support but it does not.</li> <li>• A considerable degree of experience in IT and copious amounts of time are required in order to be able to find the Local Plan and navigate around the web site to identify the various elements. Dissemination of information and opportunities to respond via other routes are very limited. This limits the percentage of the population who will know about it and be able to respond.</li> <li>• The whole consultation exercise over three years appears to have been a total waste of time. The system for comment/objections is far too complicated. Question cost to the tax payer.</li> <li>• The consultation has been made difficult for large proportions for public to take part in. Previous views have not been listened to.</li> <li>• The numbers for housing are over estimated.</li> </ul> |

- Brownfield sites should be used instead of greenbelt.
- The plan should not allocate land for use post 2030.
- Evidence has been gathered to justify the plan, rather than to objectively design the plan.
- The proposal for housing development bears no resemblance to that identified in the last consultation or the Sandbach Town strategy. This is not evidence of a genuine consultation residents views are being totally ignored.
- Bollington will not be assessed until March 2014 and the full implication of not commenting now on the SHLAA Green Belt Assessment and Open Space Documents will impact on our all ready overloaded infrastructure is not stated.
- The consultation has not been accessible to those residents unable to visit libraries or access materials online. The number of consultations and the volume of information have been too great. Fewer, more targeted consultations would have been more effective.

**Comment Only**

- Pre-Submission Core Strategy carries limited weight for development management purposes.
- When will this plan be in place? This has been on-going for three years and in that time planning applications have gone through the roof with very little likelihood of getting them refused due to the lack of the plan so in the meantime the countryside and village communities are being ruined by the lack of this plan.
- It is a very contradictory plan. Its stated aims in some areas are laudable but with little or no support strategies planned to achieve these outcomes and, in fact, the potential for the destruction of some communities.
- Recognise that the draft Local Plan is in response to local and national pressures and pleased that at last some proposals have been made that could have some impact on the local economy. Do not agree with some aspects of the plan that are not being in the interests of the Town of Crewe and its people.
- That the core strategy is being reviewed shows there are fundamental deficiencies due to CEC ignoring former planning guidance. So few people commented on the core strategy in 2010 (compared with 10% of Cheshire East population on the draft Local Plan). CEC went there own way planning-wise and the Local Plan is flawed .It is too late to re-write the Core Strategy but maybe it can be improved somewhat.
- There is too much information for the general public to digest. Never mind building loads of lovely shiny big new houses, find the jobs first to get people to want to work in the areas around Crewe, and then build. Also do not have these properties as private, but rent only. Who is actually going to buy these properties? Not local but commuters.
- The constraints of this electronic form make it too difficult to make meaningful comments e.g. inviting comments only allowing one entry per section and specifying an 'overall view' thus precluding a response to several different elements of the section.
- Local Government should interpret Central Government's parameters in the best interests of their electorates which have not happened here as quotas are accepted based on hypotheses.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to make an effective assessment due to the reliance on internet access.</li> <li>• Tables should be in portrait not landscape format.</li> <li>• The core strategy must recognise the huge amount of sites throughout the county which could be redeveloped as apposed to developing on greenfield sites.</li> <li>• The pre-submission document consists of six main documents as well as a number of key supporting documents that need to be considered to ensure a comprehensive and full understanding of the context of the Borough. It is difficult to navigate through the electronic maze and this excludes a large proportion of the population.</li> <li>• General concerns about the consultation process, the exclusion of sites previously discussed and published and the advanced state of development at NPS 31 + 33. The consultation could be misleading and Cheshire East is currently providing our share of housing.</li> <li>• Sandbach an ancient town which could be destroyed for ever, resulting in urban sprawl and the danger of being flooded with applications which could be permitted.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note that the Pre-Submission Core Strategy carries limited weight for development management purposes. Add 'Publication Stage' to diagram G.1.</li> <li>• Delete the designation of green belt land as safeguarded</li> <li>• Delete references to a road between Congleton road and A537 in Macclesfield.</li> <li>• Scrap this consultation, or at the very least, prioritise ALL brownfield sites before considering greenbelt. Use proper figures when estimating needs of the population.</li> <li>• Use local firms as Consultants</li> <li>• Consider all brown field sites. There is no such thing as protected to 2020 so that a committee can then say that the protection ceases in 2020.</li> <li>• Have a consultation that is assisted by a properly functioning website. Without this (bearing in mind that there has been no publicity about how to object to the local plan) this whole exercise must be declared null and void.</li> <li>• There should be a separate summary of the plan accompanied by presentations in all towns.</li> <li>• Proper consideration to be given to comments.</li> <li>• A restaging of the consultation is required in a more appropriate, inclusive and democratic fashion.</li> <li>• Removal of the North Cheshire Growth Village and Safeguarded Land from the Local Plan.</li> <li>• Reduce number of houses required to 20,000 in line with latest guidelines and reduced requirements. Remove large areas of greenbelt from plan that are not required. Use brownfield instead of greenbelt. Look at brownfield and villages and towns across all of Cheshire East rather than just selected towns.</li> <li>• Remove any land included to give options beyond 2030 and let future generations decide. Remove safeguarded land and leave as green belt.</li> <li>• The consultation should be re-run to be more inclusive and more time allowed for comments.</li> <li>• Less housing - improvements to all existing roads before even considering</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>building new ones which lead nowhere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The core strategy should take real account of the results of the town strategies and the housing developments already approved in Towns such as Sandbach</li> <li>• Allow Bollington to have a local consultation with proper accesses to documents listed within Appendix D.</li> <li>• The SHLAA, Green Belt Assessment, and Open Spaces Documents mention specific sites and policies which will impact on our town.</li> <li>• Reduction in the quantity but increase in the quality of consultation exercises is required. There should be greater access to consultation documents for those residents unable to visit libraries or go online to access documents.</li> <li>• Re-balance new housing and job distribution plans in line with former guidance that placed Macclesfield on a par with Crewe for development and jobs.</li> <li>• The information should have been put as booklets in local places for people to have, not everyone can get on to the internet, or want to. Not everyone who is in an area mentioned will know what is happening</li> <li>• The CE submission document says it must meet the test of 'soundness' and be positively prepared. Unfortunately, it does not meet the need to be easily comprehensible to people in the area and is hard to navigate. Even knowledgeable and active groups are hard-tasked to respond, as the document requires so many sub-set elements.</li> <li>• Make on-line submission of responses easier in future consultation stages.</li> <li>• A more concise summary of key points for each topic and geographical area would help.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The Statement of Community Involvement was adopted by the Council on 14/10/2010. The Core Strategy is being prepared in accordance with the statement. Over 8000 representations have been received so far, which is an indication of the effectiveness of the community involvement. A detailed report on this subject will be prepared as part of the submission documentation. Once the submission version is published, there will be a 6 week period to make representations for consideration by the independent planning inspector at the examination in public.</p> <p>The use of electronic documents and communications is now an accepted part of National and Local Government business and provides an accessible and cost effective tool in communication. Other forms of communication are accepted, however, and many representations have been received by post, and are given equal consideration.</p> <p>The representations received are available on the website. Appendix D is a list of reference documents with website details.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is being prepared under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework and will be given significant weight once it has been adopted.</p> <p>The document has a logical flow and is arranged into sections with an index to make for easy access to relevant issues and proposals. A summary document would inevitably have to leave out matters which many would regard as important.</p>   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p>Development within Macclesfield is explained in more detail in several sections including PG2, PG6 and the Core Strategy sites. As a Principal Town Macclesfield will be a sustainable location for new development subject to consideration of planning designations and policies.</p> <p>Many of the comments are the subject of more detailed consideration in other sections, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies PG1, PG2 and PG6 are relevant to Housing targets.</li> <li>• Policy PG3 covers the green belt issue.</li> <li>• Policy PG4 covers safeguarded land.</li> <li>• The balance between brownfield and greenfield development is covered by policy SE2. Brownfield development is encouraged where appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>The section provides a summary of the community involvement process as it was at the publication of the document. It will be updated to reflect the submission stage of the document.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | The section should be updated to reflect the next stage of production of the document.  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 58 (Support: 12 / Object 36 / Comment Only 10)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the objective of sustainable, job-lead growth</li> <li>• Support a job lead strategy</li> <li>• Support priority to greenbelt over housing</li> <li>• Support focus on brownfield sites</li> <li>• Broadly support the aims and objectives set out in the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Welcome the underpinning policy principles of the Core Strategy, in particular to develop 'brownfield' sites, where possible to minimise the use of greenfield, Green Gap, open countryside or Green Belt sites</li> <li>• Support the town centre first approach, and emphasise this should be even more so for areas within the Prime Shopping Area</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals are divisive and re-inforce North-South divide in the Borough.</li> <li>• Jobs and low cost housing are needed in Crewe as well as a complete regeneration of the town centre. Housing built on surrounding greenfield land will mostly be market value executive type. Where are the executive jobs? Manchester, Liverpool, Warrington, Chester?</li> <li>• Lack of determination to protect Green Belt</li> <li>• Lack of info re viability of building homes and business premises on brownfield sites</li> <li>• Concerns about the low level of occupancy of new houses, leading to inadequate infrastructure</li> <li>• Concerns about insufficient jobs for the estimated population figures</li> <li>• Objective will fail to be realised, under provision of housing and jobs within the Borough in the headline figures</li> <li>• The top-level thinking in the Core Strategy will undermine the protection of the environment into the future</li> <li>• 'New Settlements' proposal flies in the face of pretty much content of all of the document</li> <li>• Base the number of properties required on the type of house that is going to be realistically built and not on some wishful thinking. That way you will avoid destroying open space on the scale proposed in this plan</li> <li>• The plans for North Cheshire Growth Village, Handforth East, and Safeguarded Land break your own policy principles as described in 1.8</li> <li>• The vision: 'Sustainable, Jobs-led Growth and Sustainable, Vibrant Communities' is too generic and could be for "Anytown"</li> <li>• The plan is aimed at meeting developers needs rather than real demand</li> <li>• The need not proven for so much road building</li> <li>• Housing and jobs targets lack realism</li> <li>• There are no proposals to develop brownfield land around Congleton, creation of a link road does not equate with a town centre first policy and building</li> </ul> |

housing (especially affordable) remote from the town centre on greenfield sites is not sustainable

- None sustainable transport - contradicts the objective of preventing urban sprawl
- CEC has not done a comprehensive review to identify browned sites
- Council has now added White Moss as a strategic location which is not the 'right location' for housing given its proximity to the M6, noise and particle pollution and its status as a greenfield site
- There has not been full collaboration with neighbouring LA's
- There is no justification for choosing a high growth strategy
- There is no mention of Motorway Service Areas, or their role in supporting the safety and welfare of road users, within the whole document
- Consider not fully delivering re duty to co-operate and full green belt assessment in relation to Stockport's boundary; green belt study not sufficiently robust

**Comment Only**

- The Poynton bypass linked to the Airport link road must be a commitment before 2030
- The Airport link A550 must be a prerequisite for any development in Wilmslow and Handforth
- Include ref to visitor economy (Value of the visitor economy is now worth £689m STEAM 2012)
- Living accommodation should be provided above shops and empty properties brought back into use before building new houses
- Support improved transport links
- Essential to protect Green Belt and agricultural land
- Need right houses in right locations
- Important for elderly people to remain independent
- Support the emphasis on town centre first development.... However, the proposals for Congleton (with its massive expansion - 30% more households - and great reliance on building on many hectares of greenfield to the north and west of the town beyond its current boundaries) demonstrably fail to adhere to these principles
- Target for 27,000 new homes is totally unrealistic and not supported by any historical evidence. If this target is unachievable, then the whole strategy becomes flawed
- The whole document confuses 'improvement' and 'economic growth'
- Document largely ignores the potential to retain and improve agricultural and rural resources. Instead, it seeks to build on productive agricultural land and reduce the Green Belt
- Delay in delivering the plan means that 'unplanned' developments are in process that ignore the objectives of the local plan. The housing targets for Crewe and Nantwich already very high are in danger of being overbalanced further as a result
- Consider increasing the plan period beyond 2030. This would ensure that the plan has at least a 15 year time horizon post adoption
- 1.10 Have CE co-operated with Staffordshire over Green Belt and boundary sites such as Radway Green?

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.14 Wasn't this review the purpose of the GB Study?</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.12 To include completion of A550 and Poynton bypass</li> <li>• 1.3 Needs to add a link to visitors also value of visitor economy wrong</li> <li>• A less ambitious growth strategy for Congleton... more in proportion to the current size of the town and aligned with the percentage increase proposed for other centres</li> <li>• Propose fewer houses, scaled back to a more realistic and deliverable number; other developments and ambitions scaled back accordingly</li> <li>• Give much greater prominence to the role that agriculture and horticulture can play and associated research and rural enterprise so that its economic contribution to Cheshire East is recognised and enhanced</li> <li>• Confirmation that cooperation with neighbouring authorities has been conducted regarding green belt at Radway Green</li> <li>• Recognition that Crewe needs major investment; new housing should be predominantly affordable and built on brownfield sites.</li> <li>• Re-balance new housing across the borough; protect heritage towns (e.g. Sandbach and Nantwich); new homes (especially affordable) should be evenly distributed across the Borough, with Macclesfield seeing far more development than proposed</li> <li>• No development of Green Belt unless new roads are required to provide necessary infrastructure support to expanded communities and businesses</li> <li>• 1.8 This should state clearly that brownfield sites must be developed first, before any green field sites are built on</li> <li>• Re-examination of the supporting available data and address the issues affecting housing and jobs creation</li> <li>• Figure 1.1 should be modified to show the sections of the strategic highway network where strategic improvements are sought; it should be an accurate representation of what it claims to show; all improvements noted in 1.12 need to be illustrated</li> <li>• Intro text should recognise how development contributions would be sought in principle on an equitable and proportionate basis and reflecting the strategic priorities of the Council</li> <li>• Withdraw and revise in line with CEC, National and European policies and principles</li> <li>• Remove the North Cheshire Growth Village, Handforth East, and Safeguarded Land from the Local Plan</li> <li>• A more balanced and succinct vision for the Borough highlighting what is unique and where sustainable development can add to the future prosperity and well being of the population</li> <li>• Reduced housing numbers in plan to 20000</li> <li>• Retain greenbelt rather than safeguard for use after 2030</li> <li>• Abandon the idea of the south west link road</li> <li>• 1.13 This statement ought to be amended to read: "The focus remains on protecting open spaces within the Green Belt and elsewhere and our best agricultural land to ensure that growth is sustainable". Otherwise, the statement implies that previously developed sites within the Green Belt will be protected from development, whereas their development for new housing is essential if sufficient housing supply is to be maintained to 2030</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loopholes and inconsistencies need to be addressed immediately</li> <li>• Sort the Plan out now - it has already proved to be so inconsistent that speculative building proposals can and have successfully challenged and overturned rulings not to build</li> <li>• Plan needs to be realistic</li> <li>• Control housing to match jobs</li> <li>• Curtail building on greenfield sites</li> <li>• Drop the Congleton Link Road</li> <li>• Define housing types by area</li> <li>• Improve consultation</li> <li>• A policy of alternative transport proposals - change of policy on so -called link roads</li> <li>• Do a full and comprehensive review of brown field sites</li> <li>• Removal of White Moss as a strategic location and the development of a coherent Infrastructure Plan that applies the stated principles and priorities consistently to the community of Alsager</li> <li>• Adopt a lower growth strategy</li> <li>• The Plan needs to be expanded to explicitly detail the historic environment and its heritage assets and the contribution they make to the Borough</li> <li>• Amend para 1.5 to an approach based upon not 'minimising the impact upon the natural environment' but upon securing social and (natural and built) environmental gains alongside a thriving economy</li> <li>• Plan should consider and make reference to Motorway Service Areas and their role in supporting the safety and welfare of road users</li> <li>• Full Green Belt review required to support GB release</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Some of the issues raised/listed above have been addressed within the Council's assessment of, and response to, comments related to site specific consultation points, for example issues such as housing figures, removing land from the Green Belt, brownfield sites, employment land, safeguarded land, duty to co-operate, new settlement at Handforth East, etc. Assessments have been undertaken re housing need, Green Belt land, brownfield sites, employment land, etc. in order to inform the proposals</p> <p>The growth targets proposed have been established from assessment work undertaken and are considered to be appropriate, including the proportion of growth aimed for in each area</p> <p>Paras 1.2 and 1.3 will be amended to reflect the importance of the historic heritage of the Borough and how that shapes the character and identity of the towns and villages (indeed all the communities) that make up the Borough. It is not the intention within the 'Introduction' to refer to the specific contribution made by each and every employment sector present within the Borough</p> <p>Further details of the historic environment are provided in chapter 3, paras 3.25-3.26; the most up-to-date figure re value of the visitor economy (para. 1.16) will be included in the Plan</p> <p>Modelling work has been carried out to assess the impact of the proposals in the</p>   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Plan on the highways network and a combination of some alterations to the existing road network and new roads is proposed to ensure appropriate highways infrastructure is in place</p> <p>Figure 1.1 is considered to be an adequate representation of what it is supposed to depict; the level of information is considered to be appropriate for the scale of map. However, it may be appropriate to move the Key Diagram to the start of the document to give it more prominence. Information shown on Figure 1.1 is also shown on the key diagram so it could be deleted. Chapter 14, Policy CO 2, provides further details of the transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Principles outlined in para 1.8 are in line with guidance in the NPPF</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wording of paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 should be amended and an additional paragraph added, as follows:</li> </ul> <p><i>1.2 We are proud of our industrial heritage: the Railway Industry in Crewe, the Silk Industry In Macclesfield and Congleton and the Salt Industry of Middlewich and Nantwich. Not only has that resulted in the distinctive physical and cultural landscapes that we see today, but it has also set the foundations for the strong entrepreneurial culture which continues to permeate through our area.</i></p> <p><i>1.3 In conjunction with our historic industrial centres, our vibrant and historic market towns located throughout the Borough, with their attractive and varied townscapes and concentrations of listed buildings, provide high quality living and working environments, and are a key part of the Borough’s visitor economy. Many are also designated as conservation areas. Their rich historic environment provides the focus for vibrant and locally distinct communities, with a strong sense of place and self. They also provide a valuable link to our rural communities, who are equally vital to our wider economy and local identity. Their conservation and enhancement is extremely important, to ensure that communities remain genuinely sustainable, retain their individual character and maintain their important economic function.</i></p> <p><i>New paragraph - The richness and diversity of our built and cultural heritage, and highly attractive townscapes and landscapes provides Cheshire East with its own very unique character and identity.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete Figure 1.1 as it repeats information shown in the Key Diagram</li> <li>• Amend the number of proposed strategic sites and strategic locations to reflect the final selection</li> <li>• Amend the figure re number of consultation responses received (from 28,000 to 37,000)</li> <li>• Re-order some of the content to make it more logical and easy to read.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Chapter 2: The Context of the Core Strategy</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 8 (Support: 1 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the chapter is supported as creating a structure to manage development</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The chapter is not well presented and should start with paragraph 2.6</li> <li>• The chapter should refer to Duty to Co-operate requirements</li> <li>• The chapter should recognise that Cheshire East is a component of the national economy</li> <li>• The chapter takes too 'urban' a stance and takes little account of agriculture and its importance to the Cheshire East economy</li> <li>• The chapter should refer to emerging areas of economic activity based on meeting energy and climate change challenges and food security</li> <li>• The statement about evidence and consultation is incorrect as the approach by Cheshire East to date has been to not take into consideration residents and communities' views and therefore fails soundness test.</li> <li>• Figure 2.1 should more clearly depict that Greater Manchester reaches the northern boundaries of Cheshire East</li> <li>• Context should refer to sustainable transport with train systems and cycle routes</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The section should state that the Council can access central government funding through the Local Enterprise Partnership</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter should acknowledge the role of the Local Economic Partnership in accessing central funding</li> <li>• Chapter should refer to Duty to Co-operate</li> <li>• Chapter should refer to the importance of agriculture</li> <li>• Chapter should refer to emerging areas of economic activity based on meeting energy and climate change challenges and food security</li> <li>• Figure 2.1 should more clearly depict that Greater Manchester reaches the northern boundaries of Cheshire East</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Chapter 2 provides a brief introduction to the context of the Core Strategy (now referred to as Local Plan Strategy). It is followed by Chapter 3 (Spatial Portrait) which provides a snapshot regarding strategic issues in Cheshire East which covers matters relating to the economy and connectivity amongst others. The wording in Chapter 2 is considered appropriate in meeting its aims of introducing the reader to the Local Plan Strategy. The Council contends that it has undertaken extensive consultation, engagement and evidence gathering which has been used to develop the Local Plan. This is demonstrated in Appendix G of the Local Plan Strategy. It may be appropriate to re-order some of the content to improve the logical structure of the document and make it easier to read.</p>  |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Move section to Chapter 1 (Introduction)</li><li>• Core Strategy is now called Local Plan Strategy – references should be updated throughout the document</li><li>• Add additional sentence to paragraph 1.10 (now 1.33) 'The Local Enterprise Partnership can access funding from Central Government to deliver its objectives and overall vision'.</li><li>• Add additional sentence to Paragraph 2.6 (now 1.48) relating to the rural economy 'The Borough also has an extensive rural area with a successful rural and agricultural based economy.'</li><li>• Update Figure 2.1 (now figure 1.2) and the diagrammatic context of Cheshire East to reflect the proximity of Greater Manchester to the Borough</li><li>• Restructure section and combined with the introduction to the document to aid its presentation</li></ul> |
|-----------------------|---|

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 3: Spatial Portrait</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 118 (Support: 12 / Object: 50 / Comment Only: 56)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased that points made by Manchester Airport have been recognised in this section</li> <li>• Chapter 3 provides a helpful/informative background to the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Supports paragraph 3.10 which recognises that mineral extraction plays an important role in both the local and wider economy</li> <li>• Importance of Jodrell Bank acknowledged and supported. Important to refer to Jodrell Bank Policy in site descriptions</li> <li>• It is helpful to have the explanation of general relationships of the adjacent Potteries, Cheshire West &amp; Shropshire.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection / Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to work data needs to be investigated to include commuting by rail and potential both for reducing road travel and areas of contact if services are improved.</li> <li>• English Heritage - The Plan would benefit from including an assessment of the contribution that they make to the Borough and this should include the character and identity of the market towns and villages, which throughout the Plan are highlighted as important but there is little to inform this. These comments could be addressed in the section on Principal Towns</li> <li>• English Heritage - There has been no proper accurate assessment of the significance of heritage assets in the area and the contribution they make to the Borough (NPPF, Paragraph 169). This section needs to expand on the portrait of the built heritage within the District to illustrate this. The Borough benefits from a majority of the market towns and villages having distinct identities (which the Plan constantly makes reference to) and character including a large number of the 72 conservation areas in the Borough. It is also important that where any heritage assets are mentioned in the Plan that they are clearly identified in the Spatial Portrait. The Plan needs to explicitly detail the historic environment and heritage assets and the contribution they make to the whole District. This should include the distinct character and identity of the towns and villages within the Borough. The Plan needs to make sure that reference to specific heritage assets that are mentioned elsewhere in the Plan are mentioned here.</li> <li>• When referring to Manchester Airport's contribution to the North West economy at paragraph 3.9, a more up to date estimate can be sourced from the York Aviation Study (2011) which states that in 2011, Manchester Airport generated an estimated £627 million of GVA for the North West region, supporting around 17,000 on site jobs and nearly 40,000 jobs in the wider region. Paragraph 3.9 also makes reference to 'Manchester International Airport' rather than 'Manchester Airport' as we are known. The word International should therefore be removed from this and any other reference to the Airport's title that is made within the document</li> </ul> |

- National Trust - The text on settlements at all levels is sparse in its recognition of the key contribution of heritage assets to their form, development and distinctiveness, and just as importantly to their role and attractiveness today as places to live, work, shop and visit.
- Section admits that Alsager has a shortage of job and a net outflow of people to work. The Pre-Submission Core Strategy does not address the sustainability of Alsager.
- Principal Towns / Key Service Centres section – useful to have number of retail units (and proportion vacant)
- Economy section should refer to agricultural enterprise and the important role of the rural economy and agriculture in Cheshire East
- English Heritage - Paragraph 3.3 - We welcome the recognition that heritage assets play an important role in the visitor economy.
- Paragraph 3.3 - the economy is not as vibrant as suggested, there is a net outflow of residents working outside the borough (fig 3.5), and a high percentage of the region's businesses says that we have a too-low representation of large businesses.
- Paragraph 3.3 - Phrase "economically active residents" - it is no longer accepted that older residents do not contribute to the economy.
- Paragraph 3.4 - The comments about the number of people employed in pharmaceuticals (at Astra Zeneca - in paragraph. 3.4) are misleading. Although there was a recent announcement of significant investment in its Macclesfield production site which will secure some existing jobs there, the company is continuing with its plans to move 2,900 research and development jobs to Cambridge.
- Paragraph 3.4 - Visitor economy should be added as a key sector
- Paragraph 3.4 -This section presents a dated view of the importance of Pharma R&D to the borough's economy using 2011 figures as its baseline. This was a declining sector over the 2008-2012 periods and the AZ announcement of the termination of R&D activity at Alderley Park over the first four years of this planning period further downgrades its significance to the local economy.
- Paragraph 3.4 – how is the plan going to address a new outflow or workers from Congleton
- Paragraph 3.7 - Is it correct that the mean income of Middlewich is high, meaning above the Cheshire East average? The colour coding on the map does not seem to support this statement.  
Paragraph 3.7 – income levels mirror levels of local employment
- Paragraph 3.7 - income levels reveal a divided Borough both geographically and between towns and the country-side areas
- Paragraph 3.8 - the country's 4th best sports campus, fully equipped and maintained, is going to waste in Alsager. Once more, the south of the borough is being denuded of its jewels without any thought to replacement.
- Paragraph 3.9 - should more accurately reflect the true economic impacts of aviation?
- Paragraph 3.10 - note that the section on Mineral Workings does not mention the PEDL197 licence for gas exploration that covers a large area to the east of Macclesfield. Given the government's support for the development of non

conventional gas resources this should be addressed in the plans and the economic and environmental impact rigorously assessed.

- Paragraph 3.11 -There is no anaerobic digestion used (to my knowledge) in the borough.
- Paragraph 3.12 - citations for the 'strong evidence' are required.
- Paragraph 3.12 - support for improvements to shopping areas
- Paragraph 3.12 recognises internet shopping but this is not being recognised in the policies contained within the Core Strategy
- Paragraph 3.13 – should recognise value of Cheshire East countryside including Green Gap / Green Belt
- Paragraph 3.13 should read - the visitor economy is an important contributor to the Cheshire East economy with about 10,000 jobs associated with the tourism industry and a turnover of £689 million
- Paragraph 3.13 - recommend that his paragraph should also include reference to the extensive footpath and bridleway network and the quiet country lanes used for cycling which also attract many visitors to the Borough.
- Paragraph 3.13 - The information relating to National Trust properties should be amended. It is correct that there are a number of National Trust properties in Cheshire East (14 entirely within Cheshire East and one partially). These do include Little Moreton Hall and Nether Alderley Mill but the text fails to acknowledge that three of the major attractions referred to (Tatton Park, Lyme Park and Quarry Bank Mill) are National Trust properties.
- Paragraph 3.14 (figure 3.5) - there is little doubt that there are three functional housing market areas as referred to in the update of the SHMA. In order to achieve a correct distribution of new housing, and with it employment, and to support the facilities of existing towns the distribution of housing and other development should reflect the needs of each housing market area.
- Figure 3.5 - should show a stronger travel to work flows to Manchester from Macclesfield
- Paragraph 3.14 [& SHMA 2013] accepts Crewe & Nantwich are one functional housing market area. It is likely that desirable & easy sites in Nantwich meeting mostly footloose market 'demand' will be developed rapidly [despite proposed phasing] thus prejudicing implementation of less favoured sites around Crewe which meet actual 'needs'
- Paragraph 3.15 migration for jobs - the dearth of young adults (under 40) in the population profile just reinforces the weakness in the jobs market within the borough.
- Paragraph 3.15 - note that the population profile of Cheshire East shows lower than national average proportions in population groups under the age of 40. These groups include many who are key to the economic future of the borough.
- Paragraph 3.15 - the dependence on 2011 Interim Household Projections is flawed as they have a horizon of only 10 years to 2021 whereas the Core Strategy looks to 2030. Those projections were not based on a full range of data and are based on a series of sources which lack some key inputs.
- Paragraph 3.15 - figure 3.5 incorrectly implies that most Congleton employees commute to the SOT area and that most migration is from that

direction

- Paragraph 3.15 - "Relative low proportion of working age" - again this is using outdated economics because it is based on an assumption that older people are not economically productive.
- Paragraph 3.16 - the census was in 2011 - but the statistics for this period are from July 2000 to June 2010. Therefore the statistics should be from July 2001 to July 2011.
- Paragraph 3.17 - quotes figures from the 2011 Interim Household projections. This evidence suggests a lower level of houses should be provided in Cheshire East
- Paragraph 3.17 - Households: The housing need increase of 10,400 over a decade is 6.5%.
- Paragraph 3.18-19 House prices: initial consultation document indicated that house prices are considerably lower in the south of the borough, again illustrating the neglect of employment in the area.
- Paragraph 3.18 and 3.19 - no recognition here that the situation for Cheshire East re incomes and affordable housing has remained unchanged over time because affordable housing has typically been provided by Stockport and Manchester. This is needed because there should be evidence of "crossing boundaries" in the analysis.
- Paragraph 3.19 - the fact that Cheshire East is the 6th least affordable district in the northwest reinforces the need for a greater proportion of affordable houses.
- Paragraph 3.19 - confirms that housing in Cheshire East is among the least affordable in the North West. There has to be a causal link between this and the relative lower numbers of younger age groups. Younger households cannot afford to live in the borough. This has significant implications for labour force mobility which, unless addressed, will impinge on the deliverability of the economic vision for the borough. On this basis the Local Plan is not consistent with national policy and fails the "justified" and "effective" and "positively prepared" tests of soundness.
- Paragraph 3.20-21 - reinforces the dearth of job opportunities in the south of the Borough.
- Paragraph 3.22 (Landscape Character) - should refer to small field patterns and hedgerows and natural ponds – key Cheshire East features.
- Paragraph 3.22 - undersells the quality, diversity and historical richness of the Cheshire landscape
- Paragraph 3.22 - "unimproved features including mosses, heaths, meres". Remove the word unimproved, it is not the appropriate word to describe natural features.
- Paragraph 3.22 - This description is cursory and should make reference to low woodland cover in the district.
- Paragraph 3.22 Landscape Character - This paragraph does not do justice to the diversity and quality of the landscape throughout the Borough. The landscape is not simply a reflection of its geology but is a product of its use and development over time. We also recommend that the Landscape Character assessment map for East Cheshire be included in the Pre Submission Core Strategy.

- Paragraph 3.23 and 3.24 Nature Conservation - The map illustrates a neglect of the landscape in the southern half of the borough, with grossly disproportionately fewer protected areas of all types in the south despite some outstanding countryside.
- Paragraph 3.23 (Nature conservation) - there should be a nature conservation strategy for the district. This section fails to include the landscape mapping of Cheshire which was carried out by the council in 2008. This section fails to include the green belt mapping of Cheshire East. This is a major omission. This section fails to include the agricultural mapping of Cheshire which was carried out by MAFF. This is a major omission.
- Fig 3.7 (Paragraph 3.23) - shows neglect of landscape in south of Borough with fewer protected areas
- Paragraph 3.24 - The boundaries of the Meres and Mosses Nature Improvement Area are not shown on figure 3.7
- Paragraph 3.25 to add cultural/heritage estates; strong rural communities
- Paragraphs 3.25-26 Historic Environment and Heritage: Core Strategy should make the most of the majority of these heritage sites,
- Paragraph 3.25 - No mapping and descriptions of the whole landscape, agriculture and green belt included when available.
- Paragraph 3.26 - Add a further map showing the distribution of heritage features as indicated above.
- Paragraph 3.27 - should build out description on Green Belt, should have a separate plan or cross reference to Green Belt section of the document
- Paragraph 3.27 - Green Belt - this section does not provide any diagrammatic representation of the location of green belt areas. It is however included in the Figure 3.9 Connectivity Map of Cheshire East. Suggest either a separate diagram or a cross reference in Paragraph 3.27 be made to a re-named diagram.
- Paragraph 3.28 - Carbon Dioxide Emissions. Air quality, though linked, should be treated as a separate issue and is affected by direct emissions (Ozone and Nitrous Oxide) and particulates.
- Paragraph 3.28 - should be significantly extended on Air Quality impacts in the Borough and should be illustrated with a map of the AQMAs.
- Paragraph 3.28 - consider emission impacts in the wider context of commuter travel and commercial vehicles as "industry" emissions continue to fall
- Paragraph 3.28 – it would be useful to show these figures broken down into Industrial, Domestic and Transport, as per the DECC report
- Paragraph 3.29 - mention the fact that there is no direct link between the major towns of Crewe and Macclesfield.
- Paragraph 3.29 - extensive road network but in need of major expenditure
- Paragraph 3.29-3.31 - Middlewich has a railway station but no station. Middlewich should be given a station
- Paragraph 3.29 - should include base plan for High Speed 2
- Paragraph 3.29 - transport improvement should be based on fully integrated transport system
- Paragraph 3.30 HS2 projected route should be indicated on figure 3.9
- Paragraph 3.31 should explain that Manchester Airport's runways are within Cheshire East

- Paragraphs 3.32 to 3.35 should refer clearly to the relationship between Crewe and Shavington and the strategic benefits that arise from allocation of strategic sites for development at Shavington as part of the spatial growth strategy for Crewe
- Paragraph 3.33 - Include number of retail units in description of Crewe.
- Paragraph 3.36 - It would be good to add in that Macclesfield is a potential tourism hub and visitor gateway. It has a high proportion of heritage buildings and protected land and is also developing a cultural & heritage strategy.
- Paragraph 3.36-39 - new local stations in north and south Macclesfield may help ease congestion, pollution and VOC emissions.
- Paragraph 3.36 - Include a recognition of its potential for tourism
- Paragraph 3.37 - AstraZeneca will withdraw from Alderley Park by the end of 2016, and most employees will be withdrawn earlier. This will result in a significant loss of employment in the area.
- Paragraph 3.38 - should refer to the granting of planning permission for Macclesfield Town Centre redevelopment
- Paragraph 3.38 – remove office reference
- Paragraph 3.39 – reference to poor Manchester Bus Service
- Paragraph 3.39 - add reference to HS2
- Paragraph 3.40 - Key Service Centres Section - The text on settlements at all levels is sparse in its recognition of the key contribution of heritage assets to their form, development and distinctiveness, and just as importantly to their role and attractiveness today as places to live, work, shop and visit.
- Paragraph 3.41 - Objections to Poynton and Knutsford being considered a KSC
- Paragraph 3.41 - Support for Alsager, Nantwich and Congleton being a KSC
- Paragraph 3.44 - draws attention to the fundamental issues facing Alsager as a Key Service Centre but the Core Strategy does not seek to address this in any way.
- Paragraph 3.46 - Congleton, reference must be made to the high levels of out commuting and also in-commuting from the more affordable areas of north Staffs.
- Paragraph 3.46 - The degree of self-containment for Congleton is low, i.e. there is already a high degree of commuting
- Paragraph 3.53 & 3.59 - Both Knutsford & Nantwich are tourism hubs and have a high proportion of heritage buildings and protected land
- Paragraph 3.53 - Some undertaking included to improve the current deficiencies and preserve Knutsford's rural setting should be included as a means of retaining its attraction to visitors as its main economic driver
- Paragraph 3.55 - The significant number of out-commuters from Knutsford reinforces the premise that the town does not need an excessive number of new houses taking up valuable Green Belt.
- Paragraph 3.59 - Retailing in Nantwich centre is not described
- Paragraph 3.60 - This states that out-commuting is little more than inward.
- Paragraph 3.62 - Poynton is still a town
- Paragraph 3.62 - The construction of the Poynton by pass is essential if the proposed development of Woodford Aerodrome proceeds with Stockport Borough and /or any development near Handforth/Adlington Road in order to

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>ensure that Poynton itself and the surrounding country lanes are not subject to traffic jams.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 3.62 - false population figure for Poynton, which excludes the whole of Higher Poynton and the eastern part of the village. The description should include the fact that Poynton is surrounded by Green Belt and includes significant rural areas and woodland.</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.62 - profile could note that Fountain Place in the centre of Poynton is one of the busiest junctions (A523, A5149 and Park Lane) in Cheshire East.</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.64 - There are no buses and only limited train services on Sundays. Bus services to Manchester and Derby have been withdrawn in recent years.</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.71 Local Service Centre section - the text on settlements at all levels is sparse in its recognition of the key contribution of heritage assets to their form, development and distinctiveness, and just as importantly to their role and attractiveness today as places to live, work, shop and visit.</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.77 and 3.83 – both North Staffordshire Green Belt is referenced and so is the Greater Manchester Green Belt but neither are depicted here</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.82 - should be re-worded to make it clear that the road now being called the 'Poynton Relief Road' is in fact a combination of two previous schemes and is part of the SEMMMS network of roads</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.82 - remove unsubstantiated claim that the SEMMMS roads “are needed” and there is a claim, in the ‘Peak District, High Peak and Staffordshire Moorlands’ section (paragraph. 3.96) that the towns of Whaley Bridge and New Mills will “benefit” from the SEMMMS roads. There are no balancing statements here about the need for better public transport and modal shift.</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.82 - unsubstantiated claim in the ‘Greater Manchester’ section claiming compliance with Duty to Co-operate but it would appear that no neighbouring authorities are picking up any of Cheshire East’s housing allocation (a perfectly normal practice) and Stockport MBC have reservations about the proposal for a new settlement on their borders</li> <li>Paragraph 3.82 and 3.84 - There is a need for protecting the land adjacent to Manchester Airport</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.92 - Add in the tourism brand of Cheshire's Peak District<br/><a href="http://www.cheshirepeakdistrict.co.uk">www.cheshirepeakdistrict.co.uk</a></li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See the above section</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The Spatial Portrait section is designed to provide a brief general introduction to Cheshire East and its surrounding area and includes key characteristics about the Borough. It is not policy, but seeks to ‘set the scene’ for the Plan. The following changes are considered to be appropriate.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update Footnotes to reflect updated evidence sources</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.3 – update to economic output and employment figures</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.4 – update first line from “pharmaceutical” to read “chemicals &amp;</li> </ul>  |

pharmaceuticals". Penultimate sentence should read "There is a relative abundance of jobs (significant net inflows of commuters, in other words) in Crewe, Handforth and Knutsford, whereas Alsager, Congleton, Middlewich, Poynton and Sandbach face a relative shortage of jobs (a significant net commuting outflow). Macclesfield and Nantwich have more modest net outflows, whilst Wilmslow's inflows and outflows are broadly equal."

- Paragraph 3.6 – update to read "An estimated 173,500 people were working in Cheshire East in 2012, as either employees or working proprietors. Of those working as employees (167,000), 69% were full-time and 31% part-time. 13% of employees worked in the health and social work sector, with professional, scientific and technical activities (12%), manufacturing (11%) and retail (10%) also accounting for a large proportion of the employee total."
- Paragraph 3.9 – update to state "The closeness of Manchester Airport provides considerable economic benefits to the Borough by providing access to national and international markets as well as supporting a substantial number of jobs, both directly and indirectly. In 2011, the Airport was estimated to contribute £627 million of Gross Value Added for the North West Region, supporting over 17,000 onsite jobs and 40,000 in the wider sub-region"
- Amend references to Manchester International Airport to read Manchester Airport
- Paragraph 3.13 - update to read "with about 10,000 jobs..." and "...turnover of around £700 million"
- Paragraph 3.13 – additional text should be added as follows 'The extensive footpath, cycleway and bridleway network is a key attraction of the Borough'.
- Paragraph 3.13 – update text to read 'Major attractions include Tatton Park, Jodrell Bank, Lyme Park, Quarry Bank Mill, the canal network and the Peak District National Park. There are 14 National Trust properties in Cheshire East and one partially located in the Borough. Little Moreton Hall, Nether Alderley Mill, Tatton Park, Lyme Park and Quarry Bank Mill are all examples of National Trust Properties'
- Figure 3.5 – change Functional Diagram to have a greater emphasis of travel to work links between Macclesfield and Greater Manchester
- Paragraph 3.16 - update to read "Over the ten year period from July 2001 until June 2011, an estimated 157,000 people moved into Cheshire East and 141,800 people moved out of the Borough. These estimates include people immigrating and emigrating and those moving within the UK. The result is a net in-flow of 15,200 people (an average of around 1,500 each year). Net migration was higher in the early part of this ten year period: for example, the average net migration per year between July 2001 and June 2006 was around 1,900, compared to 1,200 between July 2006 and June 2011."
- Paragraph 3.24 – add reference to Meres and Mosses Nature Improvement Area.
- Paragraph 3.25 – add additional text 'The Borough's historic built environment is complex due, for the most part, to the size and diversity of the area. Constituent areas are heavily influenced by their geological, landscape and topographical character, which invariably has heavily influenced their purpose, character and identity'.

- Paragraph 3.31 – additional paragraph as follows: ‘Historic transport routes crisscross the Borough in the form of canals, railways and historic roadways, further enriching the built heritage of the Borough and influencing aspects of the townscape and development of towns and villages. A number of landmark structures are associated with the canals and railways, not least the viaducts across the Dane Valley to the east of Holmes Chapel and that at Bollington. Many canal structures are listed, including bridges, locks and mileposts. The Trent and Mersey and Macclesfield canals are both designated as extensive, linear conservation areas’
- Paragraph 3.35 – additional paragraph ‘Crewe evolved around the growth of the railways, with the opening of the station in 1837 and the first works in 1840. Soon the industry was employing thousands of people and new housing was built alongside the expanding railway works. Within the centre of the town, the Town and Indoor Market Halls, churches and chapels and later, the Queens Park and Lyceum Theatre were all developed as part of the emerging social infrastructure of the burgeoning town’
- Paragraph 3.37 – additional text ‘Situated on the River Bollin, the early mills were located alongside the river, utilising the damp conditions and the power of the river for mill machinery.’
- Paragraph 3.38 – additional text ‘The centre of Macclesfield characterised in part by its cobbled and meandering streets and narrow lanes is essentially a medieval street pattern, partly overlaid by later phases of the town’s growth’
- Additional paragraph ‘There are a high number of listed buildings and structures concentrated in the centre of the town but also many that are quite widely distributed. Much of the town centre is designated as a conservation area and there are also several outlying conservation areas. A number of buildings are also locally listed. This illustrates the historic importance and significance of the town and reflects the strong identity, character and picturesque qualities of Macclesfield.’
- Principal Town / Key Service Centre Section has been updated to reflect updated population information
- Paragraph 3.43 – additional text to read ‘Parts of the town are characterised by spacious tree lined streets with attractive Villas and designated as conservation areas’
- Paragraph 3.5 – amend to read ‘Within the town centre, there are over 200 retail units, making it an important shopping centre in the Borough. There is a linear high street aligned by historic buildings of various periods, but principally Georgian, many of which are Listed and within the Conservation Area. The town thrived due to its close relationship with nearby Tatton Park, one of the key heritage assets in Cheshire East and the ancestral home of the Egerton family. Knutsford contains many buildings of architectural and historic importance’.
- Paragraph 3.57 – additional text: ‘The canal is a Conservation Area, with a number of listed structures and the Mergatroyd Brine Works nearby, which is both listed and a Scheduled Monument’.
- Paragraph 3.60 –delete and replace with alternative wording as follows ‘The centre of Nantwich is in essence a planned Elizabethan town, largely rebuilt as a consequence of a fire in 1583; the re-build partly financed by Elizabeth I. This has resulted in a re-created original street pattern and a number of fine

timber framed buildings dating from the 16th century onwards. There are also a number of elegant Georgian and Victorian buildings. The centre of Nantwich contains a number of listed buildings and is designated as a conservation area. The town was also prominent in the Civil War, and besieged until the Parliamentary victory in January 1664. The battlefield is designated and lies to the north of the town'

- Paragraph 3.62 – amend to read 'Poynton's origins lie as a small mining village, however the decline of mining and its accessibility to Greater Manchester, led to significant growth during the 20th Century. Much of the mining infrastructure has therefore been lost as the town expanded, but remnants of the associated landscape still exist'
- Add additional text: 'at its heart are the characterful cobbled market square and Anglo Saxon crosses, which are both listed and a Scheduled Monument, along with a number of other key listed buildings. The wider town centre is also designated as a Conservation Area, with a number of other prominent buildings. The town also has strong associations with Sir George Gilbert Scott'
- Paragraph 3.68 – add additional text 'Wilmslow has developed beyond its historic core and has substantial late Victorian and Edwardian suburbs'
- Paragraph 3.79 – update second sentence to read "Travel-to-work flows are particularly pronounced from the Cheshire East towns of Alsager, Congleton and Crewe, although with respect to the latter two towns there is an even greater reverse flow."
- Paragraph 3.91 – update second sentence to read "However, the main flow involving Cheshire East is that of Warrington residents travelling to work in Knutsford"
- Paragraph 3.92 – add to this paragraph 'The Peak District National Park is also a key tourism brand for Cheshire East'
- Paragraph 3.97 – delete: "has house prices lower than Congleton and Macclesfield so attracts home buyers from these towns, though a significant proportion of the local housing stock is of poor quality"
- Due to its importance, the section on Duty to Co-operate should be moved to a separate chapter in the document.

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Duty to Co-Operate (Now Chapter 2)</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 52 (Support: 1 / Object: 46 / Comment Only: 5)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Warrington Borough Council – particularly support paragraph 1.10; authorities have worked closely together through various bodies; true and natural partners on many fronts; Cheshire East Local Plan aligns well with emerging Warrington plan.</li> <li>• Cheshire West &amp; Chester – will continue to work closely and effectively with Cheshire East Council on future development around Middlewich; welcomed the opportunity to see the outcomes of the Habitat Regulations Assessment documentation.</li> <li>• Stoke on Trent City Council/Newcastle Borough Council – supports the deletions of development at junction 16 of M6 and Barthomley and the less development now proposed at Crewe; new Green Belt; delivery of Radway Green Extension supported provided it is phased in the last 5 years of the Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffordshire County Council – Section 14 Connectivity and policies CO1, CO2, CO4 do not fully consider the cross boundary road and public transport implications related to development proposals at Alsager, Congleton and Crewe with North Staffordshire, further investigations are needed.</li> <li>• Stoke on Trent City Council/Newcastle Borough Council – objects to the removal of Radway Green Extension from the Green Belt prior to 2025.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffordshire – reached an agreed position on school places. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SE10 Minerals - concern that deferring amount of sand and gravel reserves needed to the Site Allocations Plan may not ensure a steady and adequate without placing reliance on sources outside the Plan area, more evidence is needed.</li> <li>○ SE11 Waste - policy is not strategic enough, is not consistent with paragraph 16 of PPS10 and it does not identify the issues as identified in the Waste Needs Assessment Report 2011 i.e. that more facilities are needed to achieve diversion of use of landfill and facilities outside the Plan area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cheshire West and Chester – seek assurance that the further work to be done to update information on Gypsies and Travellers in Cheshire East will be carried out in collaboration with Cheshire West and Chester and other authorities as part of a joint evidence base. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Draft waste policy (SE11): it is considered that it currently fails to take account of the strategic nature of waste and the movement of waste across administrative boundary. The deferring of waste policy to some future plan with no defined timetable for its production [it is not included in any Local Development Scheme] is unlikely to provide facilities in a timely manner.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

- Minerals policy (SE10): the mineral Policy could be considered to be unsound as Mineral Safeguarding Areas should be defined in the Core Strategy and shown on the Policy Map, not left to the Site Allocations DPD. The practical danger here is the loss of mineral resources as a result of applications occurring prior to the establishment of MSAs in the Site Allocations DPD.
- Stoke on Trent City Council/Newcastle Borough Council – plan should not exceed 27,000 homes and 300 ha of employment land; broadly accept development at White Moss Quarry subject to indicative phasing in Plan, it would be premature to grant planning permission here now; take full account of all emerging housing commitments and windfall site opportunities when deciding how much housing land needs to be allocated; clarify the use of housing buffer figures.
  - Request continued joint work be extended to consider migration and travel to work patterns as well as overall linkages between the authorities.
- Transport for Greater Manchester – concern about the transport impact of developing Handforth East on A34 and A555 corridors; a transport study is needed.
- Natural England – Plan does not refer to all instances where protected species and priority habitats are present or mention proposed mitigating measures. Detailed Habitats Regulation Assessment comments.
- English Heritage - Plan does not make enough of the historic environment, heritage assets and contribution they make to the Borough through making a proper assessment of these. They welcome recognition of contribution heritage assets make to the visitor economy and inward investment. Plan should summarise the heritage assets that contribute to the character and identity of places. Elaborate on the vision reference to protecting and enhancing heritage assets.
  - Add reference to a benefit of economic growth being the improvement of built and natural environment and include such a reference in the strategic priorities. The design of new development should reflect local character and context.
  - Cultural facilities should include reference to heritage. Add reference to tourism opportunities of built and natural environment
  - Allocation of sites should consider impact of historic environment. Add encourage re-use of existing buildings. Be more place specific in relation to historic environment policy. New development should make a positive contribution to significance, local distinctiveness and identity not just character and setting. Do not use the term “heritage context” but “historic environment” and “heritage assets”
  - Add reference to safeguarding sites of important local materials. Series of detailed references to heritage assets etc of places and sites. General comments about the introduction of CIL and setting charge rates in respect of the historic environment.
- Environment Agency - View watercourses not as a constraint but in a more positive way with scope for enhancement. Take more positive account of nature conservation features. Refer to Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan responsibilities on the Council and other public bodies.

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Nature Partnership - General support. Plan should refer to Nature Improvement Areas designation specifically. Should monitor the effectiveness of habitat offsetting.</li> <li>• <u>Other respondents:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process was started too late and the Council has not met the legal duty.</li> <li>• Several matters have not been resolved/what has been agreed?</li> <li>• It is not clear what changes have or will be made as a result of co-operation.</li> <li>• Housing requirements – how will CE help with under-supply in neighbouring authorities/is CE offloading its housing on neighbours putting more pressure on them?</li> <li>• SHMA ignores areas in same housing market area as North Cheshire (ie South Manchester).</li> <li>• Dispute with Stockport adds to uncertainty of SEMMMS – this long standing proposal will go ahead through the authorities continuing to work together.</li> <li>• Macclesfield proposals have been reduced in deference to Warrington. Macclesfield is treated as a dormitory town for south Manchester.</li> <li>• Need to consider the impact on regeneration in Manchester.</li> <li>• Handforth East proposal – Green Belt impact, questionable viability, will overheat local area, transport impact, cross boundary health issues not considered (has Stockport CCG been approached?), impact on local communities on both sides of boundary</li> <li>• Comments regarding the overall impact of/on – Woodford; Airport City with employment land in Knutsford; Staffs/Stoke; Cheshire West – Lostock Gralam; Warrington</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further investigation of the impact of proposals on cross-boundary road and transport links is required.</li> <li>• Provide transportation reports for Handforth East allocation.</li> <li>• Do not exclude Radway Green extension from Green belt.</li> <li>• Make reference to Nature Improvement Areas.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p><u>Transport:</u><br/>The plan specifically refers to pursuing improved connections with Staffordshire. Contributions will be sought to key transport improvements as part of land allocation policies.</p> <p>The Council is committed to realising transport solutions in partnership with Stockport Council. Full consideration is being given to a range of transport solutions.</p> <p><u>Green belt boundaries:</u><br/>It is not possible to alter Green Belt boundaries other than at Plan review stages. However 'white land' to the north of the Radway Green site could be proposed for inclusion in the Green Belt at the Site Allocations and Development Policies document stage.</p>  |

### Gypsies and Travellers

It is stated in the justification to Policy SC7 that this further work has now been done in a collaborative way with neighbouring authorities.

### Waste and Minerals:

Appropriate evidence is being drawn together to inform the Site Allocations Plan which will appropriately address this matter and the revised Local Development Scheme will clearly set out the minerals scope of this plan.

CEC acknowledge cross boundary waste movements and will clarify in new LDS the scope and timing of Waste Plan supported by an updated robust evidence base.

Appropriate evidence is being drawn together to inform the Site Allocations Plan which will appropriately address this matter and the revised Local Development Scheme will clearly set out the minerals scope of this plan.

### Growth targets:

The plan does not propose any higher development requirement figures. The White Moss Quarry site has been reduced in size. The housing target is now stepped which should help avoid any diversion of development from the Potteries during the recovery from recession years of the Plan period. The use of windfall assumptions and buffer figures has been clarified, and on-going joint working will consider migration and travel to work patterns as Census data is released.

We recognise some cross boundary influence but our housing market areas are largely contained within the Borough.

We have assessed the proposals for Macclesfield in respect of its position in the settlement hierarchy and development opportunities at the town whilst taking account of the impact on the Green Belt.

All relevant impacts of the Handforth East site have been considered.

No concerns have been raised by neighbouring Greater Manchester authorities about the impact of the Strategy on regeneration in Manchester.

### Historic Environment:

English Heritage state that there should be references to specific heritage assets and locations in the policy. References to the heritage assets of Cheshire East are contained in the supporting text to policy SE7, paragraphs 13.57-63, and are too many to list in a policy. Site specific references will be included in the site allocations and development policies document and in supplementary planning guidance. Heritage context is a clear phrase- it could be replaced with a much longer one, as it includes locations with important historic features which may be important for many reasons, not just historic reasons.

Changes are proposed to relevant sections of the Local Plan Strategy where required.

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p><u>Nature Conservation and Rivers:</u></p> <p>The comments from the Environment Agency are accepted and changes will be made to appropriate policies where specific representations have been made.</p> <p><u>Cooperation and community involvement:</u></p> <p>The co-operation has become more focussed as the Plan's proposals have been developed.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy has been prepared and publicised in accordance with statutory requirements.</p> <p>We will set the community involvement out clearly in the finalised Duty to Co-operate Statement. We will explain in the introduction to the Plan what we are doing and why we asked neighbouring authorities to assist with housing provision – to ascertain whether we could avoid rolling back Green Belt boundaries</p> <p>Discussions with neighbouring authorities have considered possible impacts on relevant places.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>Duty to Co-operate is an ongoing and continuous process. A number of issues noted above will be addressed through a number of supporting documents including the Committee Report. In addition, text should be added to the Local Plan Strategy to further address the comments noted above. The following material changes should be made to the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CO1 – add additional point to policy justification - Improved cross boundary and public transport connections are sought with all surrounding Local Authority areas and will be progressed through ongoing Duty to Co-operate arrangements.</li> <li>• Text has been added to the Spatial Portrait section to reflect comments from English Heritage</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Chapter 4: Vision and Vision Statement</b> (Now Chapter 5)  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Totals: Chapter 4 Vision 42 (Support: 15 / Object: 18 / Comment Only: 9)<br>Vision Statement 23 (Support: 5 / Object: 13 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas such as Sandbach are commuter towns and development will encourage unsustainable traffic movements, but create profitable housing developments. Plan led development will help to stop this.</li> <li>• Support the vision in general but the strategic priorities and subsequent policies do not follow, important that Key Service centres in the north of the Borough should meet their own and future housing needs to support the economy of the area.</li> <li>• ‘new employment and housing development will have been developed to meet the needs in locations that reduce the need to travel’ – support this statement as it is essential to develop houses where local employment will support such development.</li> <li>• Transition Wilmslow support paragraph 3 of the Vision Statement which expresses a clear spatial development strategy where new development will have been directed to the Principal Towns of Crewe and Macclesfield to support regeneration priorities and to the Key Service Centres of the Borough which provide a good range of services and facilities.</li> <li>• Propose the designation of Crewe as a 21<sup>st</sup> Century New Town.</li> <li>• Object to the new village at Handforth as it is not sustainable</li> <li>• Support approach to Green Infrastructure but wish to see delivery fully reflected in Infrastructure Delivery Plan</li> <li>• The Home Builders Federation generally supports the following sections of the vision, ‘New employment and housing development will have been developed to meet local needs...’ Plan paragraph 5.3 ‘The top priority for Cheshire East Council is to increase the Borough’s economic prosperity in a way that is cohesive and sustainable. The Core Strategy is therefore vital in driving and supporting the development of jobs in the Borough and the infrastructure and housing that is needed to support that employment’</li> <li>• English Heritage welcome the recognition of the role the historic environment plays in attracting inward investment and the value of its market town and villages including heritage assets to those who live there. The Spatial Portrait should ensure that this has been properly identified and assessed.</li> <li>• The Law Trust is generally supportive of the vision, and support the identification of Macclesfield as a Principal Town.</li> <li>• Object to the Green Belt protection and consider the vision should be amended to clarify that the release of some Green Belt land is necessary.</li> <li>• Sandbach Town Council support the vision outlined of jobs led growth in particular; to ensure jobs-led growth with a range of jobs in the M6 corridor; to preserve the green gaps between towns and between communities within Sandbach; to preserve and enhance the wildlife corridor; and that all</li> </ul> |

developments should be sustainable;

- The RSPB supports the principles within the vision with respects to maximising and enhancing the natural features, that are most valued across the Borough; reducing carbon emissions and tackling climate change through the increased energy efficiency of new and existing buildings, generation of renewable energy and more sustainable patterns of development; and protection of the areas of landscape value and sites of nature conservation importance from development through environmental designations.
- Seddon Homes supports the Vision in so far as it relates to the need to deliver new employment and housing development in sustainable locations, with a focus on the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres (KSCs) where there is good access to a range of services and facilities and the opportunity for a high proportion of people to travel by public transport, cycle or on foot.
- Cheshire Wildlife Trust support the statement that growth should not be at the expense of the attractive environment but the health and diversity of the environment is equally as important as its 'attractiveness'.
- HIMOR (Land) Ltd support the vision, and particular support the vision of an economically prosperous area, the recognition of the need for housing development to meet local needs, and that new development will have principally been directed to the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres.
- Goodman's support the spatial vision, in general terms for Cheshire East in particular the reference to creating 'new employment and housing development will have been developed to meet local needs in locations that reduce the need to travel. The infrastructure to support this growth will have been delivered in partnership'
- Goodman's consider that previous versions of the Vision have made specific reference to 'sustainable urban extension' and how they are intergral to the growth of Crewe as a Principal Town and as such reference should be made within the Vision to their positive regenerative role in helping to fund and deliver key infrastructure.
- Barclays fully support the 'Vision for Cheshire East in 2030' as an economically prosperous area and would like to register our importance as a key employer contributing to the diverse employment base, skilled labour force and high employment levels necessary to realise the vision.

### **Objection**

- 4.6 - Poynton is not a 'large town' (KSC) like Congleton and Wilmslow which has a population of over 20,000
- The vision does not include sufficient consideration of the need for new residential development in CEC – including directing residential development to LSC and Other Settlements/Rural Areas
- The NPPF at paragraph 157 shows Government is keen that Local Plans be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably 15 years – therefore given the Core Strategy will not be adopted until 2015 consider the Core Strategy should include a longer plan period
- Construction of the Congleton Link Road is not sustainable, improved public transport is required

- Proposed developments will increase the carbon footprint of CEC
- Para 4.4 should commit to development on brownfield site first
- NW Transport Round Table – committing to development on large areas of greenfields sites and new road networks does not equate to the Authorities desire to reduce carbon emissions
- Support statement but elements which relate to retaining outstanding environment are not carried out within the rest of the Core Strategy
- Need more emphasis on importance of market towns
- Vision needs to include improvements to Town Centres (such as Crewe) with better links to the railway
- The vision needs to ensure the protection of heritage assets, including SBI's and woodland areas, from engulfment in unsustainable development
- The vision should be amended to clearly articulate the link between allocating sufficient new land to meet the need for housing and other development, and the knock-on effects on the success of the local economy and regeneration. This is of particular importance for Crewe, which faces different challenges to the rest of the Borough.
- National Trust state that the approach to grow at a sensible pace with as low as practical environmental impact is not consistent with the NPPF and the approach to sustainable development, i.e. 'to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system' (para 8)
- Bourne Leisure Limited asserts that a number of policies are unsound, with regards to the Vision – emphasis should be given in the vision to the vital role of tourism in shaping the Borough.
- The vision makes no reference to an aspiration for well-designed new development, this is a significant omission.
- Northern Property Investment Company Limited are in general support of the vision, however consider the role which Congleton has to play should be firmly within the vision.
- The importance of new housing should not be down played,
- The plan must include a target for reducing CO2 over the plan period within the Borough – e.g. more reliable bus service and cycle lanes
- There should be a brownfield first approach to development within the plan
- The pursuit of sustainability means not to compromise the world of our children for the growth of our own. The vision should focus on exploiting the use of brownfield and protecting the Green Belt.
- Agree with the statements which recognise that the Borough has outstanding environments and include attractive open countryside, vibrant market towns and villages and many heritage assets, however these must be acted upon
- CPRE Cheshire broadly support the vision and supporting text however suggest some amendments.
- Development should be aimed in sustainable locations and to brownfield sites before any Greenfield sites are considered
- Barratt Homes support the vision, however object to the inclusion in the vision of a new 'sustainable village' to the north of the Borough. The Handforth East site is not adequately justified
- The vision should focus on primarily on the Quality of Life neither is the need

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>to conserve land for food production, and should not focus economic prosperity,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vision should include the need to reduce the need of unsustainable travel across existing and proposed development</li> <li>• English Heritage agree with the intention of of the vision but suggests amendments to the wording which should be changed to reflect a more positive approach to development that recognises the importance of both designated and non-designated heritage assets and their significance</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport system needs to be fully integrated</li> <li>• New housing should be located based on need not developer interest</li> <li>• Need to ensure heritage assets are protected, including good agricultural land, SBI's and woodland</li> <li>• Include 'visitors' under 4.2</li> <li>• Fast telecommunications are essential – including broadband</li> <li>• Houses should be energy efficient and that cost effective renewable energy should be provided without the need for subsidy</li> <li>• No reference to well designed new development</li> <li>• Need to improve economic prosperity within Sandbach with additional jobs, community facilities, improved education and new employment</li> <li>• Object to the removal and safeguarding of green belt sites.</li> <li>• Support the identified need for a 'stronger economy and sufficient housing of the right type to meet future needs' and that 'new development is necessary' to accommodate the growth required. The vision should also identify that some level of development is required within the Local Service Centres.</li> <li>• More information is required regarding the 'new sustainable village' is it North Cheshire Growth Village or Handforth East.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport improvements should include integrated Rail/Bus/Road/Cycle network.</li> <li>• Need to ensure protection of heritage assets is included in vision</li> <li>• Suggested amendment 4.2 add in '&amp; visitors from outside the area'</li> <li>• Include a reference to well designed new development</li> <li>• Make the vision more firm</li> <li>• Suggested amendment '..have been directed to the Principal Towns of Crewe and Macclesfield to support regeneration priorities, and to the Key Services Centres and Local Services Centres of the Borough'</li> <li>• Extend the Plan period beyond 2030 to ensure at least 15 years post adoption.</li> <li>• Remove Congleton Link Road from the Plan</li> <li>• Prioritise development on Brownfield sites</li> <li>• Include LSC's as growth areas in line with the market</li> <li>• Re-draft para 4.6 to exclude Poynton and other towns with population of lower than 20,000 from development,</li> <li>• Include provisions for regeneration of town centres</li> <li>• The reference to Crewe in the Vision is amended to more clearly link the</li> </ul>   |

provision of sufficient Greenfield land for new development with meeting housing needs, generating jobs and investment in the town and achieving regeneration,

- National Trust suggests amended text to read ‘...it means growing sensible pace, with an integrated approach to sustainable development such that social and environmental (built and natural) benefits are achieved, including reduced waste...’
- Bourne Leisure suggest that the Vision should be revised to say, ‘...based on its landscape and heritage assets and historic market towns, and *building on the existing and growing value of tourism and the visitor economy*, the importance of the area as a visitor and tourism designation will have increased’.
- Add reference within the vision on 4.6 to ‘well-designed’
- The vision should be to deliver a ‘mix of high quality market and affordable housing which meets the Borough’s full objectively assessed needs’
- Remove reference to new ‘sustainable village’ as it won’t be as it will act as a commuter settlement.
- It is considered that this part of the vision could be enhanced by reference to meeting *full* local needs. This would ensure that the vision is more closely aligned with the NPPF.
- Suggested change from the Cheshire Wildlife Trust supports the statement however would like to see better promotion of health and diversity of the environment as equal to ‘attractiveness’
- Goodman consider that the Vision should include the following, ‘ In the main, new development will have been directed to the Principal towns of Crewe and Macclesfield to support regeneration priorities. In Crewe, this will mainly have been achieved through Sustainable urban extensions which have been developed by providing an integrated approach to the growth on the towns population to rebalance new homes in accessible locations which are in close proximity to existing and proposed employment sites and a range of housing choices in an attractive and sustainable environment. These urban extensions will help to enable the delivery of key transport infrastructure (including the Crewe Green Link Road) and the provision of social and community infrastructure, which will have been an integral part of the new housing development.’
- The vision should acknowledge that some element of development will be required within the Local Service Centres (whilst maintaining a focus on the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres).
- More information is required regarding the ‘new sustainable village’ is it North Cheshire Growth Village or Handforth East.
- Include a challenging but realistic target for the reduction of CO2 in the borough
- Growth figures should be reduced to 20,000 in line with ONS figures.
- Remove ‘a sustainable new village..in the north of the Borough’
- Rephrase commitment to steering the location of new development to brownfield and sustainable locations
- Quality of life is not mentioned in the supporting text, neither is need to conserve land for food production

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.4 should commit to placing as much development as possible on brownfield land. Policy itself does not commit to not significantly diminishing productive countryside</li> <li>• Reducing the need to travel should be generic commitment not just apply to new development</li> <li>• Paragraph 7 of the vision should be amended to read: 'Our many areas of landscape value, sites of nature conservation importance, characteristic waterways and heritage assets will have been conserved and enhanced through positive development that recognises the importance of both designated and non-designated assets including greenbelt and safeguarding them for future generations'.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The Vision section of the Local Plan is the Council's opportunity to explain the aims of the Council and how we can achieve this vision within the plan period. The Vision for Cheshire East 2030 sets out how the Council expects Cheshire East to look by 2030.</p> <p>Whilst some of the proposed changes noted above to the vision are accepted and agreed it is considered that the focus of some of the suggestions is too specific and it is considered that the vision, as written, is succinct and includes reference to the important aspects of an economically prosperous, healthy and sustainable Borough for the future.</p> <p>Each allocated strategic site and location, including the need for safeguarded land has been considered and assessed to be the most appropriate site for development in each area. This is fully justified for each specific site/location on their relevant consultation point/policy. The Local Plan Strategy has been designed to meet the need for Cheshire East up to 2030 and beyond, as required in the NPPF. This has included Strategic sites being allocated as 'safeguarded land' to ensure that greenbelt boundaries do not need re-assessing before the end of the plan period.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>Addition of 'well designed' inserted into paragraph 4.6 and within the vision statement. No other material alterations proposed.</p>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 5: The Case for Growth</b> (Now Chapter 4)  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 60 (Support: 12 / Object: 31 / Comment Only: 17)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is essential to attract inward investment, provide more employment and retain young and qualified people; agree it is necessary to increase the amount of disposable income.</li> <li>• It is agreed that Cheshire East is at the heart of the largest single economic area outside of the capital sitting in a strategic position between the conurbations of Manchester, the Potteries and Liverpool City Regions, North Staffordshire and North Wales. Its connectivity is second to none and will be improved further with HS2 and airport links.</li> <li>• Cheshire East needs to provide sufficient housing, commercial or employment opportunities and economic growth. There needs to be more sustainable growth and an adequate supply of a range of housing plays a fundamental role in building a successful economy.</li> <li>• Housing development also makes an important contribution to local economy in its own right.</li> <li>• Support the priority afforded to increasing prosperity through sustainable economic growth (paragraph 5.3); and the acknowledgement (in the box on page 27) of the benefits of achieving growth.</li> <li>• Support the acknowledgement of how well the Cheshire East economy is performing (paragraphs 5.6 – 5.8).</li> <li>• The Case for Growth as expressed in Section 5 is appropriate and welcomed. This sets out the priorities for the Council, and confirms the benefits of planning for growth. This is wholly consistent with NPPF and wider Government direction.</li> <li>• The Draft Core Strategy notes at paragraph 5.8 that if Cheshire East Council does not provide sufficient housing, commercial and employment opportunities supporting economic growth will be constrained.</li> <li>• Clear link between housing availability of the right type in the right location and economic growth; this suggests that if sufficient housing is not provided, economic growth will be constrained.</li> <li>• Agree with 5.16 - the attractive environment of the Borough is key to its economic success</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited support and recognition for the economic development and sustainability of the rural and agricultural back bone of the county</li> <li>• Priority should be given to infill and regeneration of old housing stock</li> <li>• No solid commitment to build the number of affordable homes needed.</li> <li>• The housing and population forecasts are unrealistic. An average figure of only 1.5 people for every new house built seems very low and does not reflect the type of properties developers are building and will build in the future</li> <li>• Gross Domestic Product does not measure the overall standard of living or well-being of a country</li> </ul> |

- 5.1 This quote, dating from March 2011, is now obsolete – the UK has one of the best economic performances in Western Europe. The quote also contains no policy options so is irrelevant to the Local Plan.
- 5.7/5.8 Where is your evidence that availability of housing is a key factor when a business decides to relocate? More important are infrastructure transport communications
- 5.9 This confirms that a motivation for allowing building is to increase the total income Cheshire East receives from the Council Tax.
- 5.10 This is based on a flawed survey with a very low (5 per cent) response rate and consultations with housing associations, builders and estate agents – all of which have a vested interest in house building.
- 5.11 If the proposed strategy of building houses brought prosperity, then Spain and the Republic of Ireland would be very wealthy countries.
- 5.11 Have we still not learnt that housing development does not produce sustainable growth?
- There is an assumption in par. 5.11 that more housing development “generates increased retail expenditure in the local economy” because this has historically been the case. However, the connection is no longer so direct and can no longer be assumed with the rise of Internet shopping and home deliveries. People now buy from the cheapest provider they can source on the Internet and this may not even be a UK business. Even food shopping may be picked up some distance away and/or be delivered directly by supermarket chains or by post from more distant suppliers.
- Most of the materials used to build houses are imported into the UK.
- 5.17 This is a total misrepresentation of past development policies. Cheshire East’s predecessor authorities allowed massive development between the 1950’s and 1980’s in Poynton, Macclesfield, Wilmslow and other towns in north Cheshire. The population of Poynton was tripled over this period.
- This section makes clear that the strategy is underpinned by “the conventional model of economic growth” (para 5.18). This is not the same as a model for sustainable development, which, as noted in para 5.19, is “the best preparation for a future whose defining characteristic is uncertainty.” The strategy’s unrelenting focus on growth and proposed targets for housing and employment land are certainly ambitious, but are not realistic, and do not reflect the views of the communities of Cheshire East. They therefore fail to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the basic tenets of sustainable development.
- Remove references to High Growth City which focuses on linking Crewe and Macclesfield.
- Remove all references to changing the status of sites currently designated Green Belt.
- The case for growth needs to be tempered by a proper regard to other considerations such as the need to protect the Countryside for its own sake, to preserve long standing Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it.
- The growth argument is not proven and is an aspiration, and does not provide an exceptional circumstance. I reject the idea that Macclesfield needs to maintain its role and status.
- Once again economic growth is confused with improved quality of life.

Moreover, growth based on house building is growth based on debt whether private for market housing or the public purse for affordable/subsidised housing

- The policy is based on a flawed economic model dependent on debt.
- An ageing population can best be accommodated by ensuring that they can remain in employment as long as possible. The plan does not address this issue.
- There are no less than three versions of a 'High Growth City' concept. The full case for such extravagant and extraordinary plans has not been made and neither has the business case for many of the roads. Nor have environmental impact assessments or wider economic impact assessments been carried out for these far reaching plans. Immediately beneath the case for growth, the supporting text appears to endorse the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) produced by the Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). But the way it paraphrases the LEP's aspirations does not concur with what is actually in the SEP and neither does it concur with the description of the 'High Growth City' that is explained in the 'Enterprise & Growth' section of the Pre-Submission Strategy. In paragraph 5.4 of the Pre Submission Strategy, under the 'Case for Growth' section, there is a description of a "High Growth City focusing on linking Crewe and Macclesfield by way of Congleton, creating a 'corridor of opportunity'". In the SEP itself, an illustration of the High Growth city shows it encompassing the wider areas of Crewe, Nantwich, Alsager, Congleton, Sandbach, Middlewich and Holmes Chapel in Cheshire East and extending across into Cheshire West & Chester (CW&C) to cover the wider areas around Northwich and Winsford. However, in the 'Enterprise & Growth' section of the Pre-Submission Strategy, the 'High Growth City' is focused on Crewe and the M6. Which is it? All that is apparent is that a key part of these expansionist aims appears to be the plans to build a series of new strategic roads through the Borough, many of which would connect up.
- This section fails to address sustainable development in the manner required by NPPF paragraph 8, by explicitly prioritising and focusing on growth at the expense of the other dimensions of sustainable development
- The plan as it stands is for growth, not for sustainable development.
- There is nothing wrong or reprehensible in Cheshire East aspiring for a sensible level of growth that takes into account the current economic circumstances and environmental capacity. However, nothing is said about environmental capacity
- The long term philosophy appears to be heading towards a new strategic road system that bisects the northern and middle parts of the Borough
- New roads are permitted development in Green Belt but in order to accommodate both them and development which in many cases would facilitate their funding, the Green Belt (and the Green Gap) would be rolled back in several places.
- The High Growth City proposals should be better publicised and explained, to enable consideration of implications for communities in and around that corridor, Greater Manchester, Merseyside and Staffordshire.
- Add statement saying that carbon reduction and sustainability policies should influence choice of housing sites and houses should be built where jobs are to discourage more driving.

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage - The bulleted list which gives the reasons for growth, should include reference to the improvement built and natural environment as one of the benefits of growth. An additional bullet point should be inserted to read: “To provide improvements to the built and natural environment”.</li> <li>• 5.16 / 5.19 - Amend the text to read “In accordance with the NPPF the approach to achieving sustainable development will seek to ensure that social and environmental (built and natural) benefits are achieved alongside economic growth.”</li> <li>• Amend text to read: “New development will be necessary, but we will ensure that it secures the protection and enhancement of environmental assets.”</li> <li>• Additional bullet point should be added: “To promote a thriving rural economy and tourism industry”</li> <li>• Object to the absence of sustainability as an integrated, over arching principle from the local plan. This better reflects the definition of Sustainable Development by the Government &amp; in your glossary quoting the simultaneous achievement of all 4 aims of ‘A better Quality of Life’ Strategy.</li> <li>• I wish to see included something along the lines of Stockport Council’s Core Strategy 2011 ‘Overarching Principles: Sustainable Development – Addressing [Inequality &amp;] Climate Change’ suitably adapted to CE. They address the need to ensure that planning policy contributes to a sustainable development approach in the Borough, particularly with regards to low carbon.</li> <li>• The Plan should recognise and explicitly support the economic role, social role, and environmental role of the planning system. Whilst the need for community facilities is acknowledged at paragraph 5.15 it should be identified clearly in the Case for Growth.</li> <li>• Footnote 27 Source: The Plan for Growth, Department for Business Innovation and Skills, March 2011” It is our understanding that new figures were produced in 2013 from the same national sources which show an appreciable decrease on those collected in 2011.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The visitor economy is crucial to Cheshire East’s identity and brand and to creating the conditions for sustainable growth</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce to this section a recognition of the importance of the rural and agricultural economy to Cheshire East</li> <li>• Remove paragraph 5.1</li> <li>• Remove references to High Growth City</li> <li>• English Heritage - The bulleted list which gives the reasons for growth should include reference to the improvement built and natural environment as one of the benefits of growth. An additional bullet point should be inserted to read: “To provide improvements to the built and natural environment”.</li> <li>• Additional bullet point should be added to case for growth bullet points: “To promote a thriving rural economy and tourism industry”</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>This chapter sets out a case for growth and is considered to clearly articulate the Council’s rationale for the need for economic growth and the delivery of sustainable development in Cheshire East.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.16 clearly sets out the importance of sustainable development and the chapter is considered to be in general conformity with the objectives of the</p>   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>National Planning Policy Framework in providing economic growth in a sustainable way. It sets out the Council's position and reason for sustainable economic growth and references in the chapter to High Growth City are considered representative of other information sources including the Strategic Economic Plans being prepared by the Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>Population forecasts included in the chapter were included in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2013) as part of the Council's published evidence base. Gross Value Added and Gross Domestic Product are considered appropriate indicators of economic performance.</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add two additional bullet points have been added to the Case for Growth headline list: "To provide improvements to the built and natural environment" and "To promote a thriving rural economy and tourism industry"</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.3 – replace "economic prosperity" with "economic and social wellbeing".</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.5 – reword section to read "The Cheshire &amp; Warrington sub-region's economic output (Gross Value Added or GVA) is around £21.9bn and the area employs an estimated 444,100 people (as of 2012). Cheshire East already makes an impressive contribution to the sub-regional and regional economies: its GVA is around £9.2bn (2012 estimate), which equates to 7.0% of the North West region's economic output. As of 2012, an estimated 173,500 people were working in Cheshire East, as either employees or working proprietors."</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.5 – update final sentence to read "The overall ambition of the Core Strategy is to further strengthen the Borough's economy."</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.10 – update second sentence to read "Despite the recent recession, our analysis shows that the need for housing over the next twenty years is likely to outstrip supply unless we increase the amount of housing"</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.11 – update second sentence to read "It creates employment and skills development opportunities"</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.19– update third sentence to read "New development will be necessary, but environmental assets will be protected wherever possible." The last sentence referring to urban extensions and new villages could be removed.</li> <li>• Minor changes for readability to what is now para 5.16 beginning The Council's objective...</li> </ul> |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 6: Strategic Priorities</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 37 (Support: 22 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 9)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Strategic Priorities are appropriate and supported.</li> <li>• Support that the economic benefits and employment opportunities created by closeness to the Airport and the potential advantages that improved transport connections to the Airport can bring to the Borough have been recognised.</li> <li>• Agree with the need to increase the provision of public transport because of an ageing population and encourage the reduction in car use.</li> <li>• The foundations for the Borough to take advantage of the emergence from recession are already generally in place and should be built upon by stressing the attributes of the Borough to accept business growth given the difficulties that have slowed this down since 2008.</li> <li>• Welcome the references to well-designed places and to the importance of green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Support the delivery of sustainable communities by providing for objectively assessed housing needs and ensuring that a substantial majority of new housing is provided in sustainable locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach towards the Green Belt has little regard to the extent of existing designated areas and the presumption in the NPPF that established Green Belt should be altered only in exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>• The Plan has not examined the consequences of channelling development first toward areas that do not presently have Green Belt Status or by channelling a greater proportion of development towards Macclesfield.</li> <li>• CEC has reduced support for public transport.</li> <li>• Do not build on greenfield sites until brownfield and urban regeneration can provide no further development potential.</li> <li>• Improve public transport links rather than building roads to avoid congestion.</li> <li>• Consider the Potteries.</li> <li>• The Strategic Priorities are not applied equally and consistently across the Strategy.</li> <li>• Not enough emphasis on improving cycle networks.</li> <li>• The Council has not objectively assessed housing need.</li> <li>• There should be further correlation between the objectives as set out with particular reference to spatial linkages in terms of reducing carbon footprint and the co location of jobs and homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To keep it local, employment must be local, if there are no/very limited jobs the working population will move to where they can earn.</li> <li>• Gorstyhill accords with the Strategic Priorities.</li> <li>• No commitment to achieving the objectives on growth and transport.</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst new, housing led development will in itself create jobs, there is no evidence whatsoever that further jobs and employment opportunities will follow.</li> <li>• Cheshire East should capitalise on its unique position as a communications centre.</li> <li>• Visible infrastructure improvements must be in place before prospective employers can be expected to locate to East Cheshire.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 6.3 add visitor economy as a key industry for Cheshire East. (CEC Visitor Economy)</li> <li>• In 6.4 (3) add in culture. (CEC Visitor Economy).</li> <li>• A core strategy of bringing employment into the area at all levels needs to be identified.</li> <li>• Positive detailed objectives for cycle path building.</li> <li>• Proactive policy for preserving/developing derelict buildings owned by absentee property companies.</li> <li>• The Strategic Priorities need to be reconsidered by placing greater emphasis on the importance of retaining existing Green Belt and by focussing a greater amount of development at the Principal Towns.</li> <li>• Remove reference to improvements to public transport.</li> <li>• Focus on urban regeneration &amp; building on brownfield sites before greenfield.</li> <li>• Prioritise public transport over road building</li> <li>• Cease focussing on just the Manchester conurbation.</li> <li>• Review the strategy so that the Principles and Priorities underpin the proposals.</li> <li>• Improvements to the historic, built and natural environment should be included in the Strategic Priorities 1 and 2. (English Heritage)</li> <li>• Improving cycling networks as a strategic priority.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | Issues are considered against each individual Strategic Priority in the following tables and elsewhere in the document where appropriate.   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Add a reference to protecting and enhancing environmental quality of the built and natural environment.   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Priority 1: Promoting economic prosperity by creating conditions for business growth</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 33 (Support: 11 / Object: 12 / Comment Only: 10)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regeneration of Crewe Town Centre is essential, both for business and residential opportunities but business and residential areas should be kept separate</li> <li>• Support need to provide viable and flexible supply of quality employment land and premises and consider that site CS24 as the only employment site in Sandbach should be for employment only</li> <li>• Provision of new housing, retirement living/assisted living, school places, medical facilities and employment including retail and hotel in and around the town, providing opportunities for new and younger families whose increased levels of expenditure can benefit local shops and services, would greatly assist in achieving the second point of SP1</li> <li>• Support reference to sustainable tourism</li> <li>• Support aspiration to be an "engine for growth" and promote a dynamic, prosperous economy.</li> <li>• Support emphasis in high quality design</li> <li>• Support this objective which is aligned to the case for growth</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheshire East has a 30 year supply of employment land so no need to take areas of Green Belt to create more; should commit to providing the correct amount of employment land, because over-allocation can lead to blight and failure to use the limited land resource as efficiently and effectively as possible.</li> <li>• Should commit to enhance retail offer primarily through increases in quality, not quantity, to reflect shifts in retail trends</li> <li>• In bullet 5, the emphasis should be on sustainable connectivity / accessibility rather than simply on connectivity</li> <li>• Should include reference to strategic highway improvements to the A500 and A51 corridors – need a clear strategy for this</li> <li>• Strategy should recognise that as economic prosperity increases as a result of investment, the need for affordable housing can be reduced</li> <li>• Disagree with HS2</li> <li>• Crewe and Macclesfield should be the priority locations for new employment land and premises with Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres being appropriate for smaller scale employment growth</li> <li>• Needs to be more focus on increasing employment than on increasing housing</li> <li>• Supporting infrastructure needs to be in place in order to attract inward investment and creating jobs.</li> <li>• Having a flexible supply of employment land treats land as though it is an</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>endless resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query as to whether CE is still in the Manchester City Region as bullet 5 implies that it's not.</li> <li>• The Draft Plan does not adequately reflect the Priority in particular relation to the housing requirement, and supply to meet that requirement, both of which are deemed to be substantially understated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crewe Town Centre redevelopment scheme is desperately needed to ensure its continue viability; retail park draws trade away from town centre</li> <li>• it is necessary to improve the economy in the rural areas by supporting the development of rural enterprises, diversification of the rural economy, improve broadband connectivity and the continued importance of farming and agriculture</li> <li>• Conditions for business growth can only be created with the provision of sufficient new housing to meet the real needs of the locality of population growth and housing needs of prospective employees; the economic role of housing should be referenced</li> <li>• It is important that the objective to improve the economy in rural areas can be measured through the performance indicators</li> <li>• The provision of housing in and around Macclesfield town centre, providing opportunities for new and younger families whose increased levels of expenditure can benefit shops and services would greatly assist in the regeneration of the town</li> <li>• Concern that the plan does not adequately reflect the strategic economic and housing objectives</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to new housing as one of the vital ingredients that business needs if it is to attract the right personnel, or be attracted to set up business in the area in the first instance</li> <li>• Add a ninth point to the list “Providing a viable and flexible supply of quality housing sites to ensure that an adequate supply of new homes is delivered to meet demographic changes and to ensure that future employers have a skilled, local workforce who can support their growth. This will include ensuring that enough new homes are delivered in each of the Borough’s settlements to economically support their centres and protect and enhance their vibrancy and vitality in the longer term”</li> <li>• Prioritise Crewe town centre regeneration</li> <li>• Add to point 7 at the end of the sentence “but with the golden rule of always ensuring that there is sufficient onsite parking in any type of development.”</li> <li>• Add the point 1 at the end of the sentence “Employment opportunities should be directed towards to the Principal Towns, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres as the most sustainable locations for growth within the Borough”</li> <li>• Remove reference to HS2</li> <li>• Place point 2 before point 1 and include wording for integrated, mixed-use development first, keeping especially jobs and shops close to town centres and homes, and not creating 'business or retail parks' instead of places and streets.</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include reference to materials in point 8.</li> <li>• Add to bullet 1 'within close proximity of housing to enable people to live and work in close proximity' between 'strategic sites' and 'to attract'.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>The Strategic Priorities have been written to help frame the policies set out in the Local Plan Strategy document. As such, much of the detail referred to in the consultation responses is more appropriately directed to the policies that follow the strategic priorities.</p> <p>The need for new housing to facilitate economic growth is acknowledged and this is covered in Strategic Priority 2: Creating sustainable communities, where all members are able to contribute and where all the infrastructure required to support the community is provided. Point 1 of Strategic Priority 2 refers to "Providing for the objectively assessed housing needs for the Borough to support economic growth and to meet housing needs". It is not considered necessary to repeat this acknowledgement that housing is important to facilitate economic growth.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | No material change proposed.   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Priority 2: Creating sustainable communities, where all members are able to contribute and where all the infrastructure required to support the community is provided</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 59 (Support: 24 / Object: 21 / Comment Only: 14)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the aims of the Priority.</li> <li>• Support the requirement for a mix of house types and tenures to meet the Borough's objectively assessed needs.</li> <li>• Support the need to ensure that a substantial majority of new housing is provided in sustainable locations.</li> <li>• Support the plan's aspirations for sustainability.</li> <li>• Support the recognition of the link between planning and health.</li> <li>• Support giving priority to walking, cycling and public transport.</li> <li>• Yeowood Garden Village will help deliver this strategic priority.</li> <li>• Support the link between housing and achieving economic growth.</li> <li>• Key Service Centres should rightly be included as predetermined sustainable locations for the delivery of new housing.</li> <li>• Sustainable urban extensions should be supported in principle even where this would result in minor amendments to Green Belt boundaries.</li> <li>• Support the spatial dimension of the policy.</li> <li>• Support bullets 4 and 5.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to make any reference to new housing growth in the LSCs.</li> <li>• Gone against previous planning guidance by downgrading Macclesfield in terms of new housing.</li> <li>• To meet global housing number requirements, towns in the south and centre of the Borough have had their ration of housing increased by a disproportionate amount.</li> <li>• The government has predicted that numbers of cyclists will reduce in years to come and they will be reducing funding for cycle paths etc.</li> <li>• The focus on the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres misses the opportunity to enhance villages where additional investment, infrastructure and vibrant communities may develop with sustainable growth.</li> <li>• Recreational space is over capacity.</li> <li>• Sustainable housing will not be achieved in CS10 and CS32.</li> <li>• Priority is not given to walking, cycling and public transport in the plan.</li> <li>• Create cycling provision and safe roads throughout Cheshire East as a mode of transport linked to a fully developed public transport network.</li> <li>• Development should be focused on brownfield sites.</li> <li>• Town centre regeneration strategies should properly consider housing need.</li> </ul> |

- This Priority will not be delivered because the draft Local Plan does not provide for the objectively assessed housing needs of the Borough.
- The Draft Core Strategy does not make the most of all forms of sustainable settlements and locations as identified in other parts of the Draft Core Strategy and its evidence base.
- High quality green infrastructure cannot be created in a way that replaces mature countryside.
- Different housing needs to be quantified and developments allowed only to meet these.
- Plan town centre housing for the elderly to give access to facilities & community.
- Macclesfield town centre infrastructure does not support scale of housing plans - not 'sustainable'.
- The Plan refers to the importance of the unique identity and character of the market towns and villages. Therefore, it is important that new development reflects its context. (English Heritage).
- Housing needs should be met through the development of suitable locations at existing settlements.
- Poynton and Handforth have significant potential to accommodate a more significant scale of development.
- The requirements for new development should also ensure that local distinctive character is recognised, respected and reinforced (National Trust).
- Insufficient growth is being planned for in Knutsford and Wilmslow.
- The Priority does not commit to locating a given, significant percentage of housing on previously developed land.
- Query as to what is a substantial majority.
- Query as to what is regarded as sustainable.
- The Draft Plan does not adequately reflect the Priority in particular relation to the housing requirement, and supply to meet that requirement, both of which are deemed to be substantially understated.

**Comment Only**

- Cycling is only of marginal benefit in satisfying travel needs for work and domestic purposes.
- Great cycling provision is key.
- Providing the legal minimum of green space needed on developments does not give the high levels of benefits that open countryside gives in terms of health and wellbeing.
- Building on greenspace and vehicle emissions will increase levels of CO<sub>2</sub>.
- Affordable housing should be in affordable locations and not in unaffordable and unsupported green space.
- Concern over whether developers will provide recreational and cultural facilities.
- Concern over the lack of facilities in Middlewich and that this will be emphasised by new development.
- The Priority does not mention rural housing.
- An appropriate level of housing development should also be brought forward in the Local Service Centres to meet local demand and increase affordability.
- The Priority is about sustainable communities but makes no reference to

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference should be made to housing growth in LSCs as spatial distribution proposes delivery of at least 2,500 new dwellings in LSCs.</li> <li>• The diversity of need for housing to meet different elements of the local community, such as bungalows for elderly people, indicates that a blanket high-density approach will not always be appropriate.</li> <li>• There is an imbalance in the strategic priority which seeks to meet the majority of the needs of the Borough in the south and insufficiently in the north.</li> <li>• Recognised that slavish preservation of the green belt in all areas will inhibit the growth of regional centres and in particular threatens the growth of Macclesfield.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify what is meant by infrastructure providers.</li> <li>• Commit to being proactive in providing quality of life infrastructure in all high density housing areas.</li> <li>• Clarify as to how rural housing fits into this Priority.</li> <li>• Acknowledge that an appropriate level of housing development should also be brought forward in the Local Service Centres.</li> <li>• Add “, community” after the cultural, in point 2.</li> <li>• Amend to make explicit reference to Local Service Centres under Part 1(i).</li> <li>• Include reference to the need for residential development to be built at an appropriate density, relating to its function.</li> <li>• State the number of affordable homes needed.</li> <li>• State the strategy for delivering affordable homes.</li> <li>• Include in the Priority opportunities for growth in villages where sustainability may be achieved by the right investment.</li> <li>• Add statement to say Green Belt will be last to be built on, with brownfield sites first.</li> <li>• Add a commitment to active effort to establish rich natural environments in new green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Add statement to say housing needs to be quantified and speculative developments that do not meet needs will not be allowed.</li> <li>• Add statement to say more housing for the elderly will be built in town centres.</li> <li>• Specific reference should be made to the provision of retirement and assisted living with housing in para 1.</li> <li>• Bullet 5 should be amended to read: “Ensuring that all new development is well designed, has regard to local character and context and is sustainable and energy efficient” (English Heritage).</li> <li>• Part (1) should make reference to meeting the “full” objectively assessed housing needs of the Borough during the plan period.</li> <li>• Paragraph 1 should be amended to “Providing at a minimum for the objectively assessed housing needs”.</li> <li>• Amend to read: “5. Ensuring that all new development is well designed, respects and reinforces local distinctiveness, is sustainable and energy efficient.” (National Trust).</li> <li>• Insert places of worship at paragraph 3 line 3 after transport.</li> <li>• Bullet 5 should be strengthened to give guidance on the levels of quality and energy efficiency we are aspiring to and the levels that are unacceptable.</li> <li>• Reference should be made to the quality of new housing, and the role this can</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>play in boosting the economy, meeting housing needs and achieving regeneration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to bullet 1i 'in close proximity to employment' after 'Centres'.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>The Strategic Priorities have been written to help frame the policies set out in the Local Plan Strategy document. Strategic Priority 2 reflects the Government's aim of achieving sustainable development through the planning process. Many of the queries raised are covered by the more detailed information and policies in later chapters of the Core Strategy especially chapter 8 "Planning for Growth" and Chapter 9 "Planning for Sustainable Development". Chapter 13 "Sustainable Environment" covers green infrastructure, heritage and the efficient use of land. Affordable housing is dealt with in Chapter 12 "Stronger Communities".</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | <p>Add the word "full" to objectively assessed housing needs</p>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 33 (Support: 12 / Object: 10 / Comment Only: 11)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the distinctive characteristics of each town should be respected, maintained and advanced.</li> <li>• Support for the Priority’s aspirations/intentions.</li> <li>• Support that the careful siting of new development is necessary to protect the identity and separateness of settlements.</li> <li>• We should be reducing the Borough’s impact on climate change by having housing in walking distance of local facilities.</li> <li>• Yeowood Garden Village will help deliver this Strategic Priority.</li> <li>• Site CS 36: Upcast Lane, Wilmslow as Safeguarded Lane is fully in accordance with this Strategic Priority.</li> <li>• Support point 7.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not see evidence of this priority being included in the plan.</li> <li>• Green Belt boundaries need to be maintained and not moved to support development.</li> <li>• No allowance made for biodiversity, landscape and agriculture.</li> <li>• No allowance to stop inappropriate upsizing of houses.</li> <li>• The allocation of large areas of open countryside to the north of Congleton for massive housing and employment development does not respect the character and distinctiveness of the parishes concerned or maintain their separate identities.</li> <li>• Strategy ignores national planning guidance on protecting Green Belt.</li> <li>• Given that an alteration to the Green Belt boundaries is both needed and proposed within the PSCS, there is no reason why this should not be reflected within SP3, whereby bullet 7 should be more positively phrased and amended.</li> <li>• Object to bullet 7 as it is not considered appropriate to establish boundaries based upon releasing Green Belt land that is not currently needed for development and where that land still fulfils a Green Belt function (National Trust).</li> <li>• Recognition needs to be made that, where there is a need for Green Belt release, only those areas that contribute least to the function of the Green Belt should be considered.</li> <li>• The importance of providing Safeguarded sites to ensure that development needs in the Borough can be met beyond this plan period without the need for a further review of the Green Belt, which is currently hinted at, should be more explicit.</li> <li>• Cannot see evidence of this policy in the proposals for sites CS24 and SL5 – neither of which are in easy walking distance of local facilities.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bullet 3 vi. is far too broadly drafted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query as to why the Priority is not common practice already.</li> <li>• Reducing the Green Belt should be a last resort.</li> <li>• Housing built on Green Belt should far excel typical sustainable standards- Code for Sustainable Homes level 6, BREEAM excellent, or carbon neutrality; affordable housing only needs Code level 3.</li> <li>• Planning permission should not be given to any more greenfield developments until those sites that currently have permission and are land banked are developed in line with the permission given.</li> <li>• Housing number allocations in service centres in the south of the Borough are excessive and will destroy the present unique character of the towns of Nantwich, Middlewich, Alsager and Sandbach.</li> <li>• The priorities are properly recognised and, whilst unpopular, a studied change to Green Belt boundaries to reflect development needs in sustainable locations must be a priority for the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• The SA indicates a negative impact on carbon emissions.</li> <li>• The allowing of development on Green Gap land is contrary to bullet 2.</li> <li>• Clone housing developments do not help preserve distinctive characteristics of each town.</li> <li>• Homes should be built near jobs.</li> <li>• Using Green Belt to separate towns and give easy access to countryside must remain a priority.</li> <li>• Need to prevent urban sprawl and build communities.</li> <li>• Population density is a growing problem and thus landfill sites will become scarce.</li> <li>• By locating additional housing in the Local Service Centres the objectives of strategic priority 3 would be directly met.</li> <li>• There needs to be a proper assessment and responsible response to genuinely meet the economic and housing needs of the Borough, which requires appropriate Green Belt release.</li> <li>• With the proposal to seriously alter Green Belt boundaries, point no. 7 might not be as sound as it initially appears</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Green Belt should have to achieve highest sustainability standards possible.</li> <li>• A core strategy that will not increase carbon dioxide emissions and impact negatively on the environment.</li> <li>• Define the term high quality green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Commit to active efforts to establish a rich natural environment.</li> <li>• Add a commitment to the principle of Green Belt in its role of separating towns and giving easy access to the countryside for those in towns.</li> <li>• Bullet 7 should be altered to read ‘Maintaining Green Belt boundaries that are only altered in exceptional circumstances.’</li> <li>• Bullet 7 should be altered to read 'Reviewing Green Belt boundaries so that the development strategy and needs of the Borough can be met up to 2030 and beyond, including alterations to the Green Belt boundary where required.'</li> <li>• Bullet 7 should be altered to read ‘Establishing Green Belt boundaries that take into account the need to promote sustainable patterns of development</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>within the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bullet 7 should be altered to read ‘Establishing clearly defined Green Belt boundaries that take into account the need for sustainable patterns of development and include ‘safeguarded land’ which can meet the longer-term development needs of the borough stretching well beyond the current plan period. All of this will be done in accordance with the requirements of National Policy.’</li> <li>• Add additional sections on biodiversity, landscape and agriculture.</li> <li>• Brownfield development should be prioritised.</li> <li>• No safeguarding.</li> <li>• Add allowance for protecting inappropriate development in towns and villages.</li> <li>• A commitment to avoiding development on high quality/BMV agricultural land wherever possible, to reflect the NPPF. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• A commitment to respecting environmental capacity, both Borough-wide and with regard to specific localities.</li> <li>• Include ref to materials in SP 3 (1).</li> <li>• Bullet 3 vi. should read “avoiding developing land that is proven to be likely to materially suffer from the effects of climate change”.</li> <li>• Bullet 5 - Recognition must be given that alternative uses or redevelopment of non-designated heritage assets will be considered favourably and flexibly by the local planning authority where it would secure the occupation of important heritage assets or landmark buildings.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>The Strategic Priorities have been written to help frame the policies set out in the Local Plan Strategy document. Strategic Priority 3 reflects the Government’s aim to conserve and enhance the natural environment (Section 9 of the NPPF). Many of the queries raised are covered by the more detailed information and policies in later chapters of the Core Strategy especially chapter 13 “Sustainable Environment” and the green belt and safeguarded land and open countryside policies and sections in Chapter 8 “Planning for Growth”.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | <p>Change Point 7 - has been amended to include a reference to safeguarded land.</p>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <p><b>Strategic Priority 4: Reducing the need to travel, managing car use and promoting more sustainable modes of transport and improving the road network.</b></p>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <p>Total: 36 (Support: 18 / Object: 11 / Comment Only: 7)</p>  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that new houses should be built close to or easily accessible to places of work.</li> <li>• Support sustainable modes of transport.</li> <li>• Support the intention to reduce the need to travel, to improve public transport, and to ensure Crewe station remains as a national rail hub, as part of development.</li> <li>• There is a need for new homes across the whole of Cheshire East and not just within the major towns.</li> <li>• Yeowood Garden Village will help to support the intention to reduce the need to travel and to improve public transport.</li> <li>• This approach is welcomed and is considered to appropriately reflect national guidance as set out in the NPPF (National Trust).</li> <li>• The priorities are welcomed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport is rubbish, if everyone were to use it, the trains would be 10 miles long.</li> <li>• CEC engineer junctions to cause congestion so they have an excuse for a new link road in Macclesfield.</li> <li>• The Handforth East development does not comply with this principle.</li> <li>• To the north of Congleton is about the worst possible location for accessing Congleton railway station and bus transport is poorly utilised already, owing to it being ineffective.</li> <li>• Support the comments on sustainable modes of transport but see no development of rail and cycle and footpath networks to assist this.</li> <li>• CS10 and CS32 are located a significant distance from the railway station in Macclesfield.</li> <li>• The car is not a sustainable mode of transport.</li> <li>• Homes should be built, and planned for, where people want to live as opposed to where CEC might want to see sites allocated or developed.</li> <li>• Bullets 1 and 2 are not delivered in the plans in the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• The proposals for SL5 are at odds with the policy at SP4.</li> <li>• CS24 is alongside Old Mill Road A534, which is not a pleasant road to cycle on, yet there is not mention on cycling in the plans for site CS24.</li> <li>• CS10 and CS32, which are located a significant distance from the railway station in Macclesfield, go against the Priority.</li> <li>• Too much emphasis on road than rail.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every employment site (existing or new needs to be served by buses that get people to and from work on time.</li> <li>• Planning without sufficient onsite parking is a nightmare for residential developments not only onsite but for surrounding streets.</li> <li>• Thousands of jobs lost in Sandbach and still awaiting some to arrive, so mainly out-commuting.</li> <li>• Capricorn close to M6 thus ease of access to north and south.</li> <li>• Little that can be done to increase the capability of Middlewich Road or Crewe Road in Sandbach.</li> <li>• By locating additional housing in the local service centres the objectives of strategic priority 4 would be directly met.</li> <li>• To enable lower paid workers to live closer to places of work located in areas of high house prices, more affordable housing needs to be built.</li> <li>• If an extensive cycle network is developed, its effect will be marginal.</li> <li>• Cycling lanes are not going to solve the severe transport problems found in Crewe and Congleton.</li> <li>• Only additional roads infrastructure will enable any strategy for growth to succeed.</li> <li>• Cycle ways should always be separate from and as distant to highways as possible.</li> <li>• All strategic sites should show how they will be accessible to walking and cycling.</li> <li>• No evidence of this Priority being prioritised, for example no development of rail and cycle and footpath networks.</li> <li>• The imbalance in Spatial Distribution and emphasis on a new sustainable village in the north will not achieve this Priority.</li> <li>• Need to reflect this priority in the choice of sites to be allocated.</li> <li>• Points number 5 and 8 appear to repeat each other.</li> <li>• In a mature economy, there is no automatic connection between building transport infrastructure and economic benefit</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to bullet 2 'However, it is important to recognise the importance of providing sufficient onsite parking in any housing development to avoid infringing pedestrian and road safety to avoid street clutter and pavement parking.'</li> <li>• Achieving a high quality public realm should be emphasised either within action 2 or by creating a separate action. (CEC Heritage and Design).</li> <li>• A development strategy that reduces car use not merely managing car use.</li> <li>• The strategic priority should confirm that where homes should be built should also reflect where people want to live as opposed to where CEC might want to see sites allocated and developed.</li> <li>• Requires stronger focus on improving sustainable transport and reducing the need to travel. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• Clarify that 'improving the road network' refers to making best use of existing infrastructure: maximising the functional performance of the existing highway network for all road users, improving road safety, reducing traffic growth and maintaining a high quality environment'. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise that the proposed road-building programme fundamentally conflicts with the aspirations set out here, and a re-focusing on the principles of sustainable development and sustainable transport in particular. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• Rail and public transport should be mentioned in the title.</li> <li>• Bullets 6 and 7 should include reference to local and new stations as well as Crewe, and to freight as well as passenger travel.</li> <li>• Bullet 5 and 8 appear to repeat each other – could improve with a comment to the effect that new transport infrastructure will only be provided where a case is made for it.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | The Strategic Priorities have been written to help frame the policies set out in the Local Plan Strategy document. Strategic Priority 4 reflects the Government’s aim to promote sustainable transport (Section 4 of the NPPF). Many of the queries raised are covered by the more detailed information and policies in later chapters of the Core Strategy especially Chapter 14 “Connectivity” (Policy CO1 covers sustainable travel and transport) and Chapter 9 “Sustainable Development”.  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | No material change recommended.   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 7 and Policy MP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 64 (Support: 29 / Object: 24 / Comment Only: 11)</b><br>Chapter 7: 16 (Support: 5 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 3)<br>MP1: 48 (Support: 24 / Object: 16 / Comment Only: 8)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflects NPPF policy as required; aligns with positive pro-growth emphasis of NPPF.</li> <li>• Policy has adopted the ‘model policy’ published by the Planning Inspectorate intended for use by Local Planning Authorities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restatement of national policy without any local context means the policy is against NPPF guidance and localism; local interpretation of sustainable development should be based on the principles of Smart Growth</li> <li>• Policy should state explicitly that proposals that conflict with sustainability principles or Local Plan policies will be refused.</li> <li>• Policy should commit to give appropriate weight to Neighbourhood Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents.</li> <li>• This policy is a ‘free for all’ for developers; policy is a developers’ charter; policy for urban sprawl</li> <li>• Sustainable development does not mean building on Green Belt; policy should prevent development on greenfield sites and refer to the NPPF’s brownfield first policy</li> <li>• The NPPF’s definition of ‘sustainable development’ is not consistent with the Brundtland Commission’s definition.</li> <li>• Policy should be extended to specifically support short-term delivery of housing.</li> <li>• Sustainability should be more about quality of life and less about economic growth</li> <li>• Policy needs to introduce phrasing that commits to upholding the quality of life, operating within environmental limits, protecting important open spaces, landscapes, air quality and tranquillity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three elements of sustainable development are economic, social and environmental. For development to be considered sustainable, all three need to be met. This should be enforced.</li> <li>• Need to be more specific about what “sustainable development” is.</li> <li>• Criteria for sustainability should be listed and defined on a scale from ‘strong contribution’ to ‘unacceptable impact’ – need to be able to measure sustainability of proposals</li> <li>• Agree with policy but the Plan proposes unsustainable development</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct grammar in MP1(1) to remove split infinity ‘to jointly find’</li> <li>• Remove references to "the Council" since policies should be applicable to all decision making bodies, not just Cheshire East Council.</li> <li>• The second part of the first paragraph describes a process and therefore has no place within a policy statement. It should be removed from the policy and, if considered necessary, placed as supporting text.</li> <li>• Point 1 should be changed to work proactively with residents (as well as applicants) to ensure that localism prevails.</li> <li>• Point 3 should be removed and the onus shifted to Cheshire East Council to ensure that the Local Plan is always up-to-date and formulated by proper due process</li> <li>• Quote the four aims from “Better Quality of Life, a Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK” to help define sustainability.</li> <li>• Include a clear statement of support for the Green Belt, and the objectives of section 79 of the NPPF</li> <li>• Add statement to say greenfield sites should not be released until in-town brownfield land used up in order to minimise car use and improve town centre environments and prosperity</li> <li>• Para 7.1: change to read “... in a way that <del>can be</del> <u>is</u> in accordance with...”</li> <li>• Para 7.1 omits the third, social, element of sustainability and the fact that all elements are to be achieved concurrently.</li> <li>• Para 7.2: Replace "Development means growth . . . So sustainable development is about positive growth - making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations'." with "Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system"</li> <li>• Expand paragraph 7.2 to also reflect the NPPF guidance in Paragraph 8 which states: "These roles should not be taken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that a golden thread running through the planning system is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 15 of the Framework requires that <i>“Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally”</i>.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate has produced model wording for a policy which is considered an appropriate way to meet the Framework requirement in respect of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This model wording is included largely unchanged as Policy MP1.</p> <p>Further detail on sustainable development, including definitions and local context is provided in Policy SD1 ‘Sustainable Development in Cheshire East’ and Policy SD2 ‘Sustainable Development Principles’.</p>   |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | The Framework does set out that the three dimensions to sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) are mutually dependent and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. It would therefore be appropriate to clarify this in the policy introduction. |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | Add clarification to the policy introduction that the three dimensions to sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) are mutually dependent and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system otherwise no material changes to the policy.                 |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 8 and Policy PG1: Planning For Growth</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 191 (Support: 11 / Object: 152 / Comment Only: 28)</b><br>Chapter 8: 47 (Support: 2 / Object: 35 / Comment Only: 10)<br>PG1: 144 (Support: 9 / Object: 117 / Comment Only: 18)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good policy contradicted by plans to put houses everywhere and jobs in only three locations</li> <li>• We support the policy in that it is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared. The policy accords with the tests of soundness</li> <li>• do not want to see this figure change</li> <li>• Support for the Overall Development Strategy (Policy PG1), including the housing figure of 27,000 for the period 2010-30. However, the distribution of where this level of growth should take place should recognise the large scale growth of the Crewe area, and to a lesser extent in Alsager, Congleton, Nantwich &amp; Sandbach. Constraint in northern towns should continue.</li> <li>• Support the aspiration to increase the supply of housing and employment land. The quantum of housing proposed is insufficient to meet the housing growth requirement and should be increased. The Plan does not meet the full objectively assessed need for affordable housing. There needs to be a sufficient number of dwellings to meet the economic objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In its approach to Gorsty Hill site CEC have failed to comply with the legal requirements of the 2004 Act.</li> <li>• The consultation process has been unlawful due to pre-determination (reference to Leader's letter)</li> <li>• Focus should be on providing better public transport links into KSCs and LSCs</li> <li>• More investigation needed to establish the baseline provision and capacity of services in KSCs and LSCs</li> <li>• A net annual deficit of 1401 affordable dwellings over 5 year period – should be stressed this is a measure of imbalance of affordable need relative to supply and not a target</li> <li>• Arguments put forward to justify large scale Greenfield development are weak and unconvincing</li> <li>• Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt development do not exist</li> <li>• There is every indication that Wilmslow will deliver 400 houses on brownfield sites</li> <li>• In its current form the Development Strategy will not meet the Councils Visions and Strategic Priorities</li> <li>• Housing numbers too low, need to be significantly increased by some 33 - 50%.</li> <li>• Housing provision, taking into account longer term trends, needs to be in the range 1800-2000 dwellings per year, to avoid a catalogue of problems relating to affordability, affordable housing provision and failure to meet the needs of new household formation.</li> </ul> |

- Revise total housing requirement to a minimum of 36,000 new homes, plus a need for 4,000 dwellings for homeless households = 40,000 dwellings.
- The government reduced overall requirements from 27000 to 20000, and the council has chosen to ignore these changes.
- Housing figures should be 20,000. Insufficient allocation of Brownfield sites. 50% of Macclesfield's green belt will be destroyed.
- Policy PG1 is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with NPPF and is therefore ineffective and unsound.
- Overall targets for house building and employment land are significantly too high; they are undeliverable and the plan is therefore unsound.
- Increased focus on sustainable housing growth based on established centres and communities, rather than over reliance on new settlements. The HBF is supportive of the fact that the housing requirement is not viewed as a minimum and contains the words 'at least'. The overall housing requirement is not considered sufficiently aspirational as it is unlikely to meet the economic growth envisaged for the area and is not considered to meet the objectively assessed needs of the area.
- The case has not been made for the volume of employment land sought, the number of houses proposed or the amount of road building being promulgated and the prevailing economic circumstances mean that going for a high growth strategy is not a sustainable or logical option.
- In order to be found sound, Policy PG1 should be modified to provide for a substantially higher housing requirement which is supported by the Council's own evidence base.
- The evidence base, including the work on projections, the SHMA and SHLAA indicate that the Council should be planning for a higher housing requirement figure.
- Proposed Policy Modification: Policy PG1: Overall Development Strategy Housing provision increased to 32,000 new dwellings over the plan period to meet identified objectively assessed need
- Policy PG1 should be amended so as to refer to "at least 41,000" new homes between 2010 and 2030.

**Comment Only**

- The consultation process has been unlawful due to pre-determination
- Visions and Strategic Priorities of the PSCS and NPS would support development at Gorsty Hill yet site is NPS
- Lack of justification for exclusion of Gorsty Hill
- The accommodation of necessary growth in south east of Crewe requires allocation of Gorsty Hill as a preferred location
- Priority must be to develop brownfield sites
- PSCS has not been positively prepared to accommodate necessary growth
- Overstatement to make Crewe 'sought after'.
- Vision for KSCs should recognise that there is also a need to attract major retailers
- Plans propose more employment growth than population growth
- To reduce out-commuting, employment needs to be generated in areas other than the three locations of Crewe, Middlewich and Wardle
- There is a potential need for an additional 9,000 dwellings. The delivery rates

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>are optimistic, with over reliance on strategic sites that are also expected to deliver significant infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy PG1 (formerly CS1) continues to apply a restrictive interpretation to the types of land use for which new allocations are identified in order to support the growth of the local economy.</li> <li>• To meet the Council's 15,000 new jobs aspiration, there will be a requirement for 1,750 additional dwellings per annum over the Plan period.</li> <li>• Question the evidence for growth - do we really need so many houses? Assume the new houses will not be organised through housing associations helping people in real need. Why emphasis in growth at expense of environment?</li> <li>• Reduce figure to 20,000 new homes.</li> <li>• 27000 new houses not enough. 192% increase in house prices in 16 years; sixth least affordable area in NW. Interim 2011 forecasts based on 10 year timespan - no evidence to show that trend will continue beyond 2021. Data for 2011 projections produced during recession and does not account for previous policy restraint - long term trend will increase. Private sector studies indicate need for 36000.</li> <li>• Reconsider employment land requirement to at least 324 hectares and increase housing number to approximate to around 2000 per year</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The accommodation of necessary growth in south east of Crewe requires allocation of Gorsty Hill as a preferred location</li> <li>• 8.18 – not just with ‘policy requirements’ but with ‘previously achieved levels of completion’</li> <li>• Vision for Macclesfield to read: ‘By 2030 Macclesfield will be...’</li> <li>• Provide baseline assessment of provision and need in LSCs and KSCs</li> <li>• A net annual deficit of 1401 affordable dwellings over 5 year period – should be stressed this is a measure of imbalance of affordable need relative to supply and not a target</li> <li>• More consideration to be given to long-term skilled and semi-skilled job generation when business sites are allocated and opening up of more employment land in parts of the Borough where out-commuting is high</li> <li>• Change required to make it sound: Increase the housing requirement to a minimum of 1,800 dwellings per annum for each year of the Plan period, thus 36,000 new homes as a minimum. Make clear that it will be necessary to make up the shortfall against this level in the years to date.</li> <li>• In order to be found sound, Policy PG1 should be modified to provide for a substantially higher housing requirement which is supported by the Council's own evidence base.</li> <li>• In order to be found sound, Policy PG1 should be modified to provide for a substantially higher housing requirement which is supported by the Council's own evidence base.</li> <li>• It is critical that the Council demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land in order for development to be delivered in accordance with Policy PG6.</li> <li>• In order to be found sound, Policy PG1 should be modified to provide for a substantially higher housing requirement which is supported by the Council's own evidence base.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a potential need for an additional 9,000 dwellings. The delivery rates are optimistic, with over reliance on strategic sites that are also expected to deliver significant infrastructure.</li> <li>• Policy PG1 (formerly CS1) continues to apply a restrictive interpretation to the types of land use for which new allocations are identified in order to support the growth of the local economy.</li> <li>• To meet the Council's 15,000 new jobs aspiration, there will be a requirement for 1,750 additional dwellings per annum over the Plan period.</li> <li>• Reduce figure to 20,000 new homes.</li> <li>• 27000 new houses not enough. 192% increase in house prices in 16 years; sixth least affordable area in NW. Interim 2011 forecasts based on 10 year timespan - no evidence to show that trend will continue beyond 2021. Data for 2011 projections produced during recession and does not account for previous policy restraint - long term trend will increase. Private sector studies indicate need for 36000.</li> <li>• Reconsider employment land requirement to at least 324 hectares and increase housing number to approximate to around 2000 per year</li> <li>• The population forecast for the Macclesfield area is too high and therefore fewer new dwellings are required.</li> <li>• Increase the housing requirement to a minimum of 1,800 dwellings per annum for each year of the Plan period, thus 36,000 new homes as a minimum. Make clear that it will be necessary to make up the shortfall against this level in the years to date.</li> <li>• To meet future demand for homes and labour in CE, the housing requirement should be a minimum of 1,800 dwellings per annum, or at least 36,000 new homes in total up to 2030 as per the conclusions of the Barton Willmore Cheshire and Warrington Sub - Regional Housing Study. Provision will also need to be made to address current need for 4,000 additional homes, and shortfall since 2003, bringing the total requirement to in excess of 40,000 new homes.</li> <li>• Review of location of growth in North of the Borough<br/>Review of housing need to include statement on policies to limit and bring vacant stock into use or allow many older people their wish to stay in their own home.</li> <li>• Policy PG1 should be raised in order to be consistent with the residential allocations in the draft plan. 1,600dpa should be provided as an absolute minimum but 1,800 dpa better reflects requirements and need.</li> <li>• Request to accommodate some of High Peak Borough's objectively assessed needs for housing.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The level of growth and development proposed is based on objectively assessed needs and recognition of balancing such growth against Green Belt constraint.</p> <p>An update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment was undertaken in 2013 which predicts the housing need in the Borough and a background paper, 'Population Projections and Forecasts 2013' outlines a range of growth options.</p> <p>PG1 has been positively prepared to reflect the evidence base and provide a level of growth appropriate to the delivery of the objectively assessed needs of the</p>   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Borough.</p> <p>The Planning for Growth section establishes the approach to growth across the borough including the approach to key services centres and local service centres. This is clearly set out in Table 8.3 'Indicative Distribution of Development'.</p> <p>The approach to brownfield development has been established in policy SD1 and the level of available brownfield land is addressed in a separate background paper 'Assessment of Additional Brownfield Potential for Housing Development' November 2013'</p> <p>Given the Green Belt is drawn tightly around the towns to the north of the borough there is a need to release land from the Green Belt to accommodate sustainable growth in these settlements. The rationale for releasing such Green Belt land is established in the Planning for Growth Chapter and supported by needs identified in the Employment Land Review 2012, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013 and the Green Belt Review 2013.</p> <p>The consultation process has followed the approach established in the Statement of Community involvement and regulations established in The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Given the overlapping nature of Housing Market Areas and proposed improvements to connectivity in the north of the Borough, it may be appropriate to assist with meeting some of the housing need arising in High Peak Borough.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Policy PG 1 to add clarity to the policy and specify the phased delivery of objectively assessed needs; justification amended for clarity.</li> <li>• Amend Policy PG1 to include provision of up to 500 homes during the Plan period to assist with meeting the housing needs of High Peak Borough.</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Settlement Hierarchy and Policy PG2</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 437 (Support: 53 / Object: 332 / Comment Only: 52)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome key objective to increase employment activity at Crewe</li> <li>• Support identification of Crewe and Macclesfield as sites where most growth will take place</li> <li>• The settlement hierarchy is appropriate and based on sound evidence.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an oversupply of employment land and land for business in and around Macclesfield</li> <li>• Macclesfield has 31,000 dwellings an additional 3500 will disproportionately increase this figure by 10%</li> <li>• Do not build at Albert Road in Bollington</li> <li>• Role of Shavington is inconsistent – no explanation why sites here should be included as part of Crewe’s growth.</li> <li>• Allocation of sites at Shavington does not reflect ‘modest growth’</li> <li>• Revise downward the housing allocations for LSCs</li> <li>• Improved version would refer to ‘strictly limited growth’</li> <li>• The proposed vision puts too much emphasis on growth</li> <li>• Object to proposed narrowing of business premise delivery to meet only local needs</li> <li>• Goostrey is not viable as a LSC and should be re designated. Goostrey should be added to Other Settlements and Rural areas category</li> <li>• The Green Belt around Bollington should not be developed</li> <li>• More housing and development can be allocated in LSCs to assist CEC to meet their housing needs.</li> <li>• The strategy is now more restrictive, suggesting a cap of 2,000 dwellings to be delivered across the 124 defined settlements, as only affordable housing would be permitted under the Authority’s strategy. As such the plan is unsound as it does not seek to meet Acton’s development requirements.</li> <li>• Poynton should not be designated as a Key Local Centre.</li> <li>• Object to removal of the Sustainable Villages settlement hierarchy in Policy PG2 without which the Local Plan is Unsound as it is not Positively Prepared, Justified or Effective. The Policy fails to acknowledge greater sustainability of some villages, the role they play as current or potential local service centres to their rural area and their ability to help meet the local and borough needs.</li> <li>• Object to Rode Heath not being identified as a service centre, and suggest that it is identified as a Local Service Centre.</li> <li>• Objects to the failure of the Council to provide a robust evidence base which justifies the designation of each settlement, context of its role and the amount of housing to be distributed to each of the settlements.</li> <li>• Handforth East should be included in hierarchy.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of Crewe in the settlement hierarchy underlines the importance of growth in locations that can have a sustainable relationship with Crewe</li> <li>• Plan should make a full assessment of history, character and urban form of Macclesfield and Crewe to identify what is important and how it can be used to contribute towards a sustainable future</li> <li>• A viable and imaginative regeneration scheme is needed for Crewe town centre</li> <li>• 'modest growth' is too ambiguous – objectively assessed needs should be determined by local community and elected representatives</li> <li>• LSCs should be graded according to their genuine needs and ability to absorb new housing</li> <li>• Clarity is needed on what 'small scale alterations to the Green Belt' means</li> <li>• LSCs can potentially positively contribute to delivery of sustainable development across CEC.</li> <li>• Holmes Chapel and Alderley Edge should be re-classified as Key Service Centres as they have all the services, stations and other communications links required for such a classification.</li> <li>• Small scale developments should be defined, large scale developments on green field land can not be supported by the facilities in Bunbury.</li> <li>• Congleton is the largest KSC, to receive same level of housing growth and higher employment growth than Macclesfield, a Principal Town, and more than any other KSC. Make it a Principal Town.</li> <li>• Nantwich should avoid further development</li> <li>• There is no need to put Green Belt land under pressure from housing in Bollington.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate Gorsty Hill site to support the role of Crewe</li> <li>• No safeguarded land for Macclesfield at CS32</li> <li>• No removal of Green belt at CS10</li> <li>• Increased development of Brownfield sites</li> <li>• Reduce level of building in Macclesfield</li> <li>• No explanation of why sites in Shavington contribute to Crewe's growth</li> <li>• Remove Congleton Link Road from the Plan</li> <li>• Recognition of Poynton as a KSC is welcomed and should be expanded to include the need for alterations to the GB in certain locations and be consistent with the vision for LSCs.</li> <li>• Add in 'visitor economy' to Crewe Vision</li> <li>• Expand Crewe vision to refer to how new development will enable needs of whole community</li> <li>• Add in Macclesfield's aim to be a key visitor destination</li> <li>• No safeguarded land for Macclesfield</li> <li>• Make Congleton a Principal Town.</li> <li>• Vision for Macclesfield should include reference to delivery of new market and affordable homes</li> <li>• Change vision for KSCs so as not to preclude other types of business, amend wording to state 'growth will be strictly limited', amend to read 'where smaller independent traders and tourism initiatives will continue to thrive, existing valued environmental assets are protected and enhanced and where all</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>development will contribute to creating a strong sense of place'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add improved 'community spirit' and 'enhancing local distinctiveness'</li> <li>• Vision should not limit business premise delivery to 'local' needs</li> <li>• Clarity is needed on what 'small scale alterations to the Green Belt' means</li> <li>• Vision for LSCs to be amended to remove reference to 'small scale' and replace with 'Alterations to the GB boundaries which accord with the guidance set out in the NPPF(2012) will be sought'</li> <li>• Goostrey should be reclassified</li> <li>• Policy should be amended to provide for development of a scale which is commensurate with the scale of the existing settlement and its capacity.</li> <li>• Vision for LSCs should include reference to the unique historic environment of these settlements</li> <li>• LSC vision to read' some sustainable growth in housing and employment will have taken place to meet the objectively assessed needs</li> <li>• Reconsider wording on reducing the need to travel in reference to Other Settlements Vision</li> <li>• The vision for rural areas and other settlements should be revised and be less restrictive – remove the 2000 cap.</li> <li>• Include Handforth East in settlement hierarchy.</li> <li>• Holmes Chapel and Alderley Edge as Key Service Centres. They have been correctly categorised as Local Service Centres in the Local Plan Strategy.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The settlement hierarchy is a development of the spatial portrait strategic priorities. The principle is that the bulk of new development should take place in Principal Towns and Key Service centres, where access to services is generally easier.</p> <p>Sustainable Villages in the settlement hierarchy. This category is not used in the Local Plan Strategy as by implication some villages would be classified as unsustainable, which is not the case. The vision states that the objective for other settlements is to see some small scale residential and employment development, to help to retain and sustain local services and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Level of development in Macclesfield. An Economic Masterplan for the town was adopted in 2010, with the key elements of redevelopment of the town centre and delivery of the South Macclesfield development area. The Local Plan Strategy complements the Masterplan.</p> <p>Housing allocation in Shavington as part of Crewe's growth. The housing allocation reflects an outline planning permission for up to 360 dwellings on the Shavington triangle site (CS6) and a current application for up to 275 dwellings at East Shavington (CS7). Both sites have been selected as opportunities to provide high quality sustainable residential development with associated developments and are well located in relation to the South Cheshire Growth Village.</p> <p>The village of Shavington is included in the area of search for the Green Belt, and the designation as a Local Service Centre will encourage small scale development but will enable the Council to carefully scrutinise future developments in the context of local needs and priorities. The saved Green Gap</p> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>policies will apply until the review of Green belt is complete.</p> <p>Visitor references to vision for Crewe and Macclesfield. These are referred to in policy EG4, which confirms that proposals for tourist development of an appropriate scale will be supported within Principal Towns and Key Service Centres.</p> <p>Status of Congleton. Congleton is a distinctive historic town and has a particular issue of traffic congestion. The level of development in the town will bring high quality employment-led growth to support the town centre, ensure balanced and sustainable communities and deliver the Congleton Link Road.</p> <p>Nantwich is dealt with under the section relating to sites CS21, 22 and 23. The vitality and growth of this town is key to the prosperity of the Borough as a whole.</p> <p>Safeguarded Land is covered by policy PG4.</p> <p>The vision for Key Service Centres should restrict development. Policy PG2 is worded in a positive way as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>Vision for Local Service Centres. Sustainable development is a requirement under policies SD1 and SD2. The historic environment is covered by policy SE7.</p> <p>References to green belt alterations- this is set out in policy PG3. This issue will be developed further in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p> <p>Classification of Goostrey. Amendments are proposed to reflect the fact that development needs will largely be met in Holmes Chapel.</p> <p>Handforth East. The justification for policy PG2 explains that Handforth East will become a Local Service Centre once it is built.</p> <p>Target/cap of 2000 dwellings for other settlements and rural areas. This has been retained as a figure (not a target or limit) under policy PG6 and is considered to be achievable by 2030.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>Insert into justification: ‘in the case of Goostrey which adjoins Holmes Chapel, a larger LSC it is expected that development needs will largely be provided in Holmes Chapel’.</p> <p>No other material changes to Local Plan Strategy.</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Green Belt and Safeguarded Land and Policy PG3: Green Belt</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 677 (Support: 255 / Object: 382 / Comment Only: 40)</b><br>Green Belt and Safeguarded Land: 94 (Support: 12 / Object: 75 / Comment Only: 7)<br>PG3: 583 (Support: 243 / Object: 307 / Comment Only: 33)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Green Belt boundaries is overdue as tight restrictions have contributed to Macclesfield not being able to grow relative to its size</li> <li>• Agree that the requirements to allocate sufficient land for development to meet identified needs constitutes exceptional circumstances to justify alteration of the Green Belt boundary; there is not a sufficient supply of housing sites outside of the Green Belt to meet housing needs</li> <li>• Current Green Belt boundaries should not be used as a reason to preclude the delivery of the required levels of housing growth over the plan period</li> <li>• Historic policies have led to the very tight drawing of Green Belt boundaries around settlement in the north of the Borough which have endured in some places since 1961 and others since 1984. Settlements have grown during that time to be largely built up to the Green Belt boundary. Passage of time and changing circumstances mean there has to be an appraisal and changes to Green Belt boundaries</li> <li>• The general approach and methodology applied within the Assessment appears sound. That is, the basis for evaluating the existing Green Belt areas, by reference to the established purposes, and those purposes that are screened out due to their equal application to all areas, is considered reasonable and appropriate.</li> <li>• If the employment and housing needs of the Borough are to be met, there must be releases of land from the green belt. It is wholly unrealistic that the green belt, first drawn up in the 1960s, should remain sacrosanct.</li> <li>• Mineral extraction is not an inappropriate form of development with Green Belt.</li> <li>• There is a real need for small scale alterations to the Green Belt in Local Service Centres such as Alderley Edge</li> <li>• Significant local support for the designation of the new area of Green Belt</li> <li>• The green gap policy needs strengthening to maintain gaps between Crewe and Haslington, Haslington and Winterley, Winterley and Wheelock, Crewe and Nantwich and allow settlements to retain their individual character and distinctiveness</li> <li>• The proposed new Green Belt will help both Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme continue their planned regeneration programmes.</li> <li>• New Green Belt in Wistaston is necessary to prevent urban sprawl and protect existing landscapes</li> <li>• Inclusion of land around Acton in the new Green Belt cannot be justified in terms of the NPPF criteria</li> </ul> |

- The proposed area of search for a new Green Belt should be adopted with a natural extension from Barthomley, continuing through Wychwood (Site NPS 5: Gorsty Hill Golf Course) on the Cheshire/Staffordshire border then continue through Weston, Hough, Shavington to Nantwich then up through Wistaston and Williston
  - Increased development in Crewe will mean that people need adjacent areas to use for recreation conducive to health and well-being
  - New Green Belt is needed to preserve the identities of individual villages and prevent them merging into one large urban sprawl
- Objection**
- Exceptional circumstances for altering the Green Belt have not been demonstrated; strategy has not properly considered the extent of brownfield sites that can be used; consider converting empty offices and spaces over shops to residential instead; fill the 4500 empty homes in the county before using Green Belt; what alternatives to the use of Green Belt have been considered and why have they been rejected? The brownfield first policy should be utilised before amending Green Belt. If the required amount of housing cannot be accommodated then development should move into Manchester / Stockport to the north where brownfield sites are available or elsewhere outside the Green Belt
  - Both Stockport and Stoke Councils have indicated that they may be able to accommodate part of Cheshire East's housing requirement and no Green Belt land should be released until these options have been fully explored
  - Wrong that the boundary of the Green belt to south of Manchester should be reviewed on a piecemeal basis by district. Should prepare a joint review of the Green Belt
  - There is scope for Airport City to include an element of housing development that could relieve pressure on the northern settlements of Cheshire East.
  - Core planning principles in NPPF have been ignored regarding protection of Green Belts; amending Green Belt is inconsistent with national policy
  - Redevelopment of derelict land in Cheshire and in Greater Manchester may be discouraged by widespread building in the Green Belt
  - In his statement on 1 July 2013 Local Government Minister Brandon Lewis issued a written statement to Parliament which said 'Having considered recent planning decisions made by councils and the Planning Inspectorate, it has become apparent that the green belt is not always being given the sufficient protection that was the explicit policy intent of ministers. The Secretary of State wishes to make clear that ...he considers the single issue of unmet demand...is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute the 'very special circumstances' justifying inappropriate development in the green belt'. The Pre Submission Core Strategy fails to define exceptional circumstances other than unmet demand.
  - Development proposed will not meet identified needs therefore further Green Belt releases are required; level of release, particularly around Wilmslow will not meet growth aspirations and it is necessary to identify further amendments to the Green Belt.
  - Scale of Green Belt release is too high. The Council's aspiration for extremely high growth is not shared by local communities

- Plan is not flexible enough to ensure it delivers the proposed housing requirement, particularly if sites do not deliver or come forward at the rates anticipated. To ensure a deliverable 5 year housing land supply further Green Belt releases should be identified within the more viable market locations. SHLAA identifies sufficient sites for up to 49,645 dwellings therefore there is scope to meet the full identified need.
- Concerns of residents have been ignored; no evidence that results of previous consultations have been considered
- New Green Belt boundary should use 'physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent' as required by Paragraph 85 of the Framework. This is not, apparently, the case in all instances.
- Commercial development on Green Belt is unnecessary as there are already significant vacant premises
- Should be planning to meet the objectively assessed needs within the Green Belt towns
- Supporting text should clarify that new Motorway Service Areas need to be located in the Green Belt
- The fundamental purpose of the North Cheshire Green Belt in this area is to prevent urban sprawl from Manchester into Cheshire yet sites are chosen right on the boundary merging the two.
- Choice of sites for removal from the Green Belt seems to conflict with the purpose of the Green Belt and the conclusions of the background evidence documents; no clear evidence trail linking the sites proposed for release from the Green Belt with the Green Belt Assessment
- Core Strategy should identify the general locations of Green Belt changes in towns like Poynton; not appropriate to leave until Site Allocations
- The Core Strategy should identify the principle of Green Belt release around Rode Heath and the Sandbach Road site would be suitable
- Sites identified for Green Belt release around Macclesfield are not the most appropriate in terms of their contribution to Green Belt and infrastructure constraints. There will be a deficit of 1600 dwellings against the requirement in Macclesfield and further Green Belt releases are required
- Any erosion of Green Belt in the north of the Borough puts at risk the separation between Cheshire and the Greater Manchester conurbation
- The Green Belt Assessment screens out the purposes (1) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and (2) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. These points have greater relevance in Macclesfield than other areas of Cheshire East
- As there is a separate draft policy on safeguarded land it would be less confusing if the proposed safeguarded sites were removed from draft policy PG3 and dealt with only under PG4
- The Green Belt Assessment was published in September 2013, some time after the sites were initially selected. Therefore, choices on site allocations were made prior to the evidence being in place
- Unclear why some sites have been selected for release from Green Belt that make significant and major contributions to its purposes when other sites that do not score as highly are left in the Green Belt

- The Green Belt Assessment involved no discussion with local residents which goes against Green Belt legislation and its methodology is weak: no justification for criteria by which land is divided; hierarchy forces LPA to see parcels labelled at the lowest level of contribution as expendable; justifications for assessment categories are confused; no recognition of importance of separating smaller communities; no recognition of Green Belt land within urban areas being vital to providing open space for recreation and relief from urban sprawl; no recognition of role of Green Belt in alleviating concentrations of urban housing particularly in former industrial areas.
- The Green Belt Assessment should categorise strategic parcel BLG13 as making a major contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt because it has protected wildlife, trees and vegetation, is an informal recreation area and a nature conservation area. The open spaces report shows that Bollington has only half the open space it should have. Bollington can not take any more development.
- The Green Belt Assessment should categorise Fanny's Croft (Strategic Parcels ALS14 and ALS15) as making only a limited contribution to the Green Belt and should be removed from the Green Belt
- The Green Belt Assessment overstates the contribution of Strategic Parcel MAC35 to the purposes of Green Belt and it is a more suitable Parcel for release than others proposed
- Disagree with Green Belt Assessment of parcels KNF06 and KNF07. Assessment should be consistent with the Barton Willmore Green Belt Review commissioned in support of the North West Knutsford Site
- The Green Belt Assessment is flawed as it fails to plan for flexibility. Section 4.3.3 refers to the amount of development required in each settlement but simply because a certain amount of development is required in a settlement does not define whether the land meets Green Belt purposes and should not dictate the amount of land to be released. Object to the failure of the Council to identify Heathfield Farm (NPS56 and NPS57) as suitable for release from the Green Belt
- Land at Booths Park Knutsford should be identified as a strategic site for growth
- Land opposite the Belfry Hotel, Handforth should be listed as land to be removed from the Green Belt.
- Land between Chelford Road and Whirley Road, Macclesfield should be removed from the Green Belt (NPS38)
- Site at Lyme Green Settlement should be excluded from Green Belt boundary
- 87% of Sutton Parish residents are in favour of retaining the Green Belt between Sutton / Lyme Green and Macclesfield
- Green Belt Assessment makes no consideration of landscape value
- Green Belt Assessment takes no account of constraints due to flooding
- The Green Belt Assessment also contradicts itself in terms of selecting parcels of land which are suitable for residential development by stating that "the review does not make recommendations on specific areas to include or exclude from the Green Belt" [§1.3] yet the plan then identifies sites. Surely this is the main reason for undertaking a Green Belt assessment.
- The Green Belt Assessment overstates the contribution of strategic parcel

MOB01 and understates the contribution of strategic parcels MOB03 and MOB05.

- The Green Belt Assessment does not recognise the role that the removal of Strategic Parcels PYT06 and PYT07 from the Green Belt would have on meeting cross-boundary strategic priorities
- Land at Dickens Lane Poynton and Land to the west of Poynton Coppice (NPS66) should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for housing in the Core Strategy
- Land at Beechfield Farm, Moor Lane, Wilmslow should be excluded from the Green belt boundary
- The existing Green Belt boundary in the south of the Borough should be rolled back to the A500 as part of the longer term growth strategy for Crewe. Land west of the M6 and north of the A500 serves a limited Green Belt purpose
- The Green Belt boundary should be amended to accommodate development at the South Cheshire growth Village
- The Green Belt Assessment lacks any sense of landscape setting and sketchy understanding of the interconnection on the ground between the Green Belt and the built environment
- The Green Belt Assessment does not refer to the site at Junction 7, M56 at all. This matter needs to be addressed by the Council in advancing the Core Strategy and a full review should be carried out. This land should be removed from the Green Belt as the case for economic development represents exceptional circumstances
- The Green Belt Assessment is inward-looking at Cheshire East in isolation rather than considering the wider North Cheshire Green Belt
- All sites make a major contribution to the five purposes of Green belt – that is why they were enacted in the first place
- SHLAA site 4036 (Bollington) and land opposite should be returned to the Green Belt because it is a floodplain, has limited access, significant traffic problems already, land is used for recreation, is crossed by public footpath and is a wildlife habitat; object to proposed development at Hall Hill fields
- Green Belt boundary to the rear of land off Boundary Lane, Congleton is anomalous and should be altered
- The wedge of open countryside between Lamberts Lane and Congleton urban fringe needs to be included in the Green Belt.
- Exceptions to inappropriate development should be tightened up. Extensions to properties should not be limited to floor area, but on their impact on the Green Belt. Infilling should not be an exception, will result in closing gaps in villages and impact on the Green Belt. Affordable housing should not be an exception as it is used as a loop hole by land owners, housing associations and developers so they can build and sell their land for a higher figure
- Macclesfield will lose 50% of its Green Belt
- There is no need to build on any Green Belt around Wilmslow
- No evidence that Greater Manchester authorities agree to changes being proposed to the Green Belt which Cheshire East has no mandate to change unilaterally
- The Local Plan should not convey that villages such as Prestbury can cope with significant development pressures by releasing areas of Green Belt

around their fringes

- Change the Greenbelt South of Congleton to better distribute the town's development and transfer it to the North of the town to prevent merging with Northern Parishes
- New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances. The proposal for a new Green Belt in this instance is not related to a larger scale development or major urban extension and exceptional circumstances do not exist
- NPPF requires Local Authorities to demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate. Saved policy NE4 identifies Green Gap between Crewe and Nantwich which has been effective for many years. Why is this no longer considered effective? The Strategic Open Gap Study identifies one appeal decision as evidence that the gap is vulnerable to development - the decision being related to under supply of housing land. A sound plan will meet the tests and ensure sufficient housing land is available in suitable locations and therefore avoiding the need for development on any important gap sites.
- Green gap policy should be retained
- Creation of new Green Belt to the south of Crewe looks like a compensation measure for the land removed from Green Belt elsewhere in the Borough
- CEC not demonstrated the major changes in circumstances required to justify designation as green belt. New Green Belt Study states that significant change is represented by designation of Crewe as a key driver for growth. However, acknowledges that substantial new development is planned in other areas on the periphery. Also states that the scale of growth for the plan period is not significantly different from the preceding one and that CE has identified enough land to meet a significant proportion of this development. Evidently there are no changes in circumstances which justify designation of additional green belt in this location.
- If boundary of new Green Belt is drawn too tightly around the south of Crewe, development would be funnelled to those settlements outside the outer edge of the Green Belt which could result in unsustainable commuting patterns. To avoid this, there should be some growth permitted in the more sustainable villages in the area of search; no consideration given to settlements currently 'washed over' by the proposed Green Belt area of search
- Council is proposing to promote Crewe as a significant location for development, not allocate enough land for that development and then constrain future development by designating a new Green Belt. Land east of Willaston between Wybunbury Road / Wistaston Road and Rope Lane should be removed from the Green Belt area of search
- The area between Shavington and Crewe does not serve a Green Belt function
- The possible Green Belt extension between Crewe and Haslington does not therefore serve any of the five purposes set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF, and does not meet the criteria for creation of a new Green Belt around Crewe as set out in para 82.
- Search area doesn't define boundaries and as such it isn't possible at this stage to assess fully the implications for the policy. Without clear definition of

boundaries it is unclear how CEC has been able to fully assess policy or sustainability implications of proposed green belt, particularly on the "washed over" settlements. Council must consider and define the boundaries of proposed green belt before bringing forward such a proposal that will have significant long-term consequences

- The main justification for the creation of Green Belt is the Council's desire to prevent development to the south of Crewe which as they state in paragraph 5.1.7 of the New Green Belt and Strategic Open Gap Study "could become the focus for new development". Whilst there is a possibility that the area could become the focus for development this could be controlled by normal planning and development management policies as highlighted above and does not in our view equate to the necessity of Green Belt being created to address this possibility.
- The creation of new Green Belt in this location would actually have a detrimental impact on the delivery of sustainable development in the District, contrary to the NPPF, as new development would be prevented from taking place in close proximity to the most sustainable settlement in the District.
- The following have been referred to in the New Green Belt study but are not relevant considerations in the designation of a new Green Belt: The historic development of Crewe and Nantwich absorbing adjoining settlements; development pressures along principal traffic routes; public support for Green Belt; recognition that the green gap policy has been effective.
- Green Gap policy is not deficient but the Council has not proactively planned for development to meet needs, has operated an overall policy of restraint, doesn't have an up to date plan and doesn't have a five year housing land supply
- Paragraph 80 of the Framework advises that one of the purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent 'towns' merging into one another. Shavington, Haslington and Weston are villages, so it is inappropriate for a Green Belt designation to prevent Crewe growing towards these villages
- The new Green Belt is poor protection for the Haslington – Crewe Green Gap. The new Green Belt should not be subject to loss of areas to strategic sites. It should also be extended northwards towards Winterley, Wheelock, Sandbach and Ettiley Heath.
- Crewe has been a centre of growth for some time and the scale of growth envisaged in this plan period is not significantly different to that in previous plans
- Inappropriate to draw a Green Belt boundary so tightly to prevent natural growth of villages. The Plan also ignores the actions of the authority to approve and allocate land in the area in full knowledge it would erode the gap(s) sought to protect.
- No threats by Core Strategy which would endanger the existing gap between Crewe & Nantwich; strategic locations proposed will not result in any impact in this location.
- Object to the removal of proposal for Green belt to the west and north of Nantwich. Argument that Registered Battlefield status will protect the land is incorrect as Kingsley Fields is partially on the Registered Battlefield. Development recommended for approval has breached the former natural western edge of Nantwich (River Weaver) and has started the coalescence

process with Acton.

- Green Belt should surround Nantwich
- Weston is not closely related to the southern boundary of Crewe and should not be included in the new Green Belt
- New Green Belt Area of Search is too large and should exclude the existing quarry workings located on the eastern edge of Wybunbury
- Remove land at Sydney Road and Land South West of Crewe from the proposed new Green Belt Area of Search
- The Gorstyhill Site and nearby land should not be included within a new Green Belt.
- Mactaggart and Mickel landholding at Shavington benefits from planning permission subject to S106 Agreement and should be excluded from the new Green Belt
- Crewe Road, Shavington should not be included in the new Green Belt as it is a sustainable location and would formulate a solid, permanent boundary
- Site NPS 9 should not be included in the proposed Green Belt Area of Search
- Illogical to combine Green Belt and Green Gap policies around Crewe that are aimed at achieving essentially the same objectives. The remaining 'gap' to the north west of Crewe around Aston Juxta Mondrum that is not currently proposed for Green Belt or Gap designation is highly rural and should be included in the designation for completeness.
- Petition (101) signatures objecting to the absence of any reference to the protection of Green Gaps, previously referred to in the strategy.
- No case has been made for the proposed change to the South Cheshire Green belt in the Radway Green Area; exceptional circumstances do not exist here; the development could be accommodated elsewhere outside of the Green Belt

**Comment Only**

- Boundaries of the new Green Belt (or replacement policy for Green Gap) must be defined in the Core Strategy otherwise ambiguity will remain and developers will erode the gaps
- The line of the A534 Haslington Bypass should define the limit to expansion in this area
- Any buildings on Green Belt should meet the highest sustainability standards possible
- Green corridors between settlements in the Crewe area should be designated as 'protected land' not 'green gaps' which can be built on
- New Green Belt should surround Crewe completely, in particular to help separate Crewe from Haslington and Barthomley; The extent of the Green Belt to the east of Crewe could be expanded to cover Haslington and Winterley to help reduce pressure on the open countryside between Crewe and Sandbach and Alsager
- Witters Field in Wistaston and surrounding area should be kept as Green Belt / Green Gap
- Small sites on the eastern edge of Nantwich which do not extend into the open gap should not be included in the new Green Belt as they do not compromise openness in this area
- The amount of Green Belt should be increased

- Agricultural land grade 3 or better should not be developed
- Erosion of the Green Belt around Mobberley would seriously damage the inherent character of the village
- The Green Belt Assessment categorises strategic parcel WLM15 as making a major contribution to the Green Belt therefore any development of this area would be wholly inappropriate
- The Green Belt Assessment makes a simplistic and inaccurate assessment of land off Wilmslow Road, Alderley Edge based on an arbitrary view that it maintains a gap between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge. It is well contained and openness is affected by proximity of main roads. No objective assessment of impact. The site should be identified for release from the Green Belt
- The Green Belt Assessment categorises strategic parcel BLG09 as making a minimum contribution to the Green Belt. It makes a major contribution to the Green Belt as it provides a barrier between a residential area and industrial area and is important agricultural land. It also separates Bollington from Kerridge. The Green Belt Assessment should not be used as part of the evidence for the Core Strategy
- The Green Belt Assessment subdivides Green Belt land into strategic parcels and arbitrarily gives them a rating of importance with no local consultation which has left four areas of Green Belt around Bollington stripped of their intended permanence and highlighted as potentially available to developers in the future.
- The Green Belt Assessment is only able to evaluate the contribution of each Strategic Parcel, disregarding that there may well be smaller areas within the defined parcels that could have a very different grading of contribution. The Assessment makes no attempt to consider such disaggregation, and as such is fundamentally flawed as a tool for making decisions on potential Green Belt releases / allocation of sites for development.
- The Green Belt Assessment considers that none of the settlements are classed as historic towns and dismisses this purpose of Green Belt as being irrelevant to the study yet later in the document Bollington is described as having 2a legacy of industrial land as it developed during the Industrial Revolution as a centre for textile manufacturing.
- The Green Belt Assessment has not first objectively assessed the need for any development on Green Belt land in Bollington. All land assessed in the Green Belt Assessment should be given the same rating
- The proposed division of existing Green Belt into three categories is not justified and there is no reference in the NPPF to this approach
- Land at Clay Lane, Handforth will no longer serve a Green Belt function once the airport relief road is in place, is suitable, available and achievable and the capacity of Handforth to accommodate development has been underestimated. This site should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for housing
- The Green Belt designation of land at Legh Road, Disley designation is an anomaly that does not serve any of the Green Belt strategic purposes.
- Provisions for infilling and limited affordable housing should be defined. Suggest infilling is the same as defined in Policy PG5, i.e. 'infilling a small gap

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>with one or two dwellings in an otherwise built up frontage whereas ‘limited affordable housing’ should be explicitly linked to Policy SC6 defining where and how this will be allowed, but limiting the size of developments to five dwellings to reflect the Green Belt designation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundaries of new Green Belt should be defined as soon as possible</li> <li>• If the new green belt is implemented as suggested without any permanent protection for other towns then all that will happen is that Crewe will extend northwards (arguably into less sustainable locations than to the south of the town) and Sandbach and Middlewich will even more become dormitory towns and inevitably merge with each other and the northward sprawl from Crewe. There is a distinct danger that the mistakes that have led to the north of the borough being unreasonably constrained by green belt and housing having to be exported to other parts of the borough will be repeated</li> <li>• The New Green Belt area of search should include the areas of existing Green Gap land to the East of the Basford East Site Boundary to Main Road, identified as D1 in the Crewe Town Strategy, and the area to the East of Main Road in order to preserve the attractive setting to the Listed Dwellings at Stowford, the Listed Holly Hedge Farm on Main Road and the Entrance to Weston Village.</li> <li>• We suggest that the extended Green Belt should follow natural boundaries (not necessarily main roads), incorporating distinctive landscapes such as the Weaver Valley, and other designated areas such as the Meres and Mosses NIA.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy PG3 point 3(ii) – add tourism to the list of appropriate uses in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Policy PG3 point 6 – more Green Belt releases are required and this should not be restricted to smaller sites. Each site should be assessed on its own merits. Re-word policy “In addition to those sites identified for release in the Core Strategy, additional land within the Green Belt will be released for development and allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.”</li> <li>• Policy PG3 point 3(v) – need to clearly define ‘limited infilling’ to prevent abuse by developers</li> <li>• Policy PG3 point 2 – need to define what is inappropriate</li> <li>• Explain what the exceptional circumstances are to justify altering Green Belt boundaries</li> <li>• Object to the wording of paragraph 2 of Policy PG3 as this does not fully reflect national policy NPPF (paragraphs 87 and 88) which sets out the appropriate test for consideration of ‘inappropriate development’ within the Green Belt. This should be reflected in paragraph 2 of Policy PG3</li> <li>• Part (6) of Policy PG3: ‘In addition to those sites identified for release in the Core Strategy, additional land within the Green Belt will be released for development and allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.’ We object to the wording of Part (6) of Policy PG3 as drafted, as this does not provide sufficient flexibility to facilitate future Green Belt release in Cheshire East beyond those sites allocated in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. Green Belt release will be needed around Mobberley, and Policy PG3 should facilitate this.</li> </ul> |

**Council assessment of relevant issues**

Amending Green Belt boundaries is not necessarily inconsistent with the NPPF. Paragraph 83 indicates that they can be amended in exceptional circumstances, through the Local Plan process.

As set out in the policy justification and the Green Belt Assessment, it is considered that the requirements to allocate sufficient land to go some way to meeting the identified development needs in the north of the Borough, combined with the adverse consequences for sustainable development of not doing so, constitutes the exceptional circumstances required to justify altering the existing detailed Green Belt boundary whilst maintaining the general overall extent of the Green Belt.

Comment has been made on the statement made by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2013. The Secretary of State's clarification that "*the single issue of unmet demand, whether for Traveller sites or for conventional housing, is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development in the green belt*" relates to the consideration of planning applications in the Green Belt. The Local Plan remains the appropriate vehicle for amending Green Belt boundaries where it is necessary to do so.

The Green Belt Assessment considers where the identified development needs could be accommodated. Using a sequential approach, the assessment considers the level of development that could be accommodated within the towns and villages inset into the Green Belt. It also looks at the implications for sustainable development of channelling development to locations beyond the Green Belt and the possibilities for accommodating development within the inner Green Belt boundary.

As part of the Green Belt Assessment, a view has been taken on the likely capacity of each settlement inset into the Green Belt to accommodate development within the urban area, including the use of brownfield sites. It is important to note that not all brownfield sites are available or developable and whilst the Plan is supportive of the principle of brownfield sites redevelopment, there is no policy hook within the NPPF that would allow a Local Plan policy to require that all identified brownfield sites are developed before greenfield sites.

The Assessment also shows that the Plan does propose to channel a significant proportion of development needs to locations beyond the Green Belt, with settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary taking a significantly higher proportion of development than those settlements inset within it. The Assessment concludes that there would be significant adverse implications for sustainable development of channelling a further proportion of the development needs to locations beyond the Green Belt.

Finally, the Green Belt Assessment looks at meeting needs within the inner boundary of the Green Belt, in the southern part of the Greater Manchester conurbation. Manchester City Council, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council all have relatively recently adopted

Core Strategies and each authority has confirmed that there is little scope to accommodate any of the need arising from Cheshire East within Greater Manchester.

The exceptional circumstances argument for the alteration to the detailed Green Belt boundary at Radway Green in the South Cheshire Green Belt is different. This is located right on the very outer edge of Green Belt and alteration of the detailed boundary will enable the expansion of a key employment area with a strategic location within the M6 growth corridor from Birmingham to Manchester, allowing it to act as a key linkage between these major hubs and the wider Cheshire economy. It provides the opportunity to retain existing jobs and promote economic growth and further diversification at the site. This is also supportive of the 'All Change for Crewe High Growth City' initiative for the delivery of economic growth along the M6 growth corridor'.

The overall approach to Green Belt release has been to meet as much of the identified development needs within the urban area in the locations that they arise. Following this, a proportion of the needs are proposed to be met in locations beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt, thus minimising the impacts on the Green Belt as much as possible. Channelling further development to locations beyond the Green Belt boundary would result in unsustainable patterns of development. Ultimately, the proposals for the Green Belt represent a balance between preserving the openness of the Green Belt on one hand and allowing for sufficient levels of sustainable development to meet the identified development needs of the area on the other hand.

It is agreed that the Green Belt represents a strategic designation which crosses several local authority areas. However, the general extent of the Green Belt in Cheshire East is to be maintained and the changes proposed are considered to be detailed boundary alterations which, although important locally, do not affect the strategic overall extent of the Green Belt. The scale of the overall Green Belt is not fundamentally changing and the detailed boundary alterations proposed amount to less than 1% of the Green Belt in Cheshire East. It is therefore considered appropriate to carry out the review of the Green Belt within Cheshire East rather than expand the scope of the work to a wider study of the entire Green Belt in conjunction with other local planning authorities. It is also noted that Manchester City Council amended the detailed boundaries of its own Green Belt without a strategic study of the entire Green Belt. At no point during the Duty to Cooperate discussions have neighbouring planning authorities indicated a desire to carry out a joint strategic review of the Green Belt.

When selecting sites for release from the Green Belt, the results of the Green Belt Assessment have been considered in terms of the significance of the contribution of that area to the purposes of Green Belt. It has been noted that some of the sites proposed for release from the Green Belt have been assessed as making a more significant contribution to the purposes of Green Belt than some others that are not proposed for release. It is important to note that the Green Belt is an important issue in determining the sites selection, but it is not the determinate issue. The results of the Green Belt Assessment have been considered alongside

all other considerations.

The Green Belt Assessment has used a standard methodology to assess the strategic parcels of land against the purposes of Green Belt. It is solely an assessment against these defined purposes of Green Belt and it deliberately does not consider other planning matters (such as agricultural land quality, landscape designation etc) as these are not defined as a purpose of Green Belt and this would represent an unsound approach to carrying out a Green Belt Assessment. As stated, the Green Belt Assessment is only one element to be considered in making site selections alongside all other planning considerations.

The Green Belt Assessment does not consider 'sites' for release from the Green Belt. It assesses strategic parcels of land against the purposes of Green Belt. Therefore, sites included in the Plan may fall within a strategic parcel, or within more than one strategic parcel. The Green Belt Assessment is only one consideration and where, for example, a strategic parcel has a weak boundary to prevent further encroachment in the future, but a development site within the parcel could provide a new strong boundary, then this is considered on a site by site basis.

Finally, the Green Belt Assessment is part of the evidence base for developing Local Plan policy. It does not set policy itself. As a result, Green Belt policy treats all Green Belt equally and any development proposals would be judged against the Green Belt policy applicable at the time. The Green Belt Assessment's categorisation of parcels as making a contribution, significant contribution and major contribution is to assist decision-making on determining which sites to exclude from the Green Belt in the Local Plan. It does not downgrade the remaining areas of Green Belt which are still covered equally by the Green Belt policy.

The approach that the Council has taken is to bring forward the Local Plan in separate parts, with the strategic part being prioritised to reflect the urgency with which an up to date Local Plan is required. It is considered entirely reasonable to bring this part of the Plan forward in advance of the more detailed Site Allocations and Development Policies document. It will also be appropriate to consider whether there is a need for additional motorway service areas as part of the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.

For the proposals for a new Green Belt, it is the Council's belief that the only way to prevent Crewe from subsuming surrounding settlements and merging with Nantwich in the longer term is with the certainty and permanence of a new area of Green Belt to join with the existing South Cheshire Green Belt.

Both Crewe and Nantwich have grown significantly in recent decades and the Crewe and South Cheshire area is the Council's spatial focus for growth over the Plan period. Some revisions have been made to the spatial distribution of development proposed in the Submission Version of the Local Plan Strategy. Under this, the total dwelling stock in both the towns of Crewe and Nantwich will increase by 22.3% over the existing stock as of 2011 within a 20 year period. This

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>is necessary to deliver the overall vision and strategic objectives outlined in the Plan but this high level of growth comes with a responsibility to prevent future unrestricted sprawl and prevent settlements from merging</p> <p>The full impact of the High Speed 2 rail project on the Borough is unclear although it is likely that it will prove decisive in supporting the case for significant growth and development in south Cheshire. It will be important to ensure that future growth comes forward in a sustainable manner. The precise boundaries of the new Green Belt will be defined in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. When drawing up these precise boundaries, the Council will fully consider the need to allow for sustainable development in the future. It is not intended that the new Green Belt completely encircles Crewe, and there will also be areas of safeguarded land identified between the urban area and the inner boundary of the new Green Belt to allow for further sustainable growth, if required in the future.</p> <p>The existing Green Gap policy has been fairly successful in maintaining gaps between settlements but its effectiveness has been questioned in recent years; for example at Rope Lane in Shavington an appeal was allowed on the housing land supply argument. The Council is supportive of planned growth and development and has worked to identify a five year supply of land for housing. However, housing land supply will always be subject to minor variations year by year and given the emphasis on growth in South Cheshire, the erosion of gaps in recent years and the number of settlements in close proximity it is considered vital to have a strategic policy in place to preserve the openness of the area over the longer term. A local policy that can be over-ridden by material considerations according to temporary circumstances is no longer appropriate to maintain these gaps in the long term and the permanence of a new Green Belt is required.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers the entire area of search for the new Green Belt. The process of refining the boundary in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document will also be subject to Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The Green Belt is a strategic policy with very clear purposes and the evidence gathered in relation to the designation of a new area of Green Belt does not support the inclusion of the land to the west of Nantwich.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 'Existing Council Depot at Lyme Green' to the list of sites to be removed from the Green Belt (previously included under Site CS11)</li> <li>• Add 'Existing Car Showrooms, Manchester Road, Knutsford' to the list of sites to be removed from the Green Belt to provide a good defensible boundary</li> <li>• Clarify (in point 6 of policy) that additional "non-strategic" sites will be identified in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document (rather than "smaller" sites)</li> <li>• Revise map showing sites to be removed from the Green Belt to reflect amended boundaries for some of the sites (reasoning set out by site in the appropriate sections)</li> <li>• Revise map showing area of search for new Green Belt to clarify that areas around Willaston close to the urban edge are included (to correct a minor drafting error in the previous map)</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy PG4: Safeguarded Land</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 159 (Support: 8 / Object: 141 / Comment Only: 10)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach to safeguarded land is in accordance with the NPPF</li> <li>• The inclusion of safeguarded land is essential to a sound plan</li> <li>• More safeguarded sites are required to the north of the borough to allow for these settlements to grow sufficiently post 2030 and prevent their required housing being exported to less sustainable towns.</li> <li>• The NPPF is clear that safeguarded land is required</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement to identify "areas of safeguarded land" which are between the urban area and the new Green Belt boundary" does not mean convert existing green belt land to be "safeguarded" where urban development is already adjacent to green belt land.</li> <li>• There is no justification for safeguarding land for development after 2030, thereby removing future consultation processes</li> <li>• Safeguarding ;and for development after 2030 is beyond the remit of the plan</li> <li>• The following exchange took place in Parliament on 24th October 2013:<br/>David Rutley MP: Notwithstanding the point that the Minister is making, can he confirm that the planning horizon currently is to 2030 and any talk of moving to 2050 is for the birds, to use a technical term? Would he also use his good offices, given that there is good will—particularly in Cheshire East—to conclude local plans, to bring the requisite expertise to enable us to get over this hurdle as quickly as possible?<br/>Nick Boles (Planning Minister): I am very grateful to my hon. Friend for reminding me of two very important specific questions, to which it is a great pleasure—and a rare one—to be able to give an answer that I hope is satisfactory. The answer to the first question is that there is nothing in the Localism Act 2011, in the NPPF or in any aspect of Government planning policy that requires someone to plan beyond 15 years. So, anybody who is suggesting that there is any requirement to safeguard land or wrap it up in wrapping paper and ribbons for the future development between 2030 and 2050 is getting it wrong. There is no reason for it and my hon. Friend can knock that suggestion straight back to wherever it came from. Regarding help for authorities, I will make an offer to everyone here in Westminster Hall who has an authority that is having difficulty resolving the final objections to a plan that is still in draft form. It is that I am very happy to ask officials in my Department and—perhaps even more usefully—the recently retired chief inspector and another recently retired very senior inspector to meet those authorities to help them, in a sense, to understand what are the practical things they have to do to get the plan to a point where it can pass examination. I fully understand that there is a frustration, namely that people cannot negotiate with an inspector, because an inspector is basically like a judge; it would be like someone negotiating with a judge in court as to whether</li> </ul> |

they will be found guilty or not. The inspectors cannot negotiate, but that is why we have created a resource within the Department that is able to provide that practical support, and I am very happy to offer it to Cheshire East and to other boroughs where it would be necessary.

- NPPF para 85 requires identification of safeguarded land “where necessary”. There is no explanation of why it is necessary to safeguard land
- The failure to identify the 5-10 hectares of Safeguarded Land required for Poynton makes proper consultation impossible; the identification of any areas safeguarded for development should be included within the Core Strategy and fully identified on Figure 8.3 not left until a later stage
- Exceptional circumstances to justify alteration to the Green Belt boundaries have not been demonstrated
- Term ‘safeguarded’ is misleading. It should be called land earmarked for future development
- Safeguarded land allows land banking and disregards future free market policies
- The quantum of safeguarded land identified is excessive
- The approach to quantifying the amount anticipated to be Safeguarded is not a proper assessment of future need and simply seeks to roll forward the planned quantum of development for each settlement for a further 20 year period (2030-50). This is questionable because the housing requirement for this plan is underestimated. Secondly, designation of Safeguarded Land should also have reference (in quantum as well as locational terms) to the need to ensure long term defensible boundaries, and give consideration to whether the Green Belt releases for development suggest the need for a boundary beyond the land identified.
- The policy fails to identify enough safeguarded land. There is a shortfall of approximately 31 hectares – even if the Council’s approach in assuming the current rates of development will continue beyond 2030 is correct.
- Council has misinterpreted NPPF Para 85. It may be appropriate for new Green Belts but does not apply to existing well established Green Belts
- The distribution of Safeguarded Land is unfair – more than 50% is in Macclesfield.
- Once safeguarded land has been designated in the Local Plan it should be able to be reviewed at any time and not necessarily require waiting for a review of the Local Plan. As the land is out of Green Belt it does not require a Green Belt review and must be brought forward if it is required to achieve the Council’s strategic housing requirement. This will add flexibility for the Council giving it, for example, the opportunity to bring forward safeguarded land where the Council needs to make up a 5 year land supply without having to review the whole of the Local Plan.
- No adequate justification to remove land from the Green Belt where it continues to serve a Green Belt purpose and is not required for new development
- Policy PG4 seeks to quantify future development needs beyond the plan period for other towns where Green Belt is already present, directly informing the identification of Safeguarded Land, and it is entirely flawed not to do the same with regard to Crewe if the intention to proposed new Green Belt

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>persists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Productive and valuable agricultural land should not be sacrificed unless all alternatives have been fully and properly investigated. The loss of land will be permanent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If there is a probability of safeguarded land being needed for future development in Poynton, it should be proposed through the Core Strategy and not await a Site Allocations document</li> <li>Sites that may be needed to be brought forward in the event of a shortfall in land supply should be prioritised</li> <li>Part 4 of policy refers to release of safeguarded sites following a review of the Local Plan but no detail provided as to the measures that might trigger such a review. Policy needs to reference such triggers which could include could include: the non-delivery of allocated sites within the Borough within the anticipated site-specific timescales; the absence of a deliverable five year housing land supply; and persistent underdelivery of housing in the Borough against the annual housing requirement.</li> <li>The inclusion of such 'triggers' will provide greater certainty over the release of safeguarded land, and also provide the Core Strategy with greater flexibility to respond to changing needs and circumstances.</li> <li>It is not clear whether the safeguarded sites are proposed for development during the plan period or after it</li> <li>Green Belt review work undertaken to date is incomplete and it is premature to identify safeguarded land</li> <li>In the event of the new Green Belt becoming policy, land between the urban edge and new Green Belt should be identified under PG4 as safeguarded land except areas of land that are suitably contained by existing developments or other features which should be allocated for development in this plan</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Covered in the sections above</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>Safeguarded land is not allocated for development. It can only be allocated for development through a future review of the Local Plan if necessary and appropriate.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires that, when amending Green Belt boundaries, Local Planning Authorities should: <i>'where necessary, identify in their plan areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period'</i>. They should also <i>'make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development'</i> as well as <i>'satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period'</i>.</p> <p>It is the requirement to make sure that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period that makes the identification of</p>   |

Safeguarded Land necessary in Cheshire East. The Green Belt boundary is currently tightly drawn around the towns in the north of the Borough leaving little room for future development outside of the Green Belt. The sites to be allocated for development are intended to be completed during the Plan period to 2030. This means that at this time, there are no identified significant sites outside of the Green Belt that could accommodate future development beyond the plan period. Therefore, without the identification of safeguarded land, the Council cannot be satisfied that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of development plan period.

The Council is aware of the statement made by the Planning Minister in Parliament on 24<sup>th</sup> October. However, the Plan must be in general conformity with the NPPF in order to be found sound. The NPPF is clear that Safeguarded Land is required in Cheshire East for the reasons set out above. Subsequent advice received from the former Chief Planning Inspector confirms that the Council's approach to safeguarded land is not incorrect. A letter from the Planning Minister to David Rutley MP dated 6<sup>th</sup> Jan 2014 confirms that the determination of whether safeguarded land is necessary in particular circumstances is a judgement to be made by the local authority, appropriately scrutinised by a planning inspector.

Although there is a clear requirement to include safeguarded land, there is a lack of guidance on the quantum required. This means that the amount to be safeguarded is a judgement for the Council so long as it is satisfied that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. On this basis, and considering the NPPF requirement to make the most efficient use of land, it is considered that there will be a package of options to accommodate future development available to the Council at the end of the Plan period, of which Safeguarded Land is just one option. These options could include measures such as:

- Recycling of land within the urban areas, including the re-use of under-used employment areas, which will become redundant over the lifetime of the Plan;
- Additional town centre and higher-density development;
- Channelling development to areas within the inner boundary of the Green Belt (i.e. Greater Manchester and the Potteries conurbations);
- Channelling development to areas beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt;

Therefore, whilst there is a need to safeguard some land, there is no need to safeguard enough land to meet another full Plan period (15-20 years) after 2030 and the quantum of safeguarded land could be reduced from the amount identified in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy document.

The issue of whether there are exceptional circumstances that justify the alteration of Green Belt boundaries is covered under Policy PG3.

Chapter 16 (Monitoring and Implementation) sets out how the plan will be monitored and what triggers and steps should be taken if targets are not met.

As set out in Policy PG3, the detailed boundaries of the new Green Belt will be

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p>determined in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. At this time, safeguarded land between the urban area and the inner boundary of the new Green Belt will be identified.</p> <p>The term 'Safeguarded Land' is consistent with the terminology used in the NPPF and therefore more appropriate than 'Land Earmarked for Future Development' or any other term. Policy PG4 is clear that the definition of Safeguarded Land is <i>"land between the existing urban area and the inner boundary of the Green Belt that may be required to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the period of the Local Plan"</i>.</p>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PG4, 5 (ii) Reduce amount at South West Macclesfield from 135 ha to 45.5 ha</li> <li>• PG4, 5(iii) Reduce amount at North West Knutsford from 41ha to 25.1 ha</li> <li>• PG4, 5 (iv) Reduce amount at North Cheshire Growth Village from 26 ha to 19.8 ha</li> <li>• PG4, 5 (v) Reduce amount at Prestbury Road from 26 ha to 14.5 ha</li> <li>• PG4, 5 (vi) Reduce amount at Upcast Lane, Wilmslow from 14 ha to 7.4 ha</li> <li>• Revise policy point 6 to refer to additional 'non strategic' sites rather than additional smaller sites (for consistency with Policy PG3 where a similar revision is recommended)</li> <li>• Revise the policy justification to refer to the reduced quantity of safeguarded land required.</li> </ul> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy PG5: Open Countryside</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 50 (Support: 18 / Object: 24 / Comment Only: 8)</b><br>Open Countryside: 6 (Support: 2 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 2)<br>PG5: 44 (Support: 16 / Object: 22 / Comment Only: 6)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to retain gaps between settlements and maintain the definition and separation of existing communities</li> <li>• It should clearly define what 'sustainable development' actually is, as this could still allow developers to build in our open countryside unchecked.</li> <li>• It is essential that urban sprawl is resisted and that towns and adjacent villages maintain their unique identities</li> <li>• Policy PG 5 should continue to apply to the whole of the parishes North of Congleton</li> <li>• It is essential to protect settlement boundaries in order to protect the integrity of settlements, open countryside, green gaps and green spaces.</li> <li>• It gives local embodiment to the NPPF requirements to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and to prefer land for development that is of lesser environmental value.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the countryside should be balanced with the need to deliver development around the most sustainable settlements. This is relevant to the Local Service Centres with a limited supply of brownfield land &amp; surrounded by open countryside e.g. Audlem. The Council should review the settlement boundaries of each of the proposed Principal Towns, Key Service Centres &amp; Local Service Centres</li> <li>• Policy lacks reference to the future development of existing buildings. The conversion of unused, traditional, agricultural buildings to residential use would comply with the NPPF (paragraph 55) and should be supported in this Policy.</li> <li>• Over restrictive with regard to the numerical limits for Infill development. The quantity of dwellings to which Infill can be considered should be increased significantly to allow opportunities for growth to be met in rural areas. Limiting Infill development to a maximum of two dwellings is inconsistent with Policy SE2 which seeks to make efficient use of land. An Infill opportunity should be based upon the physical form of the village townscape and the local landscape character and not restricted by an arbitrary dwelling limit.</li> <li>• Chapter 3 of NPPF encourages a positive approach to sustainable new development in rural areas both through conversions and well designed new buildings. It also seeks to promote development of local services and community facilities. This type of rural development will obviously occur on open countryside sites as it will not always be possible to accommodate sustainable rural development within existing settlement boundaries.</li> <li>• Re infilling - these small areas of open space provide accessible green nature / recreational space for all to use</li> <li>• The definition of open countryside should include all land that is currently</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Locations should not be included in the open countryside until a detailed boundary for allocation is determined at a later date. Policy PG5 should note that the Council will be sympathetic to development proposals relating to Strategic Locations where there is a shortfall in available housing land to meet local needs.</li> <li>• Need a defined strategic green gap to the north of Moss Lane and east of the A34 to help protect and preserve the identity of Eaton village from urban sprawl</li> <li>• It is not necessary to delay the definition of settlement boundaries to the Allocations DPD stage as the evidence base has been largely prepared and these areas can be identified now</li> <li>• At present this precludes development other than that essential “for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation, essential works undertaken by public service authorities or statutory undertakers, or for other uses appropriate to a rural area”.</li> <li>• Para. 28 of the NPPF indicates that local plans should ‘support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings’.</li> <li>• Clarification that the existing settlement boundaries are out of date and they should not be considered up to date until they have been reviewed to meet the full and objectively based housing requirement in an adopted Core Strategy</li> <li>• Point 4 is imprecise, inflexible &amp; unnecessary. The meaning of ‘gaps’ is not defined or explained, nor is ‘inappropriate’ development. Point 4 is introducing Green Belt language in to an open countryside policy and as a consequence is setting a much more stringent limitation on development than is appropriate.</li> <li>• The open countryside policy should advise that whilst there is a general presumption against residential development in the open countryside this matter will be reviewed on a site by site basis if it becomes apparent that an updated objectively assessed housing requirement indicates that not all residential development can be accommodated in the defined settlement boundaries.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support protection of the countryside but other policies in the plan contradict this aim</li> <li>• Policy is contradicted by development proposals at White Moss Quarry and around Sandbach</li> <li>• The gap between Congleton and Astbury is very narrow and this policy must be strictly applied to maintain that gap</li> <li>• The biodiversity value of the countryside – recognised by audit should be protected and enhanced. The ‘intrinsic’ character and beauty of the countryside is vague – it should be defined and become part of the key evidence.</li> <li>• There should be no need to change the settlement boundary of Goostrey</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy PG5 point 4: it is also important to provide connections between undeveloped areas for species movement</li> <li>• Points (2) and (3) should be amended, so as to support development where it:</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>to be considered</b></p>                      | <p>constitutes appropriate rural diversification; is necessary to meet the identified tourism needs of the area (through the improvement of existing tourism facilities and accommodation, or the provision of new); and will support local employment and economic growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy PG5 should also reference "suitable rural tourism and outdoor leisure and recreation" and "rural diversification" under point 2.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Detailed settlement boundaries will be defined in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. In the meantime, the spatial extent of the Open Countryside is as defined in the saved policies of the existing Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan, Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review and the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, other than where specific changes (i.e. strategic sites) are identified in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>Strategic Locations do not have set boundaries, as these will be defined in the Site Allocations and Development policies document. Therefore, Strategic Locations that lie outside current settlement boundaries must continue to be within the Open Countryside until their boundaries are determined. However, it is not the intention of policy to delay applications that conform with the principles of policies in the Strategy document. Therefore, the intention to define these boundaries will be a material consideration in the determination of such applications and it will be appropriate to clarify this in the policy justification.</p> <p>The Open Countryside policy should not preclude the appropriate re-use of existing rural buildings. The policy should be amended to allow for appropriate re-use of existing buildings.</p> <p>The numerical guide for the acceptable extent of infill development is included to clarify that this exception really does only apply to very small gaps. If the gap is large enough to accommodate more than two dwellings, then it unlikely to be considered a small gap under the provisions of this policy.</p> <p>The Open Countryside does include land in the Green Belt, outside of settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Strategic Open Gap policy – protection and not Green belt</p> <p>The monitoring and implementations section of the Plan sets out how the Plan will be monitored and the actions to be taken should targets not be met, e.g. housing requirement not met.</p> <p>Maintaining the gaps between settlements is considered important in maintaining the local distinctiveness and openness. Point four of the policy clarifies the importance of these gaps. It is considered entirely appropriate for policy to seek to maintain the definition and separation of existing communities and the individual characters of settlements.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy proposes no change to the settlement boundary of Goostrey.</p> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Policy EG4 is supportive of Tourism but not all built Tourism facilities would be appropriate in the Open Countryside. The Open Countryside policy does include a provision for development for '<i>other uses appropriate to a rural area</i>' which would allow for appropriate tourism facilities.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove definition of spatial extent of open countryside from policy point 1 and use this definition to replace definition in penultimate paragraph of justification</li> <li>• Add "plus public infrastructure" to point 2 of policy</li> <li>• Remove reference to 'outside the Green Belt' in first para of justification.</li> <li>• Insert para to clarify the approach to applications on Strategic Sites</li> <li>• Amend policy to expand the exceptions allowed under point 3 to allow for the re-use of rural buildings: "3. Exceptions may be made where there is the opportunity for the infilling of a small gap with one or two dwellings in an otherwise built up frontage or where the dwelling is exceptional in design and sustainable development terms; for the re-use of existing rural buildings where the building is permanent, substantial and would not require extensive alteration, rebuilding or extension; for the replacement of an existing dwelling by a new dwelling not materially larger than the dwelling it replaces; for extensions to existing dwellings where the extension is not disproportionate to the original dwelling; for development that is essential for the expansion or redevelopment of an existing business</li> <li>• Additional of a new paragraph to the policy justification "The National Planning Policy Framework recognises that there will be cases where exceptions can be made to countryside policies, including: ' the exceptional quality or innovative design of the dwelling'. Criteria for meeting this test are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework."</li> <li>• Addition of clarification to the policy justification to highlight the value of the Cheshire countryside and the importance of its preservation.</li> <li>• Addition of clarification to the policy justification that the intention to define boundaries for the Strategic Locations and exclude them from the Open Countryside during the Site Allocations and Development Policies document will be a material consideration in the determination of any applications in these locations prior to the boundaries being confirmed.</li> </ul> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Spatial Distribution and Policy PG6: Spatial Distribution of Development</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 218 (Support: 8 / Object: 183 / Comment Only: 27)</b><br>Spatial Distribution: 15 (Support: 0 / Object: 11 / Comment Only: 4)<br>PG6: 203 (Support: 8 / Object: 172 / Comment Only: 23)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support aspirations for growth and wish to see balanced growth across the borough</li> <li>• Support the need to increase level of growth from 2000 to 2500 in SCs</li> <li>• Support increase in number of homes for LSCs to accommodate throughout the plan period as it reinforces the important role that Bunbury and other LSCs play in rural areas; new development will help support/enhance this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to Crewe as hub of developments</li> <li>• Housing and population forecasts are unrealistic</li> <li>• Increasing Congleton's housing stock by 17% over 17 years is unrealistic</li> <li>• Handforth East is not required to meet the needs of Handforth</li> <li>• No strategic decision as to what percentage of a settlements growth should come from larger strategic cites – concern over this arbitrary approach</li> <li>• Crewe's housing figures have increased with the inclusion of SCGV as part of the Crewe figures – this was not previously the case</li> <li>• The Development Strategy identified 1100 units in Alsager with 224 to be allocated later via DPD. No need to allocate White Moss quarry which now increases the target for Aslager to 1700</li> <li>• Object to the allocation of only 400 homes at Wilmslow – this figure should be substantially higher dues the town's size and role</li> <li>• The overall housing requirement has been understated and once corrected to a higher level will need to be distributed accordingly to the settlement hierarchy.</li> <li>• No evidence is presented to justify the position that release of a large amount of green belt will minimise impact ton the greenbelt overall</li> <li>• Proposed housing requirement does not match the growth in employment development and there is a clear imbalance</li> <li>• Congestion s a concern along the A34 corridor- impact of new sites will be harmful</li> <li>• Proposed growth at Crewe is too high</li> <li>• 3500 is a low estimate for Macclesfield and should be increased .to 4500.</li> <li>• Level of housing is too great in Macclesfield.</li> <li>• There is an oversupply of employment land in and around Macclesfield.</li> <li>• Distribution of development is flawed with Macclesfield underprovided for and Crewe over provided for</li> <li>• Handforth East will create localised problems without meeting other needs</li> <li>• Address distribution of development to reflect local needs and consider viability</li> </ul> |

- PG6 has not been justified and does not provide sufficient growth to meet the objectively assessed needs over the plan period
- The role and contribution of sites identified in the SHLAA to form sustainable urban extensions to KSCs has not been adequately considered as part of the spatial distribution of development
- Reduce allocation to Knutsford to 600 dwellings. . Minimising GB impact not achieved by concentrating development as proposed
- Object to removal of sustainable villages from PG2
- Allocating 70% of development to south of the borough will overload infrastructure – should be distributed more equitably
- To ensure housing needs can be met and that there is flexibility in the supply of housing in Crewe, the requirement should be increased and identified as a minimum target
- Spatial distribution is flawed and evidence to justify it is lacking
- 11 ha of employment land and 650 homes for Knutsford is a significant under provision. The Council is demonstrably not planning to meet its objectively assessed needs.
- Policy fails the tests of soundness – it is not justified, effective (does not meet objectively assessed needs), and is not consistent with national policy.
- Congleton should be identified as a Principal Town rather than KSC – Congleton can accommodate a higher level of growth than identified.
- Object to the distribution of development due to inclusion of new settlement, where there is a range of sustainable settlements which can deliver new homes and jobs.
- Level of growth for Handforth is appropriate (2000) however the allocation of a new Growth Village is neither appropriate nor sound
- Housing figures are too low
- Object to only 200 houses allocated in Poynton.
- Part 5 of Policy PG 6 contradicts the purpose of PG 5, by permitting large scale development in the open countryside.
- Shavington should not be viewed as solely a Local Service Centre as it supports its neighbouring settlement. Links with Crewe should be strengthened in Local Plan
- Level of development in Local Service Centres should be increased to 5000.
- The dwelling provision figure for Sandbach should be increased to at least 2,500 dwellings in order to help meet the objectively assessed need.
- Haslington should come under the Crewe housing requirement. Alsager housing requirement should be reduced.
- Congleton, Middlewich and Sandbach housing requirements should be increased.
- North Cheshire Growth Village should be deleted from policy.
- Local Service Centres housing requirement should be increased.
- Increases in the housing requirement should be proportionate to the settlement.
- Object to the proposed provision of 3,500 homes at Macclesfield in Policy PG 6, which is not sufficient to reflect its role as a Principal Town (Policy PG 2) and its propensity for sustainable growth. 3,500 homes is only just over half the level of housing proposed for Crewe and is no higher than the level

proposed for Congleton.

- The housing requirement for LSCs should be disaggregated and the requirement for Bollington should be for a minimum of 385 dwellings. More sites will need to be identified during site allocations.
- The Council should be prioritising housing sites within or on the edge of settlements, and not entirely new settlements as is proposed
- **Comment Only**
- The figures in PG6 area explained as a guide which represent neither a ceiling nor a target – yet they are used to establish the quantum of development. Therefore figures are being applied without proper explanation or justification.
- 1500 dwellings for Nantwich should be an absolute maximum for Nantwich up to 2030.
- More employment land and fewer houses at Congleton.
- The role of Crewe in the settlement hierarchy underlines the importance of growth which can have a sustainable relationship with Crewe.
- Some clarity is needed on how 2500 houses will be distributed across LSCs
- Housing allocation in Congleton should be increased to support the level of employment land allocations.
- If housing requirements were to be disaggregated for LSCs there would be a need to release Green Belt land around Disley.
- Proportion of homes proposed for delivery in rural areas and other settlements is supported and should be increased.
- For transparency all steps and figures that lead to indicative levels of housing should be drawn into one document.
- State in the policy that housing figures are a guide only and subject to completion of town strategies.
- Reduce housing requirement at Nantwich and meet the requirement through windfall and brownfield
- Alsager is unsustainable as it has little employment and roads operate at over-capacity.
- Bunbury cannot be expected to accommodate the same level of new development as the larger LSCs as it is not sustainable.
- To ensure that Congleton benefits from the additional employment land created the housing allocation should also be increased to support the additional jobs created in the town.
- The proposed housing distribution for Wilmslow is unsound. The proposed housing requirement does not match the growth in employment development and there is a clear imbalance, which could have a profound impact on sustainability and affordability. Further Green Belt releases around Wilmslow are necessary to meet these deficiencies in the Plan.
- A grading system for the LSCs is needed, to take account of size, local need, current facilities, transport links and local employment prospects.
- Peak time congestion is a concern in South of Greater Manchester, especially A34 corridor. There is significant growth in Handforth, Wilmslow, and the Growth Village will generate extra trips, potentially reducing quality of life, impacting businesses etc. Need evidence that impacts in Cheshire East and GM are acceptable, including mitigation i.e. joint Transport Study to determine capacity for growth and mitigation for A34 and A555.

**List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered**

- Provide clarity of the purpose of the figures and how they are to be applied
- An explanation for change from 2000 to 2500 in LSCs is needed
- Distribute growth equally throughout the Borough
- Lower the figure for new housing around Crewe
- Policies should ensure developers build the level of affordable housing required
- Remove Handforth East from the plan
- Release GB land around Disley to accommodate growth of 225 net additional dwellings
- Remove the quantum of development to the North of Congleton and remove the link road from the plan
- Demonstrate evidence and justifiable reasons as the basis of decision for determining growth
- Reduce the level of development proposed for Nantwich
- Provide clarity on the purpose of the figures and how they are to be applied
- Check the tables for Congleton and update completions (corrections to table A.2)
- Increase allocations to reflect a notable increase in the overall housing requirements
- Increase allocations to Wilmslow to reflect its size and role
- A grading system is need to ensure that small villages are not overwhelmed by inappropriate development
- Development potential of Shavington should be increased
- Increase Macclesfield housing figure to 4500
- Address distribution of development to reflect local needs and consider viability
- Figure of 1600 for Middlewich is a subjective, not objective, assessment and the justification is unclear. If 1600 is based on highways constraints then Middlewich Eastern Bypass will open a new higher quantum of development.
- Part 5 of PG6 to be amended: 'the Local Service Centres are expected to accommodate in the order of 5ha of employment land and 2500 new homes. Sites will be identified within the Site Allocations and Development Plan Document'
- Council needs to reassess the capacity of Other Settlements and Rural Areas and in turn increase the housing requirement for Local Service Centres as these settlements are able to accommodate sustainable growth.
- The policy should include explanatory wording in order that the spatial distribution reflects detailed sensitivities of any one settlement
- Policy should clearly assess sustainability of smaller communities
- Increase the housing allocations to LSCs to 5000
- The role and contribution of sites identified in the SHLAA to form sustainable urban extensions to KSCs has not been adequately considered as part of the spatial distribution of development
- Object to removal of Sustainable Villages from the Settlement hierarchy – will make plan unsound when considered against previous Development Strategy
- CS should make clear that figures quoted for housing and employment are a maximum that cannot be exceeded in the plan period PG1, PG3 and PG6 should be amended to reduce overall requirements for Prestbury – evidence

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>to suggest that such villages can accommodate growth is not demonstrated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions of viability study bring deliverability of the plan into question. To compensate for any under delivery, the Council should consider further allocations in the higher value areas of the Borough</li> <li>• The role of LSCs is underplayed. Dwellings allocated to KSCs should be reduced by 2500 and increase LSCs to 5000</li> <li>• Policy PG6 should specify a minimum of 7000 dwellings for Crewe over the plan period</li> <li>• Increase total homes required at Alsager to 2000</li> <li>• Increase Knutsford's housing requirement to 1,500.</li> <li>• Amendments to the Development Allocations to read: 'Knutsford at least 16 ha of employment land and 2100 new homes'</li> <li>• Council to identify what housing requirement is appropriate for each settlement via an objectively assessment of housing needs</li> <li>• Include land at Cholmondeley Road in Wrenbury as a site</li> <li>• Justification needed to demonstrate Crewe capable of delivering expected development by 2030</li> <li>• State in the policy that housing figures are a guide only and subject to completion of town strategies</li> <li>• LSC sites should be allocated now rather than through separate DPD</li> <li>• Increase allocations to reflect a notable increase in overall housing requirement, particularly at Poynton</li> <li>• The Local Plan Strategy should allocate housing in LSCs, rather than leaving these allocations to be dealt with at a later stage as part of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document process.</li> <li>• Better balance of development across the county. Better distribution of green belt losses.</li> <li>• Congleton should be identified as a Principal Town rather than a KSC. The reference to a New Settlement should be removed as Congleton can accommodate a higher level of growth than envisaged in the PSCS.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Following consideration of comments received and planning issues raised, changes are proposed to the growth figures and text as set out below.</p> <p>Comments relating to the settlement hierarchy have been detailed in that section (policy PG2) including specific responses for Crewe, Macclesfield, Congleton and Shavington.</p> <p>The comments on individual sites relate to the Local Plan Strategy sites (CS) and Strategic Locations (SL), or to Non Preferred Sites (NPS). They are dealt with in more detail in the response to those consultation points.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy takes account of the varied roles and character of different areas, based on the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The proposed North Cheshire Growth Village at Handforth East is responded to under policy CS30. This is viewed as a more sustainable option than extending existing settlements.</p>   |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>Non-inclusion of detailed allocations. The document sets out the Council's core ambition and the overall approach to accommodating growth, and identifies strategic sites and locations for development. It also sets out the policy principles to be used in the next stage of the plan making process. It is good planning practice to establish that this approach is sound, by consultation and examination of the Local Plan Strategy, before embarking on more detailed assessment through the Site Allocations and Development Policies and Waste Development Plan Policies documents.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.65 states that the figures in policy PG6 and table 8.4 are intended as a guide and are neither a ceiling nor a target.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>Alteration of figures in Policy PG6 to reflect changes to distribution of development. Alsager reduced from 1700 to 1600 homes; Handforth changed from 200 to 150 homes; Sandbach increased from 1600 to 2200</p> <p>Insertion of site numbers table prior to policy.</p> <p>Wholesale change to justification text.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Key Diagram</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 9 (Support: 2 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None received</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should include areas proposed as Strategic Open Gap and Green Belt</li> <li>• Identified sites should be cross referenced to relevant section of PSCS</li> <li>• Size of text used for Principal Towns, KSCS and LSCS should vary according to status in settlement hierarchy</li> <li>• LSCS not clearly distinguishable</li> <li>• Sites at Gaw End Lane to be represented by a single blue dot denoting an enlarged 'Core Strategy Site'</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New road and rail to be identified</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | None   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The Key Diagram shows the approximate location of all the spatially specific policies and site proposals in the Plan.</p> <p>New road schemes are identified separately in the relevant town and site maps at other pints in the document</p> <p>Development in Local Service Centres will be addressed via the production of a Site Allocations and Detailed Policies document later in the Local Plan process.</p> <p>To retain clarity on the map, a cross-referencing function is considered best left to the contents page which allows readers to locate sites and policies throughout the document.</p> <p>Although the map is diagrammatic, it is agreed that the southern boundary of Greater Manchester could shown as being further south to better reflect the reality. All other changes are reflective of the specific site policies and diagrams covered elsewhere in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>The southern boundary of Greater Manchester should be shown more accurately as being further south. All other changes are reflective of the specific site policies and diagrams covered elsewhere in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>Given the importance of the Key Diagram, it should be moved to the start of the document.</p>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 9 and Policy SD1: Planning for Sustainable Development</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 54 (Support: 18 / Object: 22 / Comment Only: 14)</b><br>Chapter 9: 9 (Support: 2 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 5)<br>SD1: 45 (Support: 16 / Object: 20 / Comment Only: 9)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability can mean different things to different people we argue that it is about combining the aims of environmental responsibility and social integration with commercial viability. This is the underlying philosophy behind Yeowood Garden Village</li> <li>• SD1 and SD2, which seek to achieve the delivery of sustainable development are supported, however, it is considered that both policies can be refined further delivery of 'high quality new homes' and 'the delivery of new homes which meet the full objectively assessed needs of the Borough' should be added to policy SD1 and more flexibility should be built into the language of Policy SD2</li> <li>• I am strongly supportive of CEC's policy for development of brownfield sites ahead of other types of land</li> <li>• These are the actions needed to achieve sustainable development in Cheshire East and should build on the facilities of established settlements</li> <li>• The Trust welcome and support Policy SD1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East and the explicit recognition of the need to provide appropriate infrastructure including community facilities; provide access to facilities, reflecting the communities needs and to prioritise the most accessible and sustainable locations and accords with national guidance</li> <li>• Our client supports paragraphs 3 and 15 within this policy. There is a real need for small scale development which can contribute to the creation of sustainable communities in areas such as Alderley Edge, particularly previously developed sites such as our client's which the SHLAA has identified as being "developable" for housing</li> <li>• The policy is appropriate and welcomed, in particular the first three points are considered to be essential</li> <li>• We welcome the inclusion of this policy and bullet 14 which requires development to protect and enhance the historic environment.</li> <li>• The development company strongly supports part 2 of this policy which seeks to prioritise investment and growth within the Principle Towns and Key Service Centres</li> <li>• The policy is appropriate and welcomed, in particular the first three points are considered to be essential.</li> <li>• The consultee, on behalf of the Ned Yates Garden Centre, supports the growth proposals in the Draft Core Strategy and the guidance contained within the NPPF relating to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the reuse of brownfield land. They support Policy SD1, point 15, to make the best use of brownfield land for new development</li> </ul> |

- The RSPB supports the application of the concept of sustainable development to Cheshire East, acknowledging the requirement for developing both economically and physically, but in a way that can be in accordance with a whole range of environmental concerns

### **Objection**

- There is no over-arching commitment to a brownfield first policy
- Policy SD1 is not consistent with Policy PG2 (Settlement Hierarchy)
- Policy SD1 is not consistent with National Policy because it omits any reference to Green Belt which is an important consideration in delivering a sustainable pattern of development
- I see no evidence of any attempt to undertake the following policy points
  - development not sustainable without jobs or far from railway station;
  - proposing to increase housing more than employment;
  - no plans for new stations in Middlewich, W & N Crewe, no plans for inter-town bus services and site developments far from town centres & stations;
  - insufficient plans to upgrade roads;
  - you grant applications against wishes of communities;
  - won't reduce emissions
- Sustainability is an excellent principle. Cheshire East should apply it to its own actions and not promote the White Moss as a Strategic Site
- A huge opportunity was missed at Wardle where a new town/close to employment and a new station would all have been possible
- While accepting that Policy SD1 addresses relevant sustainable development considerations for assessing development proposals, the supporting text should explain that the Local Planning Authority's strategic priorities will inform decisions on planning applications in terms of the form and content of planning obligations.
- The Handforth East proposal fails to meet many of these considerations-in particular such high growth should be in larger centres e.g. Macclesfield, it is not accessible as in point 6, and being on the far edge of the area is not accessible or sustainable
- This policy is not delivered through the choice of sites CS10 and CS32. The choose to develop these site contradicts this policy. It has been ignored, on basis of get out clause of ' whenever possible'
- Concerned at the lack of clear policy requiring development to take place in sustainable communities - development should not be forced onto small communities that are not currently sustainable and do not want to attain that status
- CPRE broadly support, but needs significant strengthening on sustainable modes of transport, reducing carbon emissions, and re-using brownfield land
- No reference at present to the delivery of "high-quality new homes," and "the delivery of new homes which meet the full objectively assessed needs of the Borough.
- Object to part (15) which expects development to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Policy SD1 fails to meet the following tests of soundness as it does not accord with the NPPF in terms of providing development in the most sustainable locations.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is inflexible, repetitious of national policy &amp; makes no reference to viability &amp; could have a detrimental impact upon the viability of schemes which will then affect delivery &amp; put the plan at risk.<br/>Viability should be taken into account in the policy to ensure that developments do not become undeliverable. Policy is unsound. New wording is suggested in point 4</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 79 - item 9.5 &amp; 9.6 - Table of Distances -<br/>This 'guidance' cannot be implemented on rural exceptions sites due to the nature of them being 'rural' and unclear how this fits with growth aspirations of 1,700 homes in Alsager as an example?</li> <li>• The Gorstyhill Site should be recognised in the Core Strategy as the preferred location for sustainable development of a growth village south east of Crewe</li> <li>• New road building will increase carbon emissions and Table 9.1 needs changes to align with its claimed source</li> <li>• 9.2 This 'definition of sustainable development ' is part of the Ministerial Foreword in the NPPF not the main document. It is meaningless. The correct definition is:<br/>'There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</li> <li>• Add in about heritage &amp; culture</li> <li>• We agree that investment and growth should be prioritised in the principal towns and key service centres and that appropriate infrastructure is provided to meet the needs of the local communities and that development is accessible by public transport</li> <li>• What objective controls are there to ensure that the plans for local peoples needs are kept at the forefront rather than that of the developer; provision of green space, local transport, local shops, community centre etc. Need an SPD to set out clearly what is expected from developers of a sustainable development, both on and off site (off site sustainable links to employment services etc.)</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9.2 Change the definition of sustainable development, to the full definition used in paragraph 7 of the NPPF. Core Strategy needs to provide equal weight to the role played by environmental factors compared to economic and social ones.</li> <li>• The council's development strategy needs to be totally reconsidered without it being based on this vacuous phrase.</li> <li>• Remove the get out clause 'whenever possible'. Evidence in plan suggest this policy is only to be paid lip service</li> <li>• The declarations about sustainable development are not borne out by the sheer scale of development that the Pre-Submission Core Strategy seeks to achieve. The wide-reaching aspirations for significant amounts of road building, house building and employment land should be reduced and there should be a commitment to build on brownfield first</li> <li>• Remove CS10 and CS32 from the plan. Apply SD1 policy in all cases, rather</li> </ul>  |

than when fits with councils plan.

- SD1 and SD2, which seek to achieve the delivery of sustainable development are supported, however, it is considered that both policies can be refined further delivery of 'high quality new homes' and 'the delivery of new homes which meet the full objectively assessed needs of the Borough' should be added to policy SD1 and more flexibility should be built into the language of Policy SD2
- Consideration of how the table of distances will work for rural communities
- i. The reference to key service centres should be omitted from (2) within Policy SD1
- ii. The need to ensure the integrity of Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it should be added as a consideration in Policy SD1
- The Gorstyhill Site should be recognised in the Core Strategy as the preferred location for sustainable development of a growth village south east of Crewe
- Remove the Congleton Link Road from the plan and align them contents of Table 9.1 with its source in all respects which meet the full objectively assessed needs of the Borough' should be added to policy SD1 and more flexibility should be built into the language of Policy SD2
- Add in 'contribute to the economic sustainability of heritage & cultural assets and landscapes
- Need an SPD to avoid developer misinterpretation and set out clearly what is expected from a sustainable development, both on and off site (off site sustainable links to employment services etc.)
- There remains a lack of reference to the sustainability of rural areas e.g. retention of shops and other services however, there is reference to supporting the vibrancy of village centres CCA would like to see more emphasis on rural sustainability for a Unitary Authority that has a third of its population living in rural areas
- Remove the White Moss from the document and re-set Alsager's housing allocation back to the agreed 1,000. Enforce the restoration agreement and keep the recreational buildings and fields on the MMU.
- Reconsider the potential for a new town at Wardle and get a better control of the shed building there before it's too late
- Additional supporting text is required to explain that in some cases planning obligations will be sought to deliver the Council's strategic priorities recognising the need to conform with CIL Regulation 122.
- Remove the Handforth East proposal
- Policy should clearly assess sustainability of smaller communities, development should not be forced onto small communities that are not currently sustainable and do not want to attain that status.
- CPRE broadly support, but needs significant strengthening on sustainable modes of transport, reducing carbon emissions, and re-using brownfield land
- Re-write provision 11 of the policy to include the need to tackle behavioural change & make it easier to travel less & to use public transport more. Add a provision that commits to reducing greenhouse gas and other harmful emissions by whatever means possible
- KCHG welcomes that "Development should wherever possible ... Contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment;".

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>However, KCHG recommends the Policy includes the addition of “,cultural” after “built”, before “and historic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add reference to the delivery of 'high quality new homes' and 'the delivery of new homes which meet the full objectively assessed needs of the Borough' This is a key component of sustainable development as expressed in the NPPF.</li> <li>• Part (15) of Policy SD 1 should recognise that in some cases a balance will need to be struck between retaining the best and most versatile agricultural land and ensuring that the most sustainable sites are brought forward for development</li> <li>• To avoid selectivity &amp; be consistent with changes I have suggested for para 7.1, it should also refer to the UK definition of sustainable development as set out in 'A Better Quality of Life - Strategy for Sustainable Development for the United Kingdom' 1999 &amp; not leave it merely in the glossary</li> <li>• SD1 point 4 add the words“ where viable”,</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The Local Plan Strategy takes account of the definition of sustainable development as advocated in the National Planning Policy Framework and the overall policy is considered consistent with the objectives set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The policy is considered to appropriately address issues including the efficient use of land to protect best and versatile agricultural land and make use of previously developed land where possible.</p> <p>The policy is considered viable as evidenced in the Draft Core Strategy and CIL Viability Assessment study (2013).</p> <p>The comments on individual sites relate to the Local Plan Strategy sites (CS) and Strategic Locations (SL), or to Non Preferred Sites (NPS). They are dealt with in more detail in the response to those consultation points.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 9.1 Now includes the five guiding principles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF</li> <li>• SD1 (14) now includes the word cultural</li> <li>• Para 9.2 now includes the NPPF actual definition of Sustainable Development rather than the previous Ministerial Foreword reference. It also acknowledges the three roles of Sustainable Development in achieving a balance of economic, social and environmental factors.</li> <li>• The rest of the issues raised are largely covered through the specific policies elsewhere in the Core Strategy</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SD2: Sustainable Development</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 67 (Support: 6 / Object: 49 / Comment Only: 12)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yeowood Garden Village meet all of these principles and that addressing the impacts of climate change in terms of both mitigation and adaptation is crucial. It actively addresses the issue of carbon emissions and impact on the wider environment through mitigation and adaption measures to combat this</li> <li>• I support Policy SD 2 but development must be preceded by the infrastructure needed to support it is all cases.</li> <li>• We welcome the content of this policy.</li> <li>• The landowners are supportive of policy SD2. The use of Table 9.1 in the assessment of planning applications would also prove to be useful.</li> <li>• The Trust is pleased to support the general and detailed approach to sustainable development as set out in this Policy. The specific references to landscape character and heritage assets (and their settings) are especially apt in the context of Cheshire East's environmental assets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SD2 fails to meet the following tests of soundness because: 1 It is not justified: The Table 9.1 Access to services and amenities is not robustly justified nor is there a defined approach to measuring the distance</li> <li>• viability of development is a key consideration and therefore that it will not be feasible for infrastructure to be provided in advance of development in all cases and that suitable trigger points will be agreed for contributions and completion of works</li> <li>• The criteria and distances are a recipe for creating ghettos. Yet more areas with run down convenience stores, deserted pubs and antisocial behaviour. Whilst it is laudable to want people to stay within their locality to shop the reality is that internet and out of town shopping districts will remain the norm in the long term.</li> <li>• Development in Cheshire East faces viability challenges and will continue to during the plan-period. A balance will need to be struck between seeking, for example public open space, public realm, or other services, and ensuring the deliverability of development.</li> <li>• Concerns over the prescriptive nature of the accessibility criteria within the policy and lack of evidence to suggest whether this is realistic or achievable.</li> <li>• Object to the proposal of Policy SD 2, which requires a contribution towards identified infrastructure/ service facilities. The Council also need to consider how this policy will operate if and when a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is introduced in the future.</li> <li>• With the relevance of design quality, Design Guides, Codes and Briefs should be required for more than as stated, encouraging the preparation and adoption by communities of Design Guides.</li> </ul> |

The priority for retail development to be located in town centres should be strengthened in the CS Policy

- Growth and sustainability is a myth. We cannot go on as we are firefighting an ever increasing population and assuming all resource and pollution problems will be solved.
- 79 under services and amenities- suggest 500m - as that is what helps develop and sustain communities.
- The aspiration to promote sustainable development and the general terms of Policy SD2 is supported. However, in our opinion Table 9.1 should be revised to allow for a flexible approach to assessing the distances to services and amenities to be adopted thereby avoiding a rigid application of the policy to all development scenarios
- Core Strategy to provide equal weight to the role played by environmental factors compared to economic and social ones. SD2 remove 'where possible' as it does not appear in paragraph 7 of the NPPF. CWT recommends CEC is positive over its policies and removes 'get out clauses'
- Clarify how SD2 will be practically implemented
- Development should not be forced on small communities that are not currently sustainable and do not want to attain that status. The list of sustainability criteria should become an absolute requirement for all items, however the requirement for a Post Office should be removed as they are already consigned to history for most communities.
- In terms of meeting the current needs for Wilmslow all housing and commercial developments should be restricted to what is possible on brown sites, mixed sites offering brown curtilage, recycled sites, sites with a history of being brown and windfall. The availability of brown sites is the limiting factor.
- This Policy imposes a number of requirements which development proposals must adhere to, and to which we object. the Policy as drafted does not contain sufficient flexibility, particularly as some of the assessment criteria are subjective and thus will require a degree of professional judgement. Our Client therefore considers that "where possible" should be included in the first sentence
- We object to the checklist approach to assessing sustainable development as set out in policy SD2. This approach does not accord with paragraph 7 of the NPPF, which states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development. Does not accord with NPPF para 55; this approach will not deliver the min 2000 dwellings in other settlement and rural areas required under policy PG6
- Object - policy is unsound, inflexible and repetitious of national policy & makes no reference to viability & could have a detrimental impact upon the viability of schemes which will then affect delivery and put the plan at risk. Viability should be applicable in relation to matters such as contributions to infrastructure, services, facilities & other detailed requirements. New wording is suggested.

**List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered**

- A recognition within the policy that 100% grant funded schemes receive government funding and as a result contributions to all of the requirements will jeopardise the viability of a project
  - needed to set out more precisely what constitutes sustainable development
  - Replace the word "expect" by the word "require" in the policy
  - CPRE strongly supports the existing content of this policy. However, it should also include a requirement for all development to minimise and wherever possible reduce levels of air, light and noise pollution, and to protect tranquil areas and dark skies..
  - Development is "expected" to comply with a number of listed conditions about the sustainability of the development. Replace with the word "required". To conform with NPPF.
  - Under point 2. add 'Provide and support existing or new community hubs such as community/village hall communities to support existing and/or new communities'.  
Criteria: Why not include community/village hall facilities in this list on page 79 under services and amenities- suggest 500m - as that is what helps develop and sustain communities.
  - Whilst the policy confirms that the distances are recommended distances, the policy should go further and refer to the table as illustrative or indicative and state that the distances are provided as a guide, benchmark or minimum thresholds. The table should quote a range of distances to allow flexibility in the application of the policy and to cover those instances where site specific characteristics or geographical elements might make a development sustainable where a strict adherence to the distances quoted in the policy otherwise wouldn't
  - Core Strategy to provide equal weight to the role played by environmental factors compared to economic and social ones. SD2 remove 'where possible' as it does not appear in paragraph 7 of the NPPF. CWT recommends CEC is positive over its policies and removes 'get out clauses'
  - Clarify how SD2 will be practically implemented
  - The supporting text to Policy SD2 should refer to the agreement of appropriate trigger points through planning obligations and conditions in respect of securing necessary and desirable infrastructure, recognising the need for deliverable and viable developments.
  - This Policy imposes a number of requirements which development proposals must adhere to, and to which we object. The Policy as drafted does not contain sufficient flexibility, particularly as some of the assessment criteria are subjective and thus will require a degree of professional judgement. Our Client therefore considers that "where possible" should be included in the first sentence
  - Criteria and distances need adjusting to take into account that 69% of household have 2 or more cars. Convenience stores will not alter this fact.
  - Development should not be forced on small communities that are not currently sustainable and do not want to attain that status. The list of sustainability criteria should become an absolute requirement for all items,

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>however the requirement for a Post Office should be removed as they are already consigned to history for most communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SD2 should make explicit reference to the balance that will need to be struck between seeking, public open space, public realm, or other services, and ensuring the deliverability of development.</li> <li>• The policy should be amended to remove the prescriptive accessibility criteria.</li> <li>• Policy SD 2 should be redrafted to note that potential financial contributions from development should be requested and agreed to on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul> <p>It should also be noted that a balance needs to be created, whereby development does not become unviable due to overburdening contributions.</p> <p>Finally Cheshire East should make reference as to how Policy SD 2 will alter in the future if a CIL is introduced for the authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the relevance of design quality, Design Guides, Codes and Briefs should be required for more than as stated, encouraging the preparation and adoption by communities of Design Guides.</li> </ul> <p>The priority for retail development to be located in town centres should be strengthened in the CS Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to address the conflicts above and ensure that the policy criteria set out within Policy SD2 are sound, it is requested that Cheshire East Council: 1 Justifies Table 9.1 robustly justify a defined approach to measuring the distance.</li> <li>• The entire Plan is supposed to be based on sustainable development principles and therefore this policy is not required. Table 9.1 fails to consider gradients in its distance thresholds and is therefore ineffective. Both SD 2 and Table 9.1 should be deleted</li> <li>• We object to the checklist approach to assessing sustainable development. This approach does not accord with paragraph 7 of the NPPF, which states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development or paragraph 55; this approach will not deliver the min 2000 dwellings in other settlement and rural areas required under policy PG6.</li> <li>• This policy should be amended as follows to include additional clauses in point 1 i:<br/>Policy SD 2<br/>Sustainable Development Principles<br/>1. All development will be expected to:<br/>i. <b>Where viable</b>, Provide or contribute towards identified infrastructure, services or facilities.</li> <li>• Change Policy SD 2 to ensure that development is preceded by the infrastructure needed to support it in all cases.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The distances quoted in Table 9.1 are taken from the North West Sustainability checklist (now revoked) which has been backed by the Department of Communities and Local Government ( DCLG) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). Distances are taken from the centre of a site using footpaths or roads to calculate their distances.</p> <p>It is clear that the figures contained in Table 9.1 are a guide to the appropriate</p>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>distances for access to services and amenities. These distances are already used as guidance in the assessment and determination of major planning applications submitted to the Council and has been used in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The comments received in this section on individual sites relate to the Local Plan Strategy sites (CS) and Strategic Locations (SL), or to Non Preferred Sites (NPS). They are dealt with in more detail in the response to those consultation points.</p> <p>References to design and other principles are appropriate in detail for the purposes of the Local Plan Strategy. Further detail on such matters are to be provided in other policies contained in the Local Plan Strategy or will be included in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document or subsequent Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>The policy is considered viable as evidenced in the Draft Core Strategy and CIL Viability Assessment study (2013)</p> <p>Other issues raised are either covered in more detail elsewhere within the Core Strategy or are not appropriate for inclusion in SD 2.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | No material changes are proposed to be made to this policy   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 10 Infrastructure and Policy IN1: Infrastructure</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 72 (Support: 9 / Object: 32 / Comment Only: 31)</b><br>Chapter 10: 26 (Support: 3 / Object: 12 / Comment Only: 11)<br>IN1: 46 (Support: 6 / Object: 20 / Comment Only: 20)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Trust welcomes the underlying positive approach to Infrastructure provision, which is recognised as crucial to the well-being of any society. The Trust therefore supports Policy IN1. However, the Council should recognise that not all Social and Community facilities will be developer funded. The Council should also recognise the infrastructure requirements for an ageing population</li> <li>• Support for specific charges on developers to improve infrastructure. Infrastructure needs to be considered more widely</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details on finance needed to deliver required infrastructure</li> <li>• Infrastructure issues are not addressed for those areas (the south of the region). No solutions are forthcoming.</li> <li>• We would like to see clarity on whether this will apply to affordable housing but believe that CIL contributions should be omitted from 100% grant funded affordable housing schemes, as they are an added cost</li> <li>• The establishment of a sustainable growth village south-east of Crewe at the Gorstyhill Site would complement existing infrastructure and incorporate appropriate on site services and facilities</li> <li>• More specific input on differentiated aspects of infrastructure required</li> <li>• Education, medical and leisure facilities to go hand in hand with housing development. Support improvements at J17. Traffic flow at Old Mill Road / Congleton road should be improved. Support for provision of allotments in all new development. Would like to see clear and specific commitment to cycle routes.</li> <li>• The highways infrastructure is already totally inadequate, and suffering from serious under-investment as regards maintenance. What few proposals are made relate to mitigation measures to treat today's congestion / accident problems. They are totally inadequate to address the forecast growth.</li> <li>• There is no commitment to adequately maintain even the existing infrastructure, let alone future improvements</li> <li>• Development on this scale requires a strategic approach to infrastructure especially around the Crewe area and this is sorely lacking in this document.</li> <li>• Major increases needed in the roads infrastructure proposals to ensure they meet the needs of the new developments. At present they do not even deal with current traffic</li> <li>• Development on Wilmslow sites and other developments such as Woodford should not be allowed until the proper infrastructure is in place,</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>as stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your plans for Knutsford contravene the definition of sustainable development as set out by the World Commission on Environment and Development, quoted in your own document. In addition the air pollution in the centre of Knutsford is already above the LEGAL limit before any additional houses are built.</li> <li>• With direct reference to Alsager, I do not object in principle to the long term development of the town. However, I am amazed that no infrastructure strategies have been published, without which the entire plan for this area becomes unsustainable and self 'blocking'</li> <li>• The Infrastructure Delivery Plan demonstrates little sense of a coherent strategy for the community of Alsager which has had imposed upon it in a top-down manner by the Council the biggest increase in housing development proportionate to the size of its current community. The Council has offered nothing in terms of investment or infrastructure support..</li> <li>• If precise routing of new roads isn't available for consultation right now, they should be removed from the plan and it submitted for examination urgently.</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs of new development not adequately addressed. In Knutsford schemes proposed are detrimental to the town if indeed they are practical at all. More consideration needed</li> <li>• There should be an over-arching commitment that new infrastructure which has environmental consequences will not be provided until an environmental impact assessment and an economic impact assessment has been carried out and unless there is a very robust business case for it</li> <li>• Comments relate to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Disagree with £0 allocated for Green Infrastructure. Include existing projects in plan. Highways list to include smaller projects. Road network projects exclude some on the LAP list. GI not covered in table 4. Level crossings part of Nantwich character. Disagree there is surplus in primary school. Identify full shortfall of sport provision</li> <li>• CWT considers green infrastructure not adequately addressed in policies IN1 and IN2 and considers evidence from the DIDP inadequate with little data, objectives, project details or funding. DIDP conflicts LP vision to reduce carbon emissions and car travel. Unacceptable to state from DIPD for open space to be included as future development sites. Green infrastructure should be joined up.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We require clarity on how the levies will be applied to affordable housing</li> <li>• The Core Strategy should recognise Gorstyhill as preferred location for sustainable development of a growth village south east of Crewe in the context of sustainable infrastructure use and planning for the area</li> <li>• More specific input on differentiated aspects of infrastructure required</li> <li>• Commitment to cycle routes</li> <li>• Road system in Knutsford is unfit for purpose. Road management needed. Progress can be anticipated in regard to educational, medical/health facilities</li> <li>• Cheshire East will acquire adequate means of maintain existing</li> </ul>   |

infrastructure and allow for future increases within the plan

- A fully costed IMPROVEMENT plan to cater for the predicted growth, which would of course be subject to adequate funding. The foreseen source of funding should be made i.e. Government Investment, CIL / Developer contributions.
- Major additional new roads (or improvements above the current proposals) as follows: -
  - Barthomley Link dualled and A500 through road at Jn 16 M6, (to be a 3-level junction)
  - Sandbach to Crewe North new road to alleviate Crewe Green roundabout
  - Congleton A34 bypass, with not major development allowed along it
  - A555 A6-Airport road to have 2 level junctions, NOT traffic light junctions
  - Major changes at the A555/A34.B5094 junction to improve A34 traffic flow
  - Additional entrance to Crewe Retail Park via new rail bridge off Macon Way
- Sustainability measures put in place before any development takes place and only enough houses to meet the new levels. All reserved land removed from the plan
- Alsager. There is a perfect route for a north about bypass that would enable a traffic/pedestrian friendly town centre (similar to Poynton), an easy access/egress to/from the east, centre and west and the resultant encapsulation of land that would provide for at least thirty years of housing growth. It would also provide for the further provision of re-planned drainage and other essential services that are currently outdated and at full stretch. Please see further details in the Alsager section of this site. It's called 'joined up thinking'
- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan demonstrates little sense of a coherent strategy for the community of Alsager which has had imposed upon it in a top-down manner by the Council the biggest increase in housing development proportionate to the size of its current community. The Council has offered nothing in terms of investment or infrastructure support..
- Cease work on route planning for new roads and submit the plan for examination immediately without them
- Knutsford relief road should be considered as part of any safeguarded land proposals
- There should be an over-arching commitment that new infrastructure which has environmental consequences will not be provided until an environmental impact assessment and an economic impact assessment has been carried out and unless there is a very robust business case for it
- Comments relate to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Disagree with £0 allocated for Green Infrastructure. Include existing projects in plan. Highways list to include smaller projects. Road network projects exclude some on the LAP list. GI not covered in table 4. Level crossings part of Nantwich character. Disagree there is surplus in primary school. Identify full shortfall of sport provision
- Green infrastructure should be joined up. Existing GI studies of Cheshire

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>East are generally based on very coarse grain assessments of the region (TEP 2011) which, for example, does not include Local Wildlife Sites in Biodiversity Plan. Only Crewe has a more detailed GI Plan to date. GI should receive a similar amount of consideration and planning as all other types of infrastructure so that, as required by the NPPF, the environment is considered on equal terms with the economy and society. Why are the conclusions of the Green Space Strategy (January 2013) not part of the Draft?</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan, including the GI requirements for Principal Towns, Key and Local SCs, and the Countryside? These should be fully costed and programmed elements of the IDP. Why is the GSS not listed as Key Evidence for IN1 and IN2? Section 106 and CIL payments could be directed to the completion of an evidence-based Nature Conservation Strategy for CE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At paragraph 10.4 line 3 insert and ageing before population. At paragraph 10.7 add: It is recognised that some community infrastructure will be funded directly by the voluntary sector</li> <li>• More emphasis on wider interpretation of infrastructure support for Local Service Centres and small communities</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that Local Plans should “plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies” of the national planning policy framework. Strategic infrastructure requirements are set out in the Core Strategy in the Site Specific Principles of Development for each allocation or strategic location and in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There also needs to be flexibility to allow the Council to seek developer contributions for other infra-structure needs that emerge during the plan period. The Council is expected to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the balance between what monies are collected between s106 and CIL will be part of this process. The level of contributions will be determined through the s106 and CIL setting agenda.</p> <p>In Chapter 13 Sustainable Environment” Policy SE6 Green Infrastructure covers green infrastructure assets and present and future requirements. The Green Space Strategy (2013), part of the Council’s Evidence base, provides a strategic overview in relation to green infrastructure looking at open space, country parks, rights of way, landscape and biodiversity. It provides the basis for more detailed policy formulation such as the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations for open space requirements. Detail will also be required at the site allocation stage.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The word “ageing” has been added to paragraph 10.4 line before population</li> <li>• The strategic policies covering Green Infrastructure are contained in policy SE6 Green Infrastructure.</li> <li>• The Green Spaces Strategy has not been included in the Core Strategy as it is a preparatory document setting out future requirements for more detailed policy formulation such as the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations for open space requirements. Detail will also be required at the site allocation stage.</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point (24)</b>  | <b>Policy IN2: Developer Contributions</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 34 (Support: 5 / Object: 18 / Comment Only: 11)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy is supported</li> <li>• A full transportation planning process must be undertaken before such massive and far reaching proposals are implemented, this will add further land take requirements needed to provide the required infrastructure</li> <li>• A policy relating to developer contributions is broadly supported by Taylor Wimpey, Harrow Estates plc and Avro Heritage provided that it does not render a development unviable in the context of the Framework [§173].</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer contributions are only a form of official bribery. For some minor fancy frills they get to put up large, cheaply built, unimaginative developments (built to standards way below that of the rest of Northern Europe). Huge profits for the developers, minimal improvements for residents. Popular with local councils and the government, but a lousy deal for the people and the environment.</li> <li>• CEC should pay for the roads and be completely separate from developers - too many sites are being given to developers in exchange for roads we wouldn't need anyway. If they were needed, they would be strategic roads and would be funded by central government.</li> <li>• The Community infrastructure levy should be flexible with regard to extensions. There is a conflict with wording in policy IN1</li> <li>• Part 1 should seek proportionate contributions reflecting the impact of the proposals. Where cumulative impacts are identified, all developments should make equal/proportionate contributions. Plan should include mechanism for strategic priorities to be reflected in planning obligations associated with strategic development proposals, which would be the case if a CIL Charging Schedule is adopted</li> <li>• We object to the absence of acknowledgement of the need for consideration of the potential impact of developer contributions on the viability and therefore deliverability of the development.</li> <li>• flexibility is required in order that S106/CIL does not make development unviable, particularly in rural areas</li> <li>• We object to the absence of acknowledgement of the need for consideration of the potential impact of developer contributions on the viability and therefore deliverability of the development.<br/>Change required to make it sound:<br/>Introduce such acknowledgement</li> <li>• Will Cheshire East compensate developers who provide contributions, for example by the Council offering additional land or permission to build in the Green Belt in return for those contributions e.g. at Alderley Park.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practicalities of developer infrastructure contributions</li> <li>• New infrastructure requires should be in place before developments impact on capacity.</li> <li>• I support Policy IN 2 except in that funds raised through S106 agreements or CIL should be spent in the area within which they are raised.</li> <li>• The comments upon Policy IN1 above are equally relevant to this policy. Part vi. of Policy IN2 indicates that until CIL is in place Section 106 agreements will be used to pool contributions. The Council will be aware of the Government's intention to 'roll- back' the use of Section 106 agreements by April 2015 or local adoption of CIL, whichever is sooner.</li> <li>• Local Plan must set out a positive strategy for the historic environment. Council should consider CIL impacts on future investment to secure the future of heritage asset. Heritage should be considered in CIL strategy. Encouraging local authorities to assert in their Delivery Plan or Draft Charging Schedules the right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances specifically where the requirement.</li> <li>• Planning Obligations should be sought where they meet all the test set out in CIL Regulations 2012. There should also be some flexibility for negotiation of obligations on a site by site basis in order to encourage rather than hinder development, taking account of economic viability and other factors</li> <li>• Point (iii) states that contributions may be collected towards 'Ongoing revenue such as the management and maintenance of services and facilities'.</li> </ul> <p>NHS England Comment:</p> <p>The cost impact of additional health infrastructure will be a combination of non recurrent capital and recurrent costs determined by the means of delivering the infrastructure. The impact of recurrent infrastructure costs to NHS England is very significant and will be recognised in the emerging health infrastructure strategies and delivery plans and requests for developer contributions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council need to ensure that paragraph 204 of NPPF is met in relation to developer contributions and that the scale of contributions are not too onerous as to render schemes unviable and hinder development from coming forwards.</li> <li>• A full transportation planning process must be undertaken before such massive and far reaching proposals are implemented, this will add further land take requirements needed to provide the required infrastructure.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development should be assessed on the true impact on infrastructure on a local basis rather than a national formula. The cost should be allocated as a part of the planning process. Once determined it should be paid up front, in full and the changes started before the development can disrupt the current infrastructure. Public records should be available to ensure this happens. This system will; 1) Ensure infrastructure is never an issue, 2) Allow for the Council to properly control its budget, 3) Make developers have social responsibility for the areas that they develop, 4) Prevent land banking, 5) Support the sustainability ethos of the NPPF</li> </ul>  |

- Increase the parts of 10.16, Include signposting; sporting facilities; cultural facilities and recreational facilities
- Funds raised through S106 agreements or CIL should be spent in the area within which they are raised.
- Add to point 1 after realm, "community"  
Add word "local" before the word strategic.  
Paragraph 10.16 f. Add the word ", community" after sporting
- Please see attachment to rep PRE-3475 to read in context of full response.
- For the historic environment in particular, we therefore encourage the Council to ensure that the conservation of its heritage assets is taken into account when considering the level of the CIL to be imposed to safeguard and encourage appropriate and viable uses for the historic environment. The document does not refer to the historic environment.  
The application of a local CIL charge on development, which affects heritage assets or their settings, might lead to harm being caused to their historic significance. For example, there could be circumstances where the viability of a scheme designed to respect the setting of a heritage asset in terms of its quantum of development, could be threatened by the application of CIL. There could equally be issues for schemes, which are designed to secure the long-term viability of the historic environment (either through re-using a heritage asset or through enabling development).  
The regulations emphasise the need to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy with the potential effects, which CIL might have upon the economic viability of development across its area.  
We are therefore also encouraging local authorities to assert in their Delivery Plan or Draft Charging Schedules the right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances specifically where the requirement to pay CIL would threaten the viability of schemes designed to ensure the reuse of heritage assets identified on English Heritage's Register of Heritage at Risk.  
Following guidance set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Relief Information Document (2011), the conditions and procedures for this could be set out within a separate statement. The statement could set out the criteria to define exceptional circumstances and provide a clear rationale for their use, including the justification in terms of the public benefit (for example, where CIL relief would enable the restoration of heritage assets identified on English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register.) For clarity, the statement could also reiterate the necessary requirements and procedures that would be followed in such cases, including the need for appropriate notification and consultation.  
The report does not include the historic environment in its list of exemptions from CIL or indeed in any of the key projects listed in the document. We urge the Council to reserve the right to offer CIL relief for particular cases, which affect heritage assets in order to avoid unintended harm to the historic environment through the application of CIL. English Heritage would strongly advise that the local authority's conservation staff

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>are involved throughout the preparation and implementation of the Draft Charging Schedule as they are often best placed to advise on local historic environment issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ref Point (iii) - The cost impact of additional health infrastructure will be a combination of non recurrent capital &amp; recurrent costs determined by the means of delivering the infrastructure. The impact of recurrent infrastructure costs to NHS England is very significant &amp; will be recognised in the emerging health infrastructure strategies &amp; delivery plans &amp; requests for developer contributions.</li> <li>• strict separation of commercial and communal financial interests</li> <li>• Reduction in the proposed outrageous housing figures CEC are using would reduce the need for more roads.</li> <li>• Introduce flexibility with regard to extensions.</li> <li>• The Policy (IN2) should include appropriate wording to ensure contributions are proportionate to the impacts of development and secured on a fair and equitable basis. Further, if enhanced contributions are sought, to deliver strategic priorities of Cheshire East Council, there should be a reference in the policy to facilitate reordering of priorities which can be reflected in S106 heads of terms to ensure the delivery of more sustainable development.</li> <li>• Policy IN2 should make explicit reference to the balance that will need to be struck between seeking, for example public open space, public realm, or other services, and ensuring the deliverability of development</li> <li>• Until amendments are made to Policy IN2, and flexibility is built into policy text and supporting justification the policy is not considered to be Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy</li> <li>• Introduce acknowledgement of the need for consideration of the potential impact of developer contributions on the viability and therefore deliverability of the development.</li> <li>• Additional text should be inserted into the policy text of IN2 to confirm that financial viability will be a consideration when establishing the level of developer contribution that is appropriate for new developments</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that Local Plans should “plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies” of the national planning policy framework.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure requirements are set out in the Core Strategy in the Site Specific Principles of Development for each allocation or strategic location and in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There also needs to be flexibility to allow the Council to seek developer contributions for other infra-structure needs that emerge during the plan period. The Council is expected to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the balance between what monies are collected between s106 and CIL will be part of this process. The level of contributions will be determined through the s106 and CIL setting agenda.</p> <p>Matters such as deliverability and viability will be taken into account. Viability is already considered in some of the detailed policies such as SE6 regarding green infrastructure. All types of infrastructure will be examined through the s106 and</p>   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | CIL setting agenda including aspects that relate to the historic environment, local needs, health etc.  |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | The specific points of detailed raised here will be covered by the CIL regulations upon adoption of a charging schedule. Therefore the detail is not required at this stage of the plan preparation but will be taken forward for consideration at the drawing up of the charging schedule. |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Chapter 11: Enterprise and Growth</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 29 (Support: 7 / Object: 14 / Comment Only: 8)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be linked to Rural Affordable Housing requirements</li> <li>• Essential to underpin the social and environmental objectives of the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Science and Technology Corridor welcomed to meet needs of existing and future workforce</li> <li>• Support for Council's ambition to secure economic growth, including inward investment, retention of jobs and job creation</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot sustain additional traffic burdens at J16 and J17 with further development in the M6 Corridor</li> <li>• Policies in Section are too vague and open to wide interpretation with 'get out' clauses</li> <li>• At least 3 iterations of what constitutes the 'High Growth City', so needs to be clarified</li> <li>• Nantwich should not be considered as a growth node (see Fig. 11.1)</li> <li>• Crewe growth should not be diluted by focus on M6 Corridor, which will encourage unsustainable travel patterns and cause significant cross-boundary issues</li> <li>• Need for Motorway Service Areas to contribute to the local economy</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEC economy cannot be successful if significant outmigration to work continues</li> <li>• Need to reference business tourism</li> <li>• Proactive approach to AZ at Alderley Park while facilities and buildings still exist</li> <li>• Employment growth to be shared between towns (eg Congleton), not all focused on Crewe</li> <li>• Manchester Airport is a major asset to the region with considerable potential to stimulate and attract economic activity</li> <li>• Protect Ashley village from increased traffic from airport expansion</li> <li>• Broaden scope of high-tech business and safeguard countryside to attract highly qualified individuals and improve public transport to such businesses</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Crewe's potential for business tourism</li> <li>• There must be a fair share of employment for each town as part of integral development</li> <li>• Remove any plans for development in M6 Corridor</li> <li>• Focus on tackling economic disadvantaged in Crewe with local jobs for local people</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-write policies in Section where they are vague and open to interpretation</li> <li>• Define what constitutes 'High Growth City'</li> <li>• Clarify growth nodes in Fig. 11.1</li> <li>• Temper focus on M6 Corridor in paragraph 11.3 and remove Fig. 11.1</li> <li>• Re-designate AZ Macclesfield as 'Opportunity Site'</li> <li>• Add policy regarding Motorway Service Areas</li> <li>• Add places of worship to Policy EG2 (6)</li> <li>• Plan for full economic and housing needs of all parts of Borough</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>It is accepted that Crewe may have potential for business tourism, but the policy framework is not considered to prejudice against such developments coming forward during the plan period. Similarly, a policy on Motorway Service Areas is recommended for inclusion in the plan's highway policies and a case for adding 'opportunity areas' is addressed in the response to Policy EG3.</p> <p>The apportionment of development is covered in Policy PG6 (Spatial Distribution), but the Case for Growth in Chapter 5 highlights the potential to focus on the M6 corridor and 'High Growth City' where full advantage can be taken of accessibility to local employment centres such as Crewe, Alsager, Sandbach and Congleton in order to promote economic prosperity for the benefit of local communities.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | No material change required.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>EG1 Economic Prosperity</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | <b>Total: 18 (Support: 3 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 8)</b><br>Economic Prosperity: 5 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 4)<br>EG1: 13 (Support: 2 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlight positive role of good performing hospitals for local economy, Leighton Hospital as big an employer for Crewe as Bentley Motors</li> <li>• Barclays to continue development in 'North Cheshire Science Corridor' to provide centre of excellence</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already 30 years supply of employment land so why take Green Belt land in Macclesfield?</li> <li>• Lack of proper research and consultation with business to identify true employment land need</li> <li>• Priority of development at Crewe and Macclesfield should be emphasised</li> <li>• Policy is not sufficiently flexible and should not preclude other employment generating (ie non-B Class uses) coming forward on allocated employment or mixed use sites as per paragraph 21 of NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ensure Cheshire agriculture continues and prospers</li> <li>• Add in visitor economy worth £689m</li> <li>• Key employment sites being diluted by housing (e.g. Sandbach J17)</li> <li>• Rural economy supports home working for high-tech businesses who may leave rural Cheshire East should over-development occur</li> <li>• Policy EG1 (2) is over-restrictive given that town plans prioritise housing at the expense of employment</li> <li>• Waiting 30 years for employment development, need jobs more than houses</li> <li>• Submission on Bridgemere Nursery and Garden World for alternative retail, business, tourism or leisure purposes</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add visitor economy to para. 11.14</li> <li>• Mention positive role of hospitals in contributing to local economy</li> <li>• CEC should use existing employment land not Green Belt</li> <li>• Research properly employment need and make Policy EG1 more definitive</li> <li>• Amend Part 1 of policy to read "Proposals for employment development (Use Classes B1, B2 or B8) will be directed to and supported in the Principal Towns in the first instance. Additional employment development will be supported in principle in the Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres as well as on employment land allocated in the Development Plan."</li> <li>• Add Part 3 of policy to read "Proposals for other employment generating uses will be supported in principle where it can be demonstrated that they would accord with the wider policies of the Plan."</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Whilst it is accepted that ‘...and tourism’ could usefully be added to paragraph 11.14 and that Leighton Hospital does contribute positively to the local economy, it is not considered that the other suggested changes to Parts 1 and 3 of the policy would add any value to the plan.</p> <p>In terms of research and defining employment needs, the <i>Employment Land Review</i> has been subject to considerable public consultation and therefore provides part of a robust evidence base in support of the plan policies and proposals.</p> <p>The case for an amendment to the Green Belt around Macclesfield is addressed in responses to Policies PG3 and PG4.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>The words ‘...and tourism’ be added at the end of paragraph 11.14.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>EG2: Rural Economy</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 23 (Support: 11 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 7)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local rural employment and recreational uses should be supported on a scale suitable to rural villages</li> <li>Support subject to minor wording change</li> <li>Support for sustainable tourism uses and facilities</li> <li>Important to respect local character and not introduce large volumes of traffic to more remote rural areas</li> <li>Public or green transport accessibility needs to be considered</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criterion 5 could lead to unplanned development</li> <li>Criterion 2 provides undue restriction on employment uses through sequential test contrary to NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No acknowledgement of Waters Corporation or 'Airport City' and potential influence on Wilmslow</li> <li>We need jobs not houses</li> <li>The statement about encouraging sustainable farming is not being adhered to</li> <li>Need to take account of characteristics and trading of modern garden centres, particularly reference to goods being produced on site in explanatory note (footnote 41)</li> <li>New dwellings may be 'sustainable' in terms of carbon footprint, but agricultural land is not sustainable when it is built on</li> <li>Footnote 41 may be unnecessary and difficult to enforce</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanatory text in Footnote 41 should be deleted or revised</li> <li>Remove Criterion 5 to ensure residents views are taken into account</li> <li>Remove Criterion 2 to recognise local employment growth in rural villages can provide opportunities to support the vitality of rural settlements</li> <li>Amend sub-paragraph (ii) to read "Supports the rural economy and could not reasonably be expected to locate within a designated centre by reason of their products sold and/or services and facilities"</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>It is not considered appropriate to delete or revise Footnote 41 or sub-paragraph (ii) as this has the potential to undermine the retail strategy by indirectly supporting out-of-town retailing, particularly garden centres. With respect to Criteria 2 and 5, these are considered to be promotional and positive in supporting a sustainable rural economy and therefore should not be removed.</p> <p>A reference to the Waters Corporation is addressed in response to Policy EG3.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | No material change required.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Policy EG3: Existing and Allocated Employment Sites</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 16 (Support: 4 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy of protecting existing employment sites for employment uses (e.g. Radbroke Hall, Knutsford)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should only apply to either a list of key sites or site size thresholds, other smaller sites should be given the option to convert to other uses including small scale residential</li> <li>• Does not promote flexible use of land as per NPPF</li> <li>• Policy at risk of sterilising derelict/vacant employment sites</li> <li>• Too much land allocated for employment use</li> <li>• Social and economic benefits of alternative uses such as retail should also be acknowledged</li> <li>• Question the reference to ‘regular review’ in Criterion 3</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Radnor Park Trading Estate should be abandoned in favour of housing and relocated nearer to M6</li> <li>• No mention of now-closed BAE site at Woodford</li> <li>• Need to encourage supplier facilities to Bentley Motors in and around Crewe</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to clarify how this policy links with Policy EG2 in rural areas</li> <li>• Policy should only apply to list of key sites or sites over a certain threshold size to allow alternative uses on smaller sites</li> <li>• Change wording to ensure consistency with NPPF</li> <li>• Re-phrase criterion 2 removing requirement to explore possibilities of including employment uses in future development</li> <li>• Economic benefits of non-B Class uses, such as retail, should be fully considered in redevelopment proposals</li> <li>• Reference to ‘regular review’ in criterion 3 should be clarified</li> <li>• Abandon further employment development at Radnor Park, relocate closer to M6 and abandon Congleton Link Road</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>It is considered that the policy would benefit by listing the key strategic employment sites which underpin the Borough’s strong economic base and which the Council would not wish to release from the employment land portfolio. Whilst some sites are highlighted in paragraph 11.24, the list is by no means exhaustive and could reasonably be supplemented by other sites as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crewe Green Business Park, Crewe</li> <li>• Crewe Gates Industrial Estate, Crewe</li> <li>• Waters Corporation, Wilmslow</li> <li>• Sanofi/Aventis, Holmes Chapel</li> </ul>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>Criterion 2 is considered to be a fundamental and justifiable objective in those instances where alternative development proposals are supported on existing employment sites; this should be emphasised to promote sustainable, mixed-use re-development schemes. However, the key tests should not be compromised on smaller sites, as viability and suitability must still be addressed. Footnote 42 provides a further test in relation to a period of marketing, currently not less than 12 months. In order to provide some flexibility on this test, it is felt that a period of not less than 2 years would be appropriate.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these criteria, alternative uses such as retail would still be subject to rigorous tests, in addition to evidence of 'need'. The reference to periodic review is acknowledged, but will be forthcoming through updates to the <i>Employment Land Review</i> as well as <i>Annual Monitoring Reports</i>.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>It is recommended:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Paragraph 11.14 be supplemented by the addition of the following key strategic employment sites:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crewe Green Business Park, Crewe</li> <li>• Crewe Gates Industrial Estate, Crewe</li> <li>• Waters Corporation, Wilmslow</li> <li>• Sanofi/Aventis, Holmes Chapel</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. That the 'Key Strategic Employment Sites' be added to the Town Plans in the Local Plan –Submission Version.</li> <li>3. That the marketing period in Footnote 42 is amended to '<i>... not less than 2 years</i>'.</li> </ol>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Policy EG4: Tourism</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | <b>Total: 28 (Support: 10 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 13)</b><br>Tourism: 4 (Support: 2 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)<br>EG4: 24 (Support: 8 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 12)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to local economy to encourage tourism (eg Jodrell Bank)</li> <li>• Approach to tourism is well considered and consistent with national policy (National Trust)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care must be taken to avoid conflicts between tourism, wildlife and tranquillity</li> <li>• Policy fails to acknowledge key role that the wider countryside plays in the visitor economy</li> <li>• Openness and Green Belt throughout Nether Alderley must be protected and safeguarded under Policy EG4</li> <li>• Why promote and instigate removal of Romany's Caravan, one of few tourist attractions at Wilmslow?</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy would benefit from a further amendment which would support opportunities for heritage tourism</li> <li>• Figures quoted greatly underestimate contribution of tourism to Cheshire East economy</li> <li>• Important that visitor economy is able to maximise contribution to local economy</li> <li>• No reference to improving Rights of Way network and their importance as a tourism asset</li> <li>• Omission of various visitor/tourist attractions</li> <li>• Amend policy to support tourism development 'proximate to' Principal Towns and KSC's</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify that infrastructure also includes 'green infrastructure'</li> <li>• Include reference to an enhanced ROWIP which will connect tourist centres/attractions such as cycle routes and footpaths</li> <li>• Amend Criterion 2 and 3 to read 'proximate to' Principal Towns and KSC's and add (d) 'The proposals would support the overall sustainability of the local tourism economy'</li> <li>• In Criterion 3 (ii) (a) add 'or detract from the nature conservation value of the area' and in 3 (ii) (c) add 'infrastructure, including public transport'</li> <li>• Add new introductory paragraph to read 'The rich and varied natural and historic environment, and the beauty and character of the wider countryside, plays a vital role in the visitor economy of Cheshire East. These Borough-wide assets will be protected and where possible enhanced to help drive the visitor economy as well as for their own sake.'</li> <li>• Amend Criterion 1 (iii) to require enhanced/expanded attractions to respect</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>landscape/townscape character and be highly accessible by sustainable modes of transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Criterion 1 (v) to read ‘Encouraging and promoting opportunities for new tourist attractions in the historic and natural environment’ (English Heritage)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>It is considered that infrastructure includes ‘green infrastructure’, but this could be usefully clarified in paragraph 11.32 together with a reference to the Rights of Way Network. Similarly, the suggested additional wording in paragraph 11.26, together with amendments to Criterion 1, is broadly accepted, subject to a reference to ‘sustainable and appropriate locations’. However, the concept of adding ‘proximate’ to the criteria is not supported, as this could undermine the overall settlement strategy.</p>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Paragraph 11.26 be amended by adding an additional sentence to read: <i>‘The rich and varied natural and historic environment, and the beauty and character of the wider countryside, plays a vital role in the visitor economy of Cheshire East. These Borough-wide assets will be protected and where possible enhanced to help drive the visitor economy as well as for their own sake’.</i></li> <li>2. That Paragraph 11.32 be amended by adding ‘...including green infrastructure and improvements to the Right of Way Network’ after visitor economy.</li> <li>3. That a new Criterion 1 (v) be added as follows <i>‘Encouraging and promoting opportunities for new tourist attractions in the historic and natural environment in sustainable and appropriate locations.’</i></li> </ol> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy EG5: Promoting a Town Centre First Approach to Retail and Commerce</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 29 (Support: 5 / Object: 9 / Comment Only: 15)</b><br>Town Centres: 5 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 4)<br>EG5: 24 (Support: 5 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 11)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support subject to clarifying wording in Section 7 (ii)</li> <li>• Support for new comparison and convenience retailing in Local Service Centres (LSC's) to create sustainable communities</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should recognise the role for new local centres associated with sustainable urban extensions to be of appropriate scale and subject to retail assessment</li> <li>• Criterion 7 restricts development outside town centres where there is a proven need</li> <li>• No mention of residential development in town centres, especially for over 65's and first time buyers</li> <li>• Criteria 3 &amp; 6 ignored by Cheshire East Council in recent decisions</li> <li>• Absence of reference to mixed use sites which will provide local community facilities</li> <li>• Not compliant with Para. 23 of NPPF as Town Centres and Primary Shopping Areas not defined</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern at impact on Town Centres of by-pass proposals</li> <li>• No assurances that employment land at Handforth East will be entirely non-retail</li> <li>• No mention of other town centre uses such as leisure and education</li> <li>• Concern over proliferation of charity shops</li> <li>• CEC should support local businesses in town centres</li> <li>• Include improvements to the public realm (Richard Milkins – CEC)</li> <li>• No room in Middlewich 'town centre' to expand comparison and convenience retailing</li> <li>• Any community more than a mile from a town centre should have convenience retail outlet</li> <li>• Vast oversupply of retail/commercial space in town centres</li> <li>• Should include 'community' in Criterion 2</li> <li>• Should require high design quality (David Hallam - CEC)</li> <li>• Accepted that policy allows sufficient scope for retailing with particular characteristics (eg bulky goods) to be located in an edge or out-of-centre location</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 'visitor' in paragraph 11.37 after 'retail'</li> <li>• Include improvements to public realm (Richard Milkins – CEC)</li> <li>• Communities over a mile from town centres should have small local centre</li> <li>• Add 'community' after 'retail' in Criterion 2.</li> <li>• Add 'Proposals for town centres should ensure high design quality, particularly where the proposal affects a conservation area and/or a listed or locally listed building' (David Hallam – CEC)</li> <li>• Add (v) to Criterion 1 to read 'Local centres within new urban extension areas'</li> <li>• Amend policy to include 'where there is a proven need'</li> <li>• Add (v) to Criterion 1 to read 'Where appropriate, new retail facilities will be provided on mixed use sites as identified and set out within the Core Strategy'</li> <li>• Define Town Centres and Primary Shopping Areas in accordance with para 23 of NPPF</li> <li>• Reference sequential test for all retail developments over 2,500 sq m.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The inclusion of 'visitor' in paragraph 11.37 is accepted, but the provision of small local centres within a mile of town centres is not practical and in any event has been addressed in the determination of the settlement hierarchy; this provides a key strand of the plan's evidence base. With respect to urban extension areas and mixed use sites, it is considered that these are already included in the Core Strategy Sites and Strategic Locations, wherein there is provision for additional retail facilities.</p> <p>The reference to high quality design and improvements to the public realm are relevant, but already included elsewhere in the plan, notably Policies SD2 (Sustainable Development Principles) and SE1 (Design).</p> <p>Issues around 'need' and identifying Town Centres and Primary Shopping Areas will be addressed in 'saved' policies, as set out in paragraphs 11.41 – 11.44, but the Council will adopt the approach set out in paragraph 26 of the NPPF in relation to the sequential test for retail developments over 2,500 sq metres. This test could usefully be set out in the Reasoned Justification to the policy</p> <p>Town Centres and Primary Shopping Areas will be defined through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. Saved policies will continue to apply until that time.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p><b>It is recommended :</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the last sentence of paragraph 11.37 is amended to read: '<i>... commercial, retail, visitor and leisure hubs</i>'.</li> <li>2. That the following is added to paragraph 11.44: '<i>The Council will apply the sequential test set out in paragraph 26 of the NPPF when determining retail applications with a floorspace in excess of 2500 square metres</i>'.</li> </ol>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Chapter 12: Stronger Communities</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 17 (Support: 2 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 10)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In accordance with paragraphs 73 and 74 of NPPF and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy (<i>Sport England</i>)</li> <li>• Support putting people at the heart of decision making</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities need a more adequate voice</li> <li>• No evidence that localism is supported</li> <li>• Policies SC1 &amp; SC2 fail to promise there will be no net loss of facilities, SC3 fails to recognise need for good air quality, SC4 is wrong to assume land-hungry bungalows are right for all older residents, SC5 has a developer get out clause, SC6 should say what is not acceptable.</li> <li>• The introductory text should make an over-arching commitment to strive for a decent quality of life for all residents and to closely monitor air quality and to take action if it falls below acceptable levels.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shortage of suitable accommodation to allow people to downsize</li> <li>• Housing and employment needs to be matched – proposing to maximise housing in the south of the Borough where employment is least</li> <li>• Ignoring the character and distinctiveness of some towns in favour of others; to create strong communities need to make the places they live in attractive</li> <li>• Need for communities to retain their separate physical identities and community spirit</li> <li>• Agree that CEC need to meet the needs of it's local communities – infrastructure, services and facilities and an appropriate mix of housing – high quality and both market and affordable</li> <li>• Macclesfield should have a voice – a town council</li> <li>• To create strong communities and social cohesion – need good accessibility – rail, bus, cycleways, footpaths and accessible countryside</li> <li>• The establishment of a sustainable development at the Gorstyhill Site (NPS5) would contribute towards stronger communities in the area</li> <li>• Need for support for Neighbourhood Plans – put local people at heart of decision making</li> <li>• Wishes of local people must not be ignored as they are currently (example given – Willaston and green gap)</li> <li>• Community needs such as village halls and community centres are vital to building stronger communities</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific mention of need for communities to retain their separate physical identities and community spirit</li> <li>• Inclusion of village halls and community centres</li> <li>• Specific reference to place of worship/community facility in site allocations</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies SC1 &amp; SC2 fail to promise there will be no net loss of facilities, SC3 fails to recognise need for good air quality, SC4 is wrong to assume land-hungry bungalows are right for all older residents, SC5 has a developer get out clause, SC6 should say what is not acceptable.</li> <li>• The introductory text should make an over-arching commitment to strive for a decent quality of life for all residents and to closely monitor air quality and to take action if it falls below acceptable levels.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>This chapter sets out the importance of meeting the needs of communities and providing the infrastructure, services and facilities required to create sustainable and stronger communities. The chapter looks at improving the health and well-being and quality of life of all residents by maximising opportunities for communities to access housing, services and facilities and the provision of essential infrastructure. The chapter is considered to be in general conformity with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 8 “Promoting healthy communities”.</p> <p>Air quality concerns are addressed in the Sustainable Environment Chapter (Policy SE12 and supporting text).</p> <p>Comments regarding quality of life for all residents and community facilities are addressed in the proposed changes to the introductory text.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | <p>Paragraph 12.5 – add after the words Core Strategy will –“strive for a decent quality of life for all residents” and will contribute etc.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.6 – in list of infrastructure amend to read: leisure “and community” facilities.</p>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>SC1: Leisure and Recreation</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 24 (Support: 10 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 7)</b><br>Leisure: 2 (Support: 1 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SC1: 22 (Support: 9 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 7)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport and Leisure facilities are a necessity; important to protect, enhance and invest in such facilities to secure the longer term benefits of improved health and well-being</li> <li>• Important that new services/facilities are introduced into areas where long term investment has suffered and new facilities would greatly benefit the community</li> <li>• Policy in accordance with paragraphs 73 and 74 of NPFF and Sport England's Planning Policy Objectives (Protect, Enhance, Provide) (<i>Sport England</i>)</li> <li>• Support the policy wording in that it allows facilities for everyday needs to be located in Local Service Centres and "other settlements"(more flexible policy wording)</li> <li>• Facilities mentioned in representations as important to protect and enhance: Facilities at Goostrey, Holmes Chapel</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Seek to protect" is not sufficient – needs to be "Protect and enhance etc"</li> <li>• Include reference to green spaces, parks, public open spaces and allotments in text to policy.</li> <li>• Policy wording needs strengthening to ensure no net loss; particularly important regarding predicted increases in population</li> <li>• (Facilities mentioned in representations as important to protect: MMU Alsager, future planned facilities – White Moss Quarry Restoration Plan)</li> <li>• Shared facilities should not harm the character and amenity of the area; some shared facilities are not needed or desirable</li> <li>• Avoid green belt</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively develop and support local sport and leisure facilities especially those that have a wide appeal such as swimming</li> <li>• Policy seeks to protect leisure facilities but the 4th best sporting campus in country is being built on (former MMU) and replaced in Crewe on a tiny waterlogged marsh. Alsager short of junior football pitches. Proposals for Alsager and Sandbach do not make sufficient allowance for more open space.</li> <li>• Linking local services will not be achieved without greatly improving accessibility, connectivity and sustainability</li> <li>• Include provision of allotments</li> <li>• Policy makes reference to financial contributions; if CIL is adopted this should be the only tool for collecting funds</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add statement recognising that new services can be introduced where appropriate into areas where long term investment has suffered and new facilities would greatly benefit the community</li> <li>• “Seek to protect” is not sufficient – needs to be “Protect and enhance etc”</li> <li>• Include reference to green spaces, parks, public open spaces and allotments in text to policy.</li> <li>• Policy wording needs strengthening: Amend bullet 1 to read “Ensure no net loss of leisure and recreation facilities by protecting and enhancing existing facilities, unless they are proven to be surplus to requirements or unless improved alternative provision, of equal or better quality and accessible to the same population, is to be made.” Ensuring no net loss is particularly important given the predicted increases in population. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend bullet 2 and 3 to clarify that facilities must be highly accessible by sustainable modes of transport and should contribute to reducing the need to travel by car</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SC1 point 1 – add after “provision” – “in an equally convenient location”</li> <li>• More recognition that a mixture of policies may need to be applied where improving future services and health and well being.</li> <li>• Point 2 after leisure add “community”</li> <li>• At end of point 5 add to last sentence “of local leisure, community and recreation facilities”.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The policy is in accordance with Section 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework “Promoting healthy communities” in particular paragraphs 73 and 74 and Sport England’s Planning Policy Objectives (Protect, Enhance, Provide). The policy covers indoor leisure, community and recreation facilities; this will be clarified in the policy wording and justification to the policy.</p> <p>Policy SE6 in the Sustainable Environment Chapter covers outdoor green space such as parks and allotments; cross reference to this policy will be added.</p> <p>Facilities do need to be accessible; paragraph 12.10 deals with accessibility.</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>In Criterion 2 add the word “community” after leisure.</p> <p>At the end of Criterion 5 add “of local leisure, community and recreation facilities”</p> <p>In justification - add to end of paragraph 12.9: “The policy covers indoor leisure, community and recreation facilities. Community halls for example can be a focus for indoor recreation such as bowls and exercise classes. Policy SE6 in the Sustainable Environment Chapter covers outdoor open space such as parks and allotments.”</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Policy SC2: Outdoor Sports Facilities</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 13 (Support: 6 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for outdoor sports facilities; need support so do not fail e.g. Gorsty Golf Club (NPS5) should be re-opened (was one of the best courses in Cheshire with a membership of 400 plus and local sporting amenity)</li> <li>• Improvement of sporting facilities through collaborative working e.g. Sandbach United FC and Sandbach Cricket Club – opportunities for creating a comprehensive community based centre of sporting excellence</li> <li>• Support as allows outdoor sports facilities that are accessible by a variety of means of transport and that are appropriate to the size of the settlement</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment to protection of existing outdoor sport facilities and no net loss of facilities needed</li> <li>• Contradictions between policies and sites e.g. Alsager where there are existing sports facilities that should be retained.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England would support this policy subject to two points of clarification being made (see following section). The policy would be in accordance with paragraphs 73 and 74 of NPPF and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and Planning Policy Objectives (Protect, Enhance, Provide)</li> <li>• Outdoor sport facilities important part of Knutsford – use CIL monies for enhancement</li> <li>• Policy makes reference to financial contributions; if CIL is adopted this should be the only tool for collecting funds</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification and some direction required for parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2ii. This would be difficult to assess as outdoor sports facilities are provided in response to a combination of demand and supply factors to cater for an identified need. What factors would you consider is a scale appropriate to the size of settlement? (<i>Sport England</i>)</li> <li>3. What are appropriate developments? How will the contributions be calculated? SPD or can a method of calculation be incorporated into the PPS/ Greenspace Strategy? (<i>Sport England</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Utilise CIL funding to enhance sport and leisure facilities</li> <li>• Commitment to no net loss of facilities needed</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The policy is in accordance with Section 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework “Promoting healthy communities” in particular paragraphs 73 and 74 and Sport England’s Planning Policy Objectives (Protect, Enhance, Provide). To strengthen the policy and add clarification regarding type and scale of development plus funding, the policy and justification will be amended and the policy will be cross referenced to Policy SE6 in the Sustainable Environment Chapter which covers all outdoor open space such as parks, allotments and playing fields.</p>   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>Re-order criteria to aid clarity and accord with paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF:<br/> “1. Protect existing outdoor sports facilities, unless:</p> <p>Either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They are proven to be surplus to need; or</li> <li>b) Improved alternative provision will be created in a location well related to the functional requirements of the relocated use and its existing and future users;</li> </ul> <p>And in all cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) The proposal would not result in the loss of an area important for its amenity or contribution to the character of the area in general.” <p>Add to Criterion 2: ;and</p> <p>iii. “Where they are listed in an action plan in any emerging or subsequently adopted Playing Pitch Strategy, subject to the criteria in the policy.”</p> <p>Add to justification regarding type and scale of development:</p> <p>“The type and scale of development appropriate to a settlement will depend upon a number of factors:</p> <p>The demand and supply factors in relation to the particular outdoor sports being catered for, for example, a combined sports facility catering for local football clubs in an area which may serve a wider area than the adjacent settlement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The classification of the settlement within the settlement hierarchy;</li> <li>• The proximity of other settlements and facilities; and</li> <li>• Accessibility and infrastructure considerations, for example, traffic impact.”</li> </ul> <p>Add to justification regarding funding etc:</p> <p>“In terms of the development of appropriate facilities this will be determined through evidence from the Playing Pitch Strategy process, other work with the community and sports bodies to determine a particular club or community’s needs. The Council is expected to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the balance between what monies are collected between s106 and CIL will be part of this process. The level of contributions will be determined through the s106 and CIL setting agenda.”</p> <p>Add cross-reference to SE6: “Policy SE6 in the Sustainable Environment Chapter covers all outdoor open space such as parks, allotments and playing fields; open space standards and contributions.”</p> </li></ul> |
|------------------------------|---|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Policy SC3: Health and Wellbeing</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 22 (Support: 8/ Object: 7 / Comment Only: 7)</b><br>Health and Wellbeing: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SC3: 20 (Support: 8 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 7)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support/welcome policy – in accordance with Section 8 of the NPPF (Protect, Enhance, Provide)</li> <li>• Welcome the commitment in the policy to create and safeguard opportunities for safe, healthy, fulfilling and active lifestyles.</li> <li>• Support for criterion 7 – communal growing spaces</li> <li>• Particularly support criterion 5 but consider it should include reference to private and voluntary sector provision</li> <li>• Particularly support criterion 3 – encouraging walking and cycling for good health reasons</li> <li>• Welcome use of health impact assessments</li> <li>• Support criterion 3 request addition of green infrastructure to list</li> <li>• Strongly support Policy SC3 on Health and Wellbeing and especially the specific reference to provision for walking and cycling in the context of new development (SC3.3). We suggest that you add here ‘and, where appropriate, for horse riding’.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remit of health and wellbeing needs to cover air quality</li> <li>• Cannot feel part of a community if localism is ignored</li> <li>• Any development of over 100 dwellings should provide allotments</li> <li>• Broad support but needs a requirement to minimising traffic levels and speeds in residential areas and commitments on air quality</li> <li>• Remove the blanket requirement for Health Impact Assessment (criterion 2)</li> <li>• Reword Part 7 of Policy SC2 as follows:<br/>         “Where practical and based on evidence, the Council will promote the role of allotments, community orchards, garden plots within developments, small scale agriculture and farmers markets in providing access to healthy, affordable locally produced food options”.</li> <li>• Need to define major development proposals (criterion 2)</li> <li>• Criterion 3 does not reflect the lack of recreation facilities in the south of the Borough and low activity rates</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enquiry re CEC’s Rights of Way section – whether there is a strategy</li> <li>• Policy SC3 point 3 requires cycleways and footpaths but all plans omit these. Proposals push people to use cars by locating housing away from town centres, stations and employment. Point 4 - improving skills etc implies making good use of existing e.g. MMU Alsager campus. Too much building on farmland and no proposals for new allotments. No strategy to deal with pockets of poor health.</li> <li>• Only policy which protects existing community facilities and only refers to</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>health. Item 70 in the NPPF that planning policies should plan for the use of shared space and guard against loss of valued facilities. There should be an overarching policy to protect all social and community facilities in Cheshire East</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider deleting 6.viii. It is important to ensure that any new development considers the need for financial support for a Place of Worship/Community facility either reusing existing buildings or spaces or new facilities, where appropriate. A meeting place is vital to help with the isolation of our increasing elderly population and to support young people</li> <li>• No reference to allocation of education facilities beyond primary and secondary</li> <li>• Need good design to achieve criterion 3 but does partly take on board previous comments</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be an overarching policy to protect all social and community facilities in Cheshire East</li> <li>• Consider deleting 6.viii.</li> <li>• There needs to be an extra provision in this policy, committing to ensuring everything is done to protect air quality</li> <li>• Any development of over 100 dwellings should provide allotments</li> <li>• Needs a requirement to minimising traffic levels and speeds in residential areas and commitments on air quality</li> <li>• Remove the blanket requirement for Health Impact Assessment.</li> <li>• Reword Part 7 of Policy SC2 as follows:<br/>“Where practical and based on evidence, the Council will promote the role of allotments, community orchards, garden plots within developments, small scale agriculture and farmers markets in providing access to healthy, affordable locally produced food options”.</li> <li>• The policy needs to amend clause 2 to read ‘.on all major &amp; some smaller scale development proposals’ &amp; secondly state the intention to redress the deficiency of recreation sites in the south of the borough.</li> <li>• Revise criteria (5) to read:<br/>Protecting existing community infrastructure and ensuring the provision of a network of community facilities, providing essential public services, together with private and voluntary sector facilities, to meet the needs of the local community.</li> <li>• Add “and community infrastructure” after care services in paragraph 12.22</li> <li>• Include the following amendments (Criterion 3):<br/>“.....opportunities for healthy living and improve health and well being through..... ”<br/>And<br/>“....sufficient open space and other green infrastructure, and sports facilities”</li> <li>• Criterion 3 – after walking and cycling add “and, where appropriate, for horse riding’</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The policy looks at improving the health and well-being and quality of life of all residents by maximising opportunities for communities to access services and facilities. The policy is considered to be in general conformity with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 8 “Promoting healthy communities”.</p>   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>The policy will be strengthened with more references to community infrastructure and links to health and well-being and reference to the role of private and voluntary agencies.</p> <p>Green infrastructure includes footpaths, cycle-ways and bridleways.</p> <p>Further information regarding Health Impact Assessments will be added to the justification to aid clarity.</p> <p>Air quality concerns are addressed in the Sustainable Environment Chapter (Policy SE12 and supporting text).</p> <p>Allotment provision is addressed in the Sustainable Environment Chapter (Policy SE6 and supporting text).</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise Criterion 3:<br/>".....opportunities for healthy living and improve health and well being through..... "<br/>And<br/>"...sufficient open space and other green infrastructure, and sports facilities"</li> <li>• Revise criteria (5) to read:<br/>Protecting existing community infrastructure and ensuring the provision of a network of community facilities, providing essential public services, together with private and voluntary sector facilities, to meet the needs of the local community.</li> <li>• Add "and community infrastructure" after care services in paragraph 12.22</li> <li>• Add to justification:<br/>"Any future Cheshire East Council policy on Health Impact Assessments will set out when a HIA is required in relation to new development. This policy (SC3) will then be applied to new development in relation to Criterion 2."</li> </ul> |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SC4: Residential Mix</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 28 (Support: 4 / Object: 20 / Comment Only: 4)</b>   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All developments should contribute to the housing needs of the entire community wherever possible, especially the aged and less able</li> <li>• Yeowood Garden Village will maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to create a mixed, balanced and inclusive community</li> <li>• Commend and support the Council for addressing the issue of appropriate levels of accommodation to meets the needs of its aging population, specifically within sub-clause 3) of Policy SC4: Residential Mix</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective should be a mix within the whole community, but every single small development should not require this</li> <li>• Mandatory requirements for Lifetime Homes and Bungalows do not take into account the issue of viability, impact on densities which may deflect development away from lower value market areas</li> <li>• Requirement for Lifetime Homes for Housing Associations could make schemes unviable</li> <li>• Mixing communities risks crime</li> <li>• Requirement for Lifetime Homes ignores market demand and isn't in accordance with NNPF (encourage without delay...)</li> <li>• No evidence that Lifetime Homes help meet long-term demands</li> <li>• Lifetime Homes can increase costs</li> <li>• Focus on bungalows as housing solution for older people inappropriate and backward-looking (land hungry...) - Well-designed apartments serviced by lifts and with communal open spaces and facilities, etc. increasingly popular/more sustainable</li> <li>• Nothing in the Wilmslow proposals which would meet the policy aims (as brownfield sites ignored)</li> <li>• Requirement for Lifetime Homes not supported by evidence in the SHMA</li> <li>• Fails to meet soundness test</li> <li>• Impact on layout and density</li> <li>• Concern about emphasis re public sector key workers (12.28); increasing provision of services by private and voluntary sector</li> <li>• Requirement for Lifetime Homes not 'justified' and therefore Plan is 'unsound'</li> <li>• Policy not 'effective', therefore 'unsound'</li> <li>• Can deter purchasers</li> <li>• Could prohibit deliverability</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the inclusion of self-build projects but disappointed this is only a</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>possibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for 30% affordable takes no account of existing housing in the area – where there is a surfeit no more should be built, where a deficit, increase to 40% (NPPF requires locally based required, not borough wide broad brush)</li> <li>• Requirements listed at 12.31 don't appear to have been applied to vast majority of proposed sites</li> <li>• There is no requirement for renewable energy generation</li> <li>• Could require sprinkler systems in all commercial buildings above a certain size</li> <li>• Housing Strategy 2011-16 [5] in the list of key evidence is omitted from the Local Plan Evidence web page</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change wording to 'should' from 'could' para 1</li> <li>• Policy to deliver a minimum of 10% of residential development as self build</li> <li>• Include bungalows for older people, not just the elderly infirm</li> <li>• Affordable housing to be indistinguishable from the all other units</li> <li>• Make 'Housing Strategy 2011-16 [5]' during consultation period</li> <li>• Amend so as not to require mix for every single development</li> <li>• Modify the policy to encourage , not require, mandatory requirements for Lifetime homes and Bungalows</li> <li>• Reduce requirement for Lifetime Homes for Housing Associations</li> <li>• Limit mixing of communities</li> <li>• Delete requirement for Lifetime Homes</li> <li>• Paragraph 12.28 should be amended with the following text deleted: "Smaller schemes will need to contribute to the mix of housing across the wider area".</li> <li>• Place emphasis on 'encouraging' rather than 'requiring'</li> <li>• Delete part 2 of the policy</li> <li>• Should have policy for specialist accommodation provision for older people</li> <li>• Remove the word 'public'</li> <li>• Amend policy SC4 1 to include more emphasis on lower income earners</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SC4 is about <i>enabling</i> a residential mix to be achieved</li> <li>• The Council does not have any evidence to be able to state that a specified percentage of residential units built have to be self-build</li> <li>• The wording of the policy is flexible and does not specify a mix for every single development, nor does it specify details for self-build or Lifetime Homes - such details will be provided in the 'Site Allocations and Development Policies Document'</li> <li>• Viability of individual schemes can be addressed via the Development Management process</li> <li>• The 'Housing Strategy 2011-16' document is available on the CE website; a link to the document will be provided on the Local Plan evidence documents list</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>No material change required</p>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SC5: Affordable Homes</b>   |
| <b>Representations Received</b> | <b>Total: 58 (Support: 16 / Object: 30 / Comment Only: 12)</b><br>Affordable Homes: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SC5: 57 (Support: 15 / Object: 30 / Comment Only: 12)   |
| <b>Relevant Issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to increase number of affordable homes</li> <li>• Only approve if a housing needs survey shows a need</li> <li>• Should be in sustainable locations</li> <li>• Affordable housing plays an important part in ensuring a sustainable economy, by providing housing for workers in the lower to medium wage bracket</li> <li>• Housing Associations would like to see the recognition of sites they bring forward purely for affordable housing</li> <li>• Paragraph 4 should be more strongly worded, to prevent the creation of ghettos</li> <li>• Support the target of at least 30% of all units to be affordable</li> <li>• Support parts 6, 7 and 8 of the Policy but Point 8 should be more flexible re viability matters.</li> <li>• Welcome more detail being included in a Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing</li> <li>• Method of assessing need should be more fine grained.</li> <li>• Consider using fabric first approach instead of Code for Sustainable Homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only support if viable on sites</li> <li>• Target should be varied if Council Policy dictates other matters e.g. infrastructure are more important</li> <li>• Policy should state there is a need for affordable homes in areas of high market prices e.g. Alderley Edge &amp; Previously Developed Land in such areas should be developed for such purposes</li> <li>• Affordable housing should only be on highly sustainable sites and not mixed with housing for the wealthy</li> <li>• Do not agree that 30% should be seen as a minimum (which is what 'at least' implies) and Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 is unacceptable to developers and may be withdrawn by Central Government in future. Should refer instead to negotiation of a justified proportion, by reference to the SHMA and viability assessment.</li> <li>• Due to viability, Part (5) should be amended whereby it is only applicable to those schemes which benefit directly from HCA funding.</li> <li>• This approach is unjustified and will impact on viability of sites.</li> <li>• Is 30% target achievable in lower value areas?</li> <li>• The Council's 'Draft Core Strategy and CIL Viability Study' (October 2013 ) has found that 30% affordable housing will be unachievable in lower value areas such as Crewe, and medium value areas such as Macclesfield.</li> </ul> |

- Object to Open Book Appraisals - policy requirement is not justified.
- Part (3) of Policy SC5 should include the types of affordable housing tenure which are currently available and suitable.
- Object to the inclusion of a specific tenure split in the supporting text on viability grounds. There should be flexibility, in terms of the tenure split and arbitrary tenure splits should not be imposed across the Borough.
- Object to the requirement for overage payments to be made in circumstances where it will have been proven that the proposed level of affordable housing cannot be provided due to the financial viability of a development proposal. Policy is not sound.
- Disagree with Part iii of Policy SC5 which permits the level of provision to vary over time depending on the SHMA. This will have an adverse impact on scheme viability.
- Affordable housing provision could be increased by increasing the overall housing target.
- Do not support point 8 – all affordable housing should be provided on site.
- Onerous requirements including the provision of Code for Sustainable Homes will make schemes unviable
- The introduction of affordable housing thresholds and standards at a later date (for example within a Supplementary Planning Document) has been proposed elsewhere (notably by Leeds City Council). However, this approach was rejected by the conducting Inspector, who concluded that local standards and targets must be clearly set out within plan policies to ensure that they are sound.
- Policy SC5 should be amended, comprising either a reduced affordable housing requirement (removing “at least” from the Policy), or alternatively introduce a variable requirement across the Borough (allowing for viability constraints).

**Comment Only**

- Point 8 is a cop out and will not result in affordable housing provision being made
- Target in SHMA for provision (56.1% of newly forming households) cannot be met – there is a mismatch between need in the SHMA and delivery in the Local Plan
- Housing Association - A mortgagee in possession clause is essential for Registered Providers to use the property for charging purposes. Any restrictions placed on this could mean the properties are unmortgageable.
- Housing Association - Agree with dispersing affordable housing however a presumption in favour of clusters is preferable from a management and maintenance perspective.
- Housing Association - Standards required may mean that affordable homes stand out from market homes
- Financial contributions could be used for regeneration projects and for providing affordable units off-site.
- Must avoid creating large areas of segregated housing.
- Add point 7 in policy SC6 to policy SC5, except where it says Parish change to “local area”. Macclesfield is currently unparished - need cascades for the

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>urban areas as well such as preference for those in the local ward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to point 8 a new sentence at the end “A financial contribution will take account of the need to consider off- site provision in the local area to ensure that affordable housing is available throughout Cheshire East even in areas where housing land provision is more expensive.”</li> <li>• Affordable housing should provide social and community facilities</li> <li>• If a viability analysis is undertaken this must be an ‘independent’ analysis and subject to public scrutiny and not based on evidence provided from the developer.</li> <li>• Welcome the change of wording to this policy which now refers to ‘Affordable Homes’</li> <li>• Welcome the recognition that the policy needs to be flexible enough to respond to changes over the Plan period but query how this will be applied in practice and in a consistent manner; what trigger mechanism will there be for the affordable requirements to be varied?</li> <li>• Where there is a surfeit of affordable housing, no more should be built, and where a deficit, the proportion could be 40%. It is not a locally based requirement.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of Suggested Policy Changes for Consideration</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should allow for lower levels of affordable housing if Council Policy dictates other matters e.g. infrastructure are more important.</li> <li>• A mortgagee in possession clause is essential</li> <li>• presumption in favour of clusters is preferable from a management and maintenance perspective</li> <li>• Financial contributions could be used for regeneration projects</li> <li>• Policy should state there is a need for affordable homes in areas of high market prices eg Alderley Edge &amp; Previously Developed Land in such areas should be developed for such purposes.</li> <li>• Add point 7 in policy SC6 to policy SC5, except where it says Parish change to “local area”.</li> <li>• Add to point 8 a new sentence at the end “A financial contribution will take account of the need to consider off- site provision in the local area to ensure that affordable housing is available throughout Cheshire East even in areas where housing land provision is more expensive.”</li> <li>• Add point- “Affordable homes should consider the need to provide not only for the housing but the social needs of residents where there is a lack of community facilities. For example by allocating one dwelling unit as a meeting place for residents or by supporting the development of a Place of Worship/Community facility to enhance a community hub.”</li> <li>• Policy should allow a lower level of affordable housing where contributions to other things such as highway infrastructure are considered to be more important; this should be explained in supporting text.</li> <li>• Remove the words ‘at least’ from the affordable housing requirement or introduce variable targets across the Borough or state that affordable housing will be negotiated by reference to the SHMA and viability</li> <li>• Part (3) of Policy SC5 should include the types of affordable housing tenure which are currently available and suitable.</li> <li>• Delete point iii</li> <li>• Remove the reference promoting affordable home ownership.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 4 should be more strongly worded, to prevent the creation of ghettos <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part (5) should be amended whereby it is only applicable to those schemes which benefit directly from HCA funding.</li> <li>• Part (7) of Policy SC5 should be amended to delete reference to open book viability assessments</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Point 8 should be more flexible re viability matters.</li> <li>• Policy SC5 should be amended, comprising either a reduced affordable housing requirement (removing “at least” from the Policy),</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council Assessment of Relevant Issues</b></p> | <p>The policy seeks to address high levels of housing need whilst reflecting the economics of provision. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Viability Studies have informed the approach set out in policy SC5 (Affordable Homes), the following comments directly address comments made during the consultation.</p> <p>References to Code for Sustainable Homes (CFSH) are considered appropriate as Code For Sustainable Homes (CFSH) does not stipulate how to achieve level 3 and developers have a choice of how they could achieve level 3, including a fabric first approach. Code For Sustainable Homes level 3 and Homes and Community Agency (HCA) design and quality standards are requirements for all affordable homes and therefore should be a standard for developer subsidy and/or HCA subsidy</p> <p>The Policy includes a 30% requirement which is derived from the SHMA and is therefore considered to be justified for inclusion within the Policy. The evidence presented in the SHMA supports a Borough wide 30% requirement.</p> <p>Point 7 relates to Viability, if a scheme/site cannot deliver 30% then applicants can evidence that through a viability assessment using an open book approach. This is considered a justified approach in terms of dealing with viability issues on a case by case basis. Indeed there are still examples of sites being brought forward around Crewe that deliver on the policy requirement.</p> <p>Open Book Appraisals are a standard method used and is required by the Council in order to allow the Council to verify information provided by the developer. This is a common practice used by Local Planning Authorities and is considered to be reasonable if a developer is stating that their development would not be viable.</p> <p>The policy refers to further detail being provided in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and therefore some of the more detailed comments received to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy will be addressed through an SPD, this includes issues such as mortgagee in possession clauses.</p> <p>The tenure split highlighted in paragraph 12.46 is a starting point based on the findings of the SHMA and is stated as such within the Justification to the Policy. Further detail on tenure split could be included in an SPD and would be based on reviews of the SHMA and/or local housing need information</p> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Overage Payments are a common practice already used by the Council.</p> <p>In terms of objections to point 1 iii of policy SC5, the plan period covers up to 2030 - allowing a review of the policy requirement in the future based on up to date evidence would ensure the level of provision is up to date and will meet housing need. The SHMA only covers a 5 year period and we see no reason why the policy can't be reviewed and the thresholds varied if robust evidence calls for it.</p> <p>In respect to affordable housing being provided on site (point 8 of the policy), as every site is different, this may not always be possible. The Policy clearly states that on-site delivery is the preference and that off-site delivery will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>In relation to point 4 and the dispersal of affordable housing units on site, the Council would assess pepper-potting on a site by site basis and it would not be feasible to define numbers/clusters in this policy.</p> <p>In terms of the policy allowing a lower level of affordable housing where contributions to other things such as highway infrastructure, it is considered that the wording of the policy is appropriate and such instances should be dealt with on a case by case basis.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 1i – remove reference to Local Service Centres</li> <li>• Point 1ii – add reference to Local Service Centres</li> <li>• Insert new paragraph to read 'The Draft Core Strategy and CIL Viability assessment (2013) noted that greenfield residential development is generally viable at the current time at a 30% affordable housing requirement. The assessment acknowledges challenges however, in respect the viability of brownfield development in meeting the 30% requirement with particular issues around the urban area of Crewe. Point 7 of policy SC5 allows for the viability of schemes to be a key consideration in demonstrating an alternative affordable housing provision alongside an open book viability assessment in order to consider schemes on a case by case basis'.</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SC6: Rural Exceptions Housing for Local Needs</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 17 (Support: 5 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the development of the Policy where it will support an element of market housing introduced into rural exception schemes to ensure their deliverability.</li> <li>• We welcome this policy in its amended form and the proposed Supplementary Planning Document.</li> <li>• Support this policy - exception sites will have to make a significant contribution to the delivery of affordable homes in rural areas.</li> <li>• Welcome that the majority of housing on a site should be affordable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request clarification of "close", "strong links" and speculative developments</li> <li>• Sites should be in not adjoin Local Service Centres and other settlements</li> <li>• Housing needs survey forms should be factual, not opinions they should be no more than two years old; 5 years is far too long'</li> <li>• Occupancy should not be extended to those that only have links with the parish.</li> <li>• The cascade system where occupancy may be open to any residents in Cheshire East, is not for community needs</li> <li>• Cross Subsidy would allow the building of market housing; this will be used by developers as a loop hole. There will be very little protection left in Green Belt policies.</li> <li>• Policy SC 6 will trap disadvantaged people in homes that no longer suit their needs or aspirations by virtue of the restrictions on re-sale at Point 7. Shared ownership homes are notoriously difficult to sell</li> <li>• Point 8 - Concern re requirement that there should not be an element of profit – contrary to paragraphs 173 and 174 of the NPPF. This Policy should be more flexible and this element of the policy should therefore be removed.</li> <li>• Bullet 8 iv should be strengthened. As it stands, 49% of an exception site could be given over to market housing. This would undermine the purpose of the policy and people's trust in the exceptions site system. A maximum of 30% market housing to cross-subsidise exception sites should be prescribed.</li> <li>• For this policy to be effective, tightly drawn settlement boundaries will be required.</li> <li>• Object to the strict requirement that market housing is supported by open book viability assessments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can local need be established if there isn't a housing needs survey in place?</li> <li>• Additional housing should only be provided based on locally assessed needs.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is rural affordable housing?</li> <li>• Is point 5 legal? What if a resident subsequently changes job to outside the parish?</li> <li>• Point 8 and 12.48 are at odds with each other. The Framework requires plans "to reflect local needs", whereas the policy is 100% affordable housing, broad-brush.</li> <li>• 12.53 You omit people who have lived in the parish for significant parts of their lives, and wish to move back.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Point 7 to increase freedom of movement.</li> <li>• Housing needs survey forms should be no more than two years old</li> <li>• Occupancy should not be extended to those that only have links with the parish.</li> <li>• Omit the cross subsidy proposal</li> <li>• The Local Plan should reflect the position of the NPPF and allow some market housing on rural exception sites, with a competitive degree of landowner return.</li> <li>• Bullet 8 iv - A maximum of 30% market housing to cross-subsidise exception sites should be prescribed.</li> <li>• Make Point 8 more flexible, to allow more market housing.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The policy allows for the allocation of or granting of planning permission for small sites comprising affordable housing to meet local needs as an exception to normal policies. The following comments are made in response to the issues raised during the consultation:</p> <p>The reference in point 8 to the non inclusion of profit for the market housing component is appropriate to ensure that the market element of the housing is only included to cross subsidise the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>Point 8 (iv) is considered appropriate to ensure that the majority of development is for rural affordable housing delivered on an exceptional basis. Point 8 is consistent with national guidance included in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.53 and the definition of 'strong links' in the policy is consistent with the Cheshire Homechoice Policy.</p> <p>The cascade approach is considered appropriate and allows flexibility in the implementation of the policy.</p> <p>The 5 year timeframe for the housing needs survey outcomes reflects current evidence and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Housing Need Survey and is therefore a suitable basis to require evidence.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | No material change is proposed to be made to the policy  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SC7: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 16 (Support: 2 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 7)</b><br>Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: 3 (Support: 1 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)<br>SC7: 13 (Support: 1 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 6)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SC7 Criteria in Part 2 - The considerations listed are considered helpful and well drafted</li> <li>• Policy SC7 Point 3 – the policy on safeguarding sites is compliant with paragraph 19 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS).</li> <li>• The addition of SC7 Point 3 is of great benefit to this Policy. This will avoid the manipulation of permission gained under one guise being turned into an attempt to develop Park Homes and mixed-residential use for commercial profit resulting in not meeting accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the lack of a revised Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) which has not been completed. This is not compliant with national policy set out in the PPTS. It is not based on a robust evidence base as required by paragraph 6 of the PPTS.</li> <li>• Core Strategy fails to identify suitable locations for Gypsy and Traveller or Travelling Showpeople sites and does not appear to make any provision for Travellers on any of the sites listed in the Sites and Strategic Locations chapter (Chapter 15)</li> <li>• Objection to the intention of leaving site provision to a separate Site Allocations and Development Policies Development Plan Document when the Core Strategy is able to identify in some detail the main locations for housing needs. The Site Allocations DPD is not due for adoption until late 2014 at the earliest. There is likely to be further slippage. It could be 7 years from the 2007 GTAA before suitable sites are found.</li> <li>• It is not clear how many of the 37-54 pitches for Gypsy and Travellers and 4 plots for Travelling Showpeople have been provided since 2007</li> <li>• The policy is not fair, realistic or inclusive as required by paragraph of the 4 PPTS in so far as policy SC7 is not PPTS compliant and fails to address identified need in the same way as provision is made for the settled community.</li> <li>• The policy fails to set pitch targets for even the first 5 years of the plan.</li> <li>• There is little evidence that the policy has been prepared in co operation with the Travelling community or neighbouring authorities through Duty to Co-operate and it does not meet the needs of the area over the lifespan of the development plan as required by PPTS 6.</li> <li>• The Core Strategy fails to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites for the first 5 years or identify sites or broad locations for years 6-10 of years 11-15 as required by paragraph 9 (a) and (b) of national guidance.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy fails the requirements of paragraph 11 of the PPTS and will do little to promote integrated co existence with local communities when it fails to even help Travellers identify suitable locations to meet the pressing and immediate need.</li> <li>• SC7 point 1 fails to provide a time period for the provision identified in 1 (i) and 1 (ii) i.e. ten transit pitches by when? The justification implies the 2007 GTAA figures were for the period 2006-2016. This should be made clear in the policy as it is for Travelling Showpeople plots i.e. in the period to 2016.</li> <li>• 1 (ii) Given that there is no up-to-date need assessment to inform policy this should be a minimum figure</li> <li>• Question figures included in the policy</li> <li>• Mottram St. Andrew is a small community lacking in shops, public transport, main drainage etc and therefore would not be an appropriate location.</li> <li>• Provision should be grouped with that existing already.</li> <li>• Overall, Policy SC7 relies on out of date, unreliable figures. The upper and lower limits are so wide apart the range has to be questioned. Is it 37 or 54 or somewhere in between and should 10 for Transit be added as well as 4 for Showpeople? The figures are of poor quality, statistically questionable, representing no substantiated proven need</li> <li>• The vague considerations in point 2 of the policy regarding location and design are not prescriptive enough and should involve much of the recommended distances from services etc. required by existing policies for new development by both the Gypsy and Traveller and the settled communities.</li> <li>• The policy should include a statement to the effect that CEC will not endorse the laying of hardstanding or foundations or the provision of other infrastructure in advance of or in the absence of planning permission.</li> <li>• The policy should restrict encampment without safeguards including payment of council tax by users; permanent monitoring by Cheshire East Council of access, management and use of the site; and users signing Terms and Conditions governing behaviour etc which allow CEC to close the site if terms are broken.</li> <li>• English Heritage - In allocation of sites, the impact on the historic environment should be considered.</li> <li>• Amend wording of point 2 viii to read 'Impact on landscape character and the appearance of the surrounding area, and nature conservation sites and heritage assets including their settings'</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheshire West and Chester would like assurance that the further work to be undertaken to update information regarding Gypsy and Travellers in Cheshire East is carried out in collaboration with Cheshire West and Chester and other local authorities as part of a joint evidence base</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include revised GTAA figures</li> <li>• Core Strategy should make provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites</li> <li>• Policy should make clear the provision of sites since the last GTAA and reflect appropriate timeframes for delivery in the policy</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Strategy fails to identify 5 year supply of sites or broad locations for years 6-10 of years 11-15 as required by paragraph 9 (a) and (b) of national guidance</li> <li>• Demonstrate that the policy has been prepared in co operation with the Travelling community or neighbouring authorities through Duty to Co-operate and it does not meet the needs of the area over the lifespan of the development plan as required by PPTS 6.</li> <li>• The policy should include a statement to the effect that CEC will not endorse the laying of hardstanding or foundations or the provision of other infrastructure in advance of or in the absence of planning permission.</li> <li>• Amend wording of point 2 viii to read ‘Impact on landscape character and the appearance of the surrounding area, and nature conservation sites and heritage assets including their settings’</li> <li>• Point 2 of the policy should be prescriptive and contain recommended distances to services.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>An up-to-date Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) has been prepared (January 2014) and has been used to update policy SC7. The Council considers that its approach to the identification and allocation of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson Sites in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Development Plan Document is reasonable and proportionate in meeting identified need over the first five year period.</p> <p>The Council has appointed consultants to undertake a study to identify Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson sites in the Borough and the outcomes of this study are expected in February 2014 with its recommendations used to inform the development of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The criteria set out in part 2 of the policy are designed as a guide to inform the determination of proposals on a case by case basis. This is considered a suitable approach so as to ensure that proposals are sustainable and acceptable in terms of location and design (alongside other material considerations) whilst ensuring the appropriate provision of sites to meet identified needs. The GTAA has been prepared on behalf of Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Halton and Warrington and is therefore an example of joint working across different Local Authority areas.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update policy to reflect the outcomes of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (January 2014) with references to 2007 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment removed.</li> <li>• Present the outcomes of the GTAA with an updated picture regarding the number of pitches / plots required up to 2028 and how these figures should be broken down into 5 year timeframes.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>  | <b>Chapter 13: Sustainable Environment</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 6 (Support: 2 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the explanation about resurveying of SBIs and re-designation as Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>• In full agreement with the Chapter.</li> <li>• Welcome the Policies in the Chapter especially SE 4, SE 6 and SE 6 3 (v).</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food production and the farm economy need proper recognition in the Plan.</li> <li>• There is no mention in the introductory text of the need to take climate change into account in planning for a 'sustainable environment'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of a growth village as a sustainable development at the Gorstyhill Site would make a strong contribution towards a sustainable environment for the area.</li> <li>• Grade 3b soils in Cheshire deserve protection.</li> <li>• Food production and concern for food security is likely to increase in importance during the period covered by the Local Plan.</li> <li>• Effects of fragmentation or lack of connectivity are crucial.</li> <li>• An evidence-based Nature Conservation Strategy is essential.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Core Strategy should recognise the positive role which the establishment of a sustainable development at the Gorstyhill Site could play in the preservation and enhancement of a sustainable environment for the area.</li> <li>• A free-standing policy on food production and the farm economy incorporating the point about protecting best and most versatile agricultural land, the need to minimise disruption to farm operations from development, and with that efficiency and profitability of food production.</li> <li>• A supportive policy for Artisan markets.</li> <li>• Refer to the benefits of home-grown food production, and especially the contribution of allotments and urban food growing for healthy lifestyles and social cohesion.</li> <li>• Policies are needed to safeguard allotments and support urban food growing.</li> <li>• Add commitment to preparing a Nature Conservation Strategy.</li> <li>• The introductory text needs to reference climate change as being a key factor in planning for a sustainable environment.</li> <li>• Specific reference in paragraph 13 to the benefits of access to natural greenspace for mental wellbeing (supporting documentation is available from Natural England).</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | Relevant issues are fully considered against the relevant policy in the following tables.  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | No material changes recommended  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Quality of Place and Policy SE1: Design</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 33 (Support: 12 / Object: 10 / Comment Only: 11)</b><br>Quality of Place: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)<br>SE1: 31 (Support: 12 / Object: 9 / Comment Only: 10)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full agreement with 13.6</li> <li>• Support the intention of creating a sense of place</li> <li>• New development must reflect and enhance the local character</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognising the quality of the environment in Cheshire East, long-distance views of significance at specific locations should be protected.</li> <li>• We disagree with the inclusion of ‘larger scale and more complex’ in describing which schemes need to ensure they have responded positively to the design review process. At Places Matter! we believe the design review process has added benefit to large and small scale schemes alike. In fact one recent one in Cheshire East was a NPPF para 55 house, which was brought by the applicant. This would not have been described as either large scale or complex. So that Cheshire East Council does not have to debate with developers whether they should shoulder the cost of attending design review, we believe the clause above</li> <li>• Viability should not be hampered by design requirements</li> <li>• No justification for including Building for Life or design codes as part of the development process</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriately qualified staff needed to judge on good design.</li> <li>• All 12 elements of Building for Life 12 should be required to be met</li> <li>• Wide enough roads, streets and pavements should be required</li> <li>• Policy should ensure that enough</li> <li>• Design policy should stress that quality requirements relate equally to residential and non-residential forms of development space for food waste to be collected and bins to be dealt with</li> <li>• We welcome the principles behind this policy but it is far too vague and open to interpretation,</li> <li>• All other items in this policy that start with the word 'encourage' should be similarly reworded.</li> <li>• Re: section 2 “Managing design quality”: In limiting Design Coding to “major developments”, the relevance also of Design Guides and Briefs should be recognised for other development at significant locations and where that development could help maintain or enhance the built or natural environment.</li> <li>• Part 2iii of the policy places a mandatory requirement that housing developments achieve Building for Life 12 (BfL12) (or as updated) standard. Whilst the HBF is supportive of BfL12, and many developers conform to its requirements, the Council should not attempt to make a standard developed by the industry a mandatory requirement of all developments.</li> </ul> |

**List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered**

- Section 4 of this policy should include a requirement for new development to be at an appropriate density, implying a suitable balance between built development and open space.
- Additional 'Protecting long-distance views' - "Long-distance views of significance will be protected, comprising: ...."
- Change SE1.3.v to read 'Safeguarding existing green infrastructure and seeking to enhance it'  
AND add the following additional policies:  
SE1.3.vi Promote the use of sustainable drainage systems and seek to minimise surface sealing, especially on permeable soils.  
SE1.3.vii Conserve and enhance urban biodiversity.
- "Design in safety" could be re-phrased "Secure by Design", or "Designing-in Security".  
Add requirements for a culture of Health & Safety in design and execution.
- Designing in Safety: Add "iii. Ensure developments which are not littered with cars on the pavements and roads by providing wide enough roads and pavements for the safety of both pedestrians and road safety, with sufficient on site road parking in front of each house in a housing development to provide natural surveillance, using the ideas of defensible space."  
Also add "iv. Ensure that waste, recycling, garden and food waste can be collected safely by both pedestrians putting out and refuse vehicles collecting, to allow for safe collection points and a suitable turning circle for large refuse vehicles."  
Page 129: Please add a similar section on the Community space standards
- Design policy should stress that quality requirements relate equally to residential and non-residential forms of development  
Sub section 2 Managing design quality  
Add criterion: 'preparation of design/development briefs for all major and strategic sites'  
Sub section 3 Sustainable urban, architectural and landscape design  
Criterion v rewording to – 'encouraging the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure'  
Sub section 4 Liveability/workability  
Criterion ii rewording – privacy replaced by amenity  
In Justification insert additional paragraph after 13.11 – 'In respect to Section 4, Amenity would include appropriate levels of privacy for residential properties and management of air quality, exposure to noise and other potential pollution'  
In key evidence change 1. to 'Local Design Review and awards'  
Add '6 Building for Life or other local quality assessment and monitoring'
- Strengthen Policy SE1 by removing words relating to scale and complexity of scheme because even smaller schemes can benefit from design review. Other ways of ensuring design intent is delivered on the ground should form an integral part of the design process, not just masterplanning and design coding, which are mentioned for major schemes.
- An SPD is needed to set on what basis CEBC will assess sense of place, sensitive design etc (give good examples).  
Reword the policy to remove the word encouraging, e.g. the wording of 3 iii should be amended as follows:

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Energy and water usage will be reduced through appropriate design. All other items in this policy that start with the word 'encouraging' should be similarly reworded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to referring to Design Codes, section 2 of Policy SE1 should include encouragement of the preparation and adoption of Design Guides and Briefs.</li> <li>• It is recommended that the policy be amended so that part 2iii read 'Housing developments be encouraged to achieve Building for Life....'</li> <li>• In order to address the conflicts above and ensure that the policy criteria set out within Policy SE1 are sound, it is requested that Cheshire East Council deletes the requirement for design coding and Building for Life 12.</li> <li>• The policy should reflect that in some cases a balance will need to be struck between design and sustainability considerations and the need to bring forward new development.</li> <li>• The policy provides little guidance in relation to how this should be achieved or how they will test that a development achieves high quality design.</li> <li>• Add reference to the need to engage in design review process, Building for Life 12 etc at an early stage in the application process, i.e. pre-application for all types of applications; outline, hybrid and detail. This relates to the process shown in para 13.11.</li> </ul> <p>Amend reference in 2i. to large scale &amp; more complex developments by adding 'and some smaller scale developments'</p> <p>Amend reference in 2ii. to major developments by adding 'and some smaller scale developments'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External lighting should not be permitted on rural developments</li> <li>• An additional bullet point should be inserted to read: (vi) Encouraging the reuse of existing buildings.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The intention of the Council is to ensure that new development in the Borough is well design and sits well within its environment. The NPPF places a significant emphasis on achieving high quality design as part of delivering sustainable and well designed development. The policy requires that development proposals should make a positive contribution to their surroundings in terms of sense of place, managing design quality, sustainable urban, architectural and landscape design, Livability/workability and designing in safety.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy wording as it stands is succinct, robust and in line with the Strategic Priorities set out in the Local Plan Strategy. Additional wording proposed to the policy would make it too prescriptive and detailed. More detailed design policies will be included within the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document and there is also an intention to produce a more detailed Supplementary Planning Document on Design in the future.</p> <p>Whilst the policy does not specifically outline density requirements for new development the policy does include requirements for new development to achieve a sense of place by protecting and enhancing the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements. Given the varying nature of the existing development across Cheshire East it would be difficult to require a 'one size fits all' approach to development across the Borough. For larger developments there</p>  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>is suggestion that a design review is carried out with the LPA and this will allow for site specific design solutions to be achieved.</p> <p>Additional notes have been made within the justification of the policy to include the importance of landscape character and the characteristic of certain localities and also the importance of suitable boundary treatments and hard landscaping in design.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional wording added to paragraph 13.9 in the justification to include 'boundary treatment and hard surfaces are equally important to successful design.</li> <li>• Additional paragraph added 13.10 in relation to landscape character and characteristics of localities.</li> <li>• No material changes recommended to the policy wording</li> </ul>              |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SE2: Efficient Use of Land</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 19 (Support: 8 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 3)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the development of previously developed land first. There is a need to make sure the neighbouring boroughs also develop their brownfield sites before the green fields of Cheshire are sacrificed.</li> <li>• Support Policy SE 2 but it should require brownfield sites to be developed prior to greenfield sites in a given area.</li> <li>• Policy SE2 clearly prioritises development on brownfield sites ahead of the development of greenfield, Green Belt and safeguarded land. This approach is consistent with national policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The huge housing development proposed for the Giantswood/Manchester Rd area of Congleton conflicts with this Policy statement. It does not consider the landscape of character of the area and there is currently no gas supply. This land has previously been refused for housing due to lack of utility infrastructure. A huge investment would be required to service the volume of houses, with consequent disruption.</li> <li>• This policy is inadequate to deliver the Council's publicly stated pledges. It requires an ambitious but realistic target, a clear sequential approach, and a phased approach to housing delivery to recognise economic realities and the dynamic replenishment of brownfield land supply.</li> <li>• Adopting a sequential approach means that more brownfield land will be available when the Plan comes to be reviewed, which can then be phased for development to minimise loss of greenfield and Green Belt land. In the meantime, brownfield capacity could be increased by; a more nuanced approach to density, enabling higher levels where appropriate, while still ensuring good design, respect for local character and adequate internal and open / green space; consolidating retail areas and encouraging more housing in and around centres, Living Over The Shop etc ; releasing some land allocated for employment for housing ; paying more attention to the potential of small sites</li> <li>• With higher densities now being achieved on brownfield sites, the number of dwellings which that land can support has grown considerably. The proportion of dwellings that can be provided on brownfield land has been underestimated, and in setting a brownfield target account should be taken of the evidence showing that brownfield land is a continually replenished resource not a fixed and ever-diminishing one.</li> <li>• Good-quality, desirable family homes with gardens and communal green areas can be provided in urban areas at over 50dph, with public transport in easy walking distance of every dwelling.</li> <li>• The plan will remove good quality productive agricultural land. The importance of local food security is understated in the plan. Removing local agricultural land will place higher demands on imported food with the associated</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>increased demands on infrastructure and pollution, apart from the reduction in the local economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy is confusing and misleading. Whilst encouraging the development of brownfield sites, this should not be used as a means to preclude suitable and sustainable greenfield development. Brownfield sites should not be released at all cost; they still should be policy compliant and sustainable in line with NPPF.</li> <li>• A portfolio of sites is required that would deliver a mix in house types and sizes to meet demand. Over reliance on brownfield sites may prevent this range from being maintained. Part 3 of the policy should be split.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst it is important to make an efficient use of land, this policy should also include a requirement for new development to be at an appropriate density. Where family housing is required, this should not be built at a density which precludes the provision of open spaces and generous gardens. Where development of bungalows is required, it must be recognised that this will also be at a lower density.</li> <li>• Policy SE2 and 13.13-15: There is no mention as to the uses to which any of this land should be put. It should be applied so as to ensure employment is provided within walking and cycling distance of housing, and within walking distance of bus routes and stations.</li> <li>• Criterion 1 would benefit from reference to encouraging the reuse/conversion of existing buildings as this is important in achieving sustainable development and thus the efficient use of land.</li> <li>• Fully support the development of previously developed land. However, the word 'encourage' is meaningless, this should be changed to 'support'.</li> <li>• The wording of the policy fails to recognise and promote the opportunities provided by vacant buildings (often sustainably located) to meet development needs.</li> <li>• The policy should restrict windfall development in those locations where landscape character and function is being adversely impacted by cumulative development.</li> <li>• Policy should note the important contribution that private residential gardens contribute to quality and character of localities, biodiversity, quality of life and mental wellbeing as well playing a key role in climate change adaptation with regard to drainage and shade,</li> <li>• Welcome the encouragement for the redevelopment/re-use of previously developed land and request that this policy be amplified in order to clarify that this encouragement applies equally within rural and urban areas.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy should be applied so as to ensure employment within walking and cycling distance of housing, and within walking distance of bus routes and stations.</li> <li>• The policy should require building to be within the town boundaries on brownfield sites, and should not extend the boundaries into green fields destroying agricultural land.</li> <li>• The word 'encourage' should be changed to 'support'</li> <li>• The first point of the policy needs to be re-cast around a very much clearer approach which will provide more certainty for developers and communities</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>alike by; setting an ambitious but realistic brownfield target; applying a brownfield-first sequential approach; phasing plans for housing delivery to reflect market conditions and the dynamic replenishment of brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the plan to develop good quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Criterion 1 should be amended to read: The Council will, where appropriate, encourage the redevelopment/re-use of previously developed land and buildings, or vacant/ under-used buildings.</li> <li>• Part 3 of this policy relates specifically to windfall development, and how this type of development should consider issues such as landscape and townscape character and density. These elements should be picked up through separate policies.</li> <li>• Add proposed new policy SE2.4 The Council will restrict windfall development in those locations where landscape character and function (i.e. provision of residential play space, urban biodiversity and resilience to the impacts of climate change) is being adversely impacted by cumulative development. Institute monitoring and reporting systems on its use.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Employment within walking and cycling distance of housing. Policies SD1 and 2 and the criteria in table 9.1 set out the recommended distances. It is not possible to predict where people will work but the Local Plan will provide for a mix of uses in many development sites.</p> <p>Stronger reference to use of brownfield land. The policy recognises that in some cases previously developed land should be protected from development.</p> <p>Requirement for higher densities to maximise available brownfield land. Guideline figures have been provided and will be elaborated upon in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. Opportunities for town centre development have been identified in Crewe and Macclesfield.</p> <p>Remove the plan to develop good quality agricultural land. The use of some greenfield sites to meet housing targets for Cheshire East is inevitable.</p> <p>Restriction of windfall development. The policy refers back to SD1 and SD2 which contain criteria to assess windfall sites. The supporting text of the policy recognises that there are limitations on windfall development and that it is not possible to predict where sites and buildings will become available.</p> <p>Include reference to vacant or under-used buildings: They are included in the definition of PDL as contained in the NPPF annexe 2. A moratorium on new development in certain areas is not justified and would not be in accordance with the NPPF.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>Delete point 2(vi) of policy SE4 and move to a new point 4 of Policy SE2. This is because it relates better to the efficient use of land than landscape. Further text added regarding the role of agriculture and minerals in Cheshire East.</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 36 (Support: 11 / Object: 19 / Comment Only: 8)</b><br>Biodiversity and Geodiversity: 5 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 4)<br>SE3: 31 (Support: 11 / Object: 16 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements should be adhered to</li> <li>• Requirements appropriate re relative importance of assets</li> <li>• Support concept that natural environment should be protected and enhanced (suggest Yeowood Garden Village will enhance biodiversity)</li> <li>• Support policy but in reality development often has negative impact; exceptional circumstances should be defined more</li> <li>• Strongly support policy – refer to extensive network of deeply incised valleys (cloughs) which often support ancient woodland</li> <li>• Policy SE3: Paragraph 3<br/>Please can you add “Nature Improvement Areas” to the list of bullet pointed sites listed in this paragraph.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 4<br/>Please can make the following additions "and there are no appropriate alternatives" plus "and offsetting", to the text of this paragraph of the policy:<br/>“where in exceptional circumstances the reasons for the proposed development clearly outweigh the value of the ecological feature affected and there are no appropriate alternatives, the adverse impacts of the development.....”<br/>“...appropriate monitoring is undertaken to make sure mitigation, compensation and offsetting is effective”</p> <p>Paragraph 5<br/>Please can you amend the final sentence to read.<br/>“...will only be permitted where suitable mitigation and/or compensation is provided to address the adverse impacts of the proposed development”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 5 non-designated sites valued by communities - Insert provision for sites not in plans to be ‘registered’ as provisional &amp; then surveyed &amp; assessed by a specialist as soon as necessary until such time as the council has undertaken a borough-wide full landscape &amp; habitat survey to provide adequate data</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD needed to clarify what is meant by significant adverse impact – this should include examples of good mitigation. Policy should insist that any protected area lost is replaced by a compensatory area 10 times larger and of equivalent or better quality</li> <li>• Welcome importance of ecological networks – but not borne out in Infrastructure Delivery Plan; need for Nature Conservation Strategy – could cost for this be included as a project in IDP</li> <li>• Need for strategic plan for biodiversity of Cheshire East; clear policy guidelines and targets; biodiversity not considered sufficiently in choice of proposed site for development e.g. sites CS10 and CS32 – proposed</li> </ul> </p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>destruction of biodiversity – ancient woodland, rich diversity of birds etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SE3 ignores important landscape/green belt/ wildlife areas of CS10 and CS32</li> <li>• Section 3 should refer to veteran trees; section 5 should clearly reinforce the mitigation hierarchy; i.e. avoidance of harm first, then if harm unavoidable – mitigation and finally only compensation for any unavoidable residual harm.</li> <li>• Over-reliance on DC process to improve existing situation. Need for greater public awareness. Need for nature conservation strategy and SPD. Need for comprehensive survey of habitats – findings to trigger revisions to policy</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to take a firmer position on conservation of woodland and wildlife habitats when considering possible development sites; sites considered for development on a piecemeal basis; include statement to clarify the importance of wildlife habitats and strategic overview accompanied by clear policy guidelines.</li> <li>• No mention of the beautiful deep valleys and the woods, meres and low hills of the southern half of the Borough. Need to create wildlife corridors and ecological networks; provide net gains in biodiversity; create a resilient ecological network etc in accordance with the NPPF.</li> <li>• Point 1. CWT welcomes Point 1 but increases and connections could be achieved through co-ordination with the IDP. Focus NIA with enhancements such as ecological assessments and a nature conservation strategy. Point 3. Definition of 'clearly outweigh' needed. Point 4. CWT questions the wording 'When appropriate'. Conditions to offset will require a long term management plan which must be monitored.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to take a firmer position on conservation of woodland and wildlife habitats when considering possible development sites; include statement to clarify their importance and strategic overview accompanied by clear policy guidelines.</li> <li>• Need to create wildlife corridors and ecological networks; provide net gains in biodiversity; create a resilient ecological network etc in accordance with the NPPF.</li> <li>• Point 1. Increases and connections could be achieved through co-ordination with the IDP. Focus NIA with enhancements such as ecological assessments and a nature conservation strategy. Point 3. Definition of 'clearly outweigh' needed. Point 4. CWT questions the wording 'When appropriate'. Conditions to offset will require a long term management plan which must be monitored.</li> <li>• Policy should insist that any protected area lost is replaced by a compensatory area 10 times larger and of equivalent or better quality</li> <li>• Importance of ecological networks not borne out in Infrastructure Delivery Plan; need for Nature Conservation Strategy – could cost for this be included as a project in IDP; need for SPD</li> <li>• Need for strategic plan for biodiversity of Cheshire East</li> <li>• Section 3 should refer to veteran trees; section 5 should clearly reinforce the mitigation hierarchy; i.e. avoidance of harm first, then if harm unavoidable – mitigation and finally only compensation for any unavoidable residual harm.</li> <li>• Clause 1 – ensure this relates to non-designated sites as well as high value sites; Clause 4 – state how council will ensure compliance and rectification by competent specialists.</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Ecologist should ensure that the more sensitive areas and features are impacted upon to the absolute minimum – should the clause “exceptional circumstances” be invoked.</li> <li>• Refer to extensive network of deeply incised valleys (cloughs) which often support ancient woodland</li> <li>• CEC’s Ecologist: Policy SE3: Paragraph 3<br/>Please can you add “Nature Improvement Areas” to the list of bullet pointed sites listed in this paragraph.<br/>Paragraph 4<br/>Please can make the following additions "and there are no appropriate alternatives" plus "and offsetting", to the text of this paragraph of the policy: “where in exceptional circumstances the reasons for the proposed development clearly outweigh the value of the ecological feature affected and there are no appropriate alternatives, the adverse impacts of the development.....”<br/>“...appropriate monitoring is undertaken to make sure mitigation, compensation and offsetting is effective”<br/>Paragraph 5<br/>Please can you amend the final sentence to read.<br/>“...will only be permitted where suitable mitigation and/or compensation is provided to address the adverse impacts of the proposed development”.</li> <li>• Clause 5 non-designated sites valued by communities - Insert provision for sites not in plans to be ‘registered’ as provisional &amp; then surveyed &amp; assessed by a specialist as soon as necessary until such time as the council has undertaken a borough-wide full landscape &amp; habitat survey to provide adequate data</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>This policy accords with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Policy SE6 Green Infrastructure also includes biodiversity as part of the network of multi-functional green spaces. The Green Space Strategy (2013), part of the Council’s Evidence base, provides a strategic overview in relation to green infrastructure and biodiversity. Some of the detailed responses to policy SE3 are dealt with under policy SE6 and the Green Space Strategy such as strategic direction/plan, wildlife corridors and the Borough’s valleys and cloughs.</p> <p>Veteran trees and woodland are covered by policy SE5 Trees Hedgerows and Woodland.</p> <p>Policy amendments in relation to some detailed questions/responses are proposed to strengthen the policy and add clarity.</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 3: Add “Nature Improvement Areas” to the list of bullet pointed sites listed in this paragraph.</li> <li>• Paragraph 4: Add the following additions "and there are no appropriate alternatives" plus "and offsetting", to the text of this paragraph of the policy: “where in exceptional circumstances the reasons for the proposed development clearly outweigh the value of the ecological feature affected and there are no appropriate alternatives, the adverse impacts of the development.....”</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>“...appropriate monitoring is undertaken to make sure mitigation, compensation and offsetting is effective”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Paragraph 5: Amend the final sentence to read.<br/>“...will only be permitted where suitable mitigation and/or compensation is provided to address the adverse impacts of the proposed development”.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Policy SE4: The Landscape</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 24 (Support: 11 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 5)</b><br>The Landscape: 4 (Support: 1 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 2)<br>SE4: 20 (Support: 3 / Object: 11 / Comment Only: 6)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the statements protecting the landscape.</li> <li>• The introduction is well-informed.</li> <li>• Support the desire to protect high quality agricultural land.</li> <li>• Support the need for a landscape policy.</li> <li>• Support the policy's intentions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Policy should facilitate the consideration of a balanced judgement rather than just expect developments to safeguard high quality agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a).</li> <li>• Object to the Policy's application in the plan.</li> <li>• CS32 and CS10 are contrary to the Policy.</li> <li>• Grade 2a and 3 agricultural lands should be protected in the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Modern landscape planning practice has moved away from those stated in SE4.3 and 4.4.</li> <li>• ASCVs/Local Landscape Designation Areas are strategic environmental assets and as such should be identified at this stage in the same way that the strategic sites for housing and employment development have been. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• The location of new development must be the first consideration in terms of impact on the landscape. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• The first sentence of bullet point 3 does not differ significantly from bullet point 1. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• The countryside of Cheshire East provides spaces of great tranquillity relative to the urban areas within and around the Borough. This tranquillity should be recognised as a specific asset and protected accordingly. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• Important long-distance/strategic views should also be protected, whether these are of specific landscape or townscape features or heritage assets. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• The proposed policy is unsound because the Local Landscape Designations are neither listed nor mapped in the Core Strategy, they have not been consulted on and the relevant study is not accessible on the website.</li> <li>• Minerals are covered in SE10; air quality in SE12; and water quality in SE13.</li> <li>• Concern that 'safeguarded' means development.</li> <li>• Bullet 2 (iv) in relation to safeguarding high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) is not considered to be consistent with national Policy on the basis that it may hinder the delivery of sustainable development.</li> <li>• The Policy does not appear to offer any degree of balance or assessment of the significance of the scale of impacts from development proposals.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy is too restrictive and could result in development being significantly stifled.</li> <li>• The Policy provides little clarity on how development proposals that may affect local or national designation will be judged in a proportionate and consistent manner.</li> <li>• The Council should not apply blanket landscape policies which act to restrict development in general.</li> <li>• The policy relies too much on the development control process improving the existing situation.</li> <li>• There is insufficient data below the county character assessment level for landscape improvement and enhancement or development control apart from the designated areas.</li> <li>• The Borough's significant landscape assets are accepted as important [para 13.27]. But it is unclear how the policy is to be supported in details especially as it relates to some of the poorer landscape value and being proactive in landscape enhancement across the borough.</li> <li>• Not all of the Borough is of high quality.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact not all the Borough is high quality landscape should be acknowledged.</li> <li>• It should be clear that a landscape character approach will be required for assessments and landscape enhancement for poor quality landscape areas.</li> <li>• Open countryside is an important feature in Cheshire East, which should be protected and enhanced.</li> <li>• The most neglected and vanishing part of our landscape is the lowland mosses and heaths, which need protecting and (in some cases) restoring to connect together small islands of them; building on White Moss would be an ecological disaster.</li> <li>• There is inadequate landscape protection in the south of the Borough.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend to refer to a landscape character-led approach to development assessment and design and the need for enhancement in areas of poor landscape quality.</li> <li>• Amend reference to Cheshire East Landscape Character Assessment.</li> <li>• Amend bullet 3 (ii) by replacing 'development' with 'enhancement'.</li> <li>• Bullet 2(vi) should be modified to allow a balance to be struck in accordance with the NPPF's requirement regarding the use of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Delete SE4.3 and SE4.4.</li> <li>• Delete the final sentence of the policy; it repeats bullet point 3. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• Explicitly acknowledge that the Local Landscape Designation Areas are those areas currently known as Areas of Special County Value (ASCVs), that there will be no changes made to current boundaries, and that there will be no reduction in the level of protection afforded to these areas. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• The ASCVs/Local Landscape Designation Areas should be listed and identified on a map (and ideally on the key diagram) in the Core Strategy. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• Insert a new final sentence in bullet point 1: "Development will be encouraged</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>to take place in landscapes, or parts of landscapes, that are less sensitive to change.” (CPRE Cheshire).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert a new bullet 2 i before the existing bullets: “Use the Cheshire Landscape Character Assessment (and local landscape character assessments and Village Design Statements where available) to ensure that development proposals are sensitively located and designed in order to respond to and blend in with the local landscape setting and key landscape features”. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• Replace 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of bullet 3 with “Cheshire East will protect Local Landscape Designation Areas from development which is likely to have an adverse impact on its character, appearance or setting. Development within or adjacent to Local Landscape Designation Areas which would preserve or enhance the character or features for which they have been designated will be supported. Proposals which would be likely to damage, directly or indirectly, or contribute to the erosion of the character or features for which they have been designated will be refused.” (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• Add a new bullet point 3 i: “Ensuring sensitive site, building and infrastructure design which is responsive to the specific character of the landscape and preserves and incorporates significant landscape features.” (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• Insert a new bullet point in section 2: “maintain and enhance the tranquillity of the countryside and rural areas”. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• Insert a new bullet point 5: “Local Green Spaces and tranquil areas, as identified by the community, will be designated through the Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD”. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• The protection of important long-distance/strategic views should be flagged up in this policy, as being of strategic importance, and a full set of such views detailed either in the Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD or as a separate Supplementary Planning Document. (CPRE Cheshire).</li> <li>• The text to Part 2(vi) should recognise that in some cases a balance will need to be struck between retaining the best quality agricultural land and ensuring that the most sustainable sites are brought forward for development.</li> <li>• Acknowledge the need for landscape enhancement in areas deficient in rich landscape.</li> <li>• Commit to encouraging the improvement and enhancement of the condition of areas deficient in rich, high quality landscape character across the borough.</li> <li>• Commit to undertake/assist in a detailed borough-wide landscape character survey at local level and assessment to supplement the Cheshire Landscape Character Assessment 2008.</li> <li>• Commit to an evidenced based Landscape Strategy and SPD.</li> <li>• Point 2(vi) of policy SE4 has been deleted and moved to a new point 4 of Policy SE2. This is because it relates better to the efficient use of land than landscape.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>It is acknowledged that Cheshire East has a rich and diverse landscape, and it is important to retain, enhance and improve the landscape where possible.</p> <p>It is considered that 2vi is more of an appropriate policy requirement for SE.2 (Efficient Use of Land) as the reference to effective use of land relates more suitably with Policy SE.2. A number of comments relate to this part of the policy</p>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>and have been addressed within the assessment for policy SE.2.</p> <p>The Local Landscape Designations Areas, formerly the Areas of Special County Value are defined within the Cheshire East Local Landscape Designation Area Study (May 2013). It is considered that the wording of the policy is sufficiently robust and will ensure suitable protection is afforded to the Local Landscape Designation Areas.</p> <p>The more detailed areas such as peak district fringe and Alderley Edge Sandstone escarpment will require further guidance and/or design advice which will be published in future documents, and this has been clarified within the justification for the policy.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>13.29 insert: 'further guidance and/or design advice will be published for areas of particular distinctiveness such as the peak district fringe, Alderley Edge sandstone escarpment.'; Point 2(vi) of policy SE4 has been deleted and moved to a new point 4 of Policy SE2. This is because it relates better to the efficient use of land than landscape.</p> <p>Second sentence should refer to Local Landscape <u>Designation</u> Areas.</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Policy</b>                   | <b>Policy SE 5: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 18 (Support: 10 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 3)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is welcomed.</li> <li>• Support the strong protection given to ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees by this policy.</li> <li>• Strongly support the policy of preserving trees, hedgerows and woodlands and new plantings in future developments wherever possible.</li> <li>• Paragraph 13.37 is useful in setting out some of the reasons why the Council considers it important to protect trees and woods.</li> <li>• Support the commitment to planting new trees and woods as part of new development.</li> <li>• A welcome, helpful and practical policy. (National Trust)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not taking a firm enough position on conservation of woodland and wildlife habitats; there is no statement that clearly states the importance of these habitats.</li> <li>• There is no strategic overview accompanied by clear policy guidelines.</li> <li>• Encouraging the development of planting to mitigate losses of natural habitats, tree felling and hedgerow removal does not go far enough.</li> <li>• The policy allows a single line of bushes to be designated a hedgerow, which doesn't help any wildlife other than birds and a few insects.</li> <li>• The policy is too weak to protect existing trees that form an important but un-designated role or even ones with TPOs in the landscape.</li> <li>• Object to the term 'exceptional circumstances'.</li> <li>• The council does not proactively designate trees, woodlands or hedgerows for protection, allowing developers to easily avoid this policy.</li> <li>• The core strategy seeks the destruction of ancient woodland, hedgerows, and veteran trees in its designation of CS10 and CS32.</li> <li>• No evidence of detailed plans to enhance this aspect of our landscape and biodiversity in the core strategy.</li> <li>• Should be aspiring to increase tree cover significantly. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council should be more proactive in plantings; particularly replacing roadside trees and planting more.</li> <li>• Important that this strong protection is carried forward into planning decisions and that the wording "in exceptional circumstances" is only applied to cases which are truly exceptional.</li> <li>• Yeowood Garden Village will provide substantial new tree and hedgerow planting within the infrastructure of the development proposals to provide local distinctiveness within the landscape and enable climate adaptation resilience.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County's ecology - trees, hedgerows and woodlands, must be protected.</li> <li>• Perhaps offsets in mitigation etc proposed by developers should be required by council contracted ecologists as meeting proper offset levels or indeed whether any offset is permissible.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take firmer position on conservation of woodlands.</li> <li>• Include a statement to clarify the importance of woodland and wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Include a strategic overview accompanied by clear policy guidelines.</li> <li>• Loss of woodland/individual trees and hedgerows due to development or incidental destruction must be replaced.</li> <li>• All developments should provide for hedgerow planting and, for hedgerows to sustain wildlife, they must be a minimum of 2m and preferably 4m wide.</li> <li>• Include a requirement for the over-riding need to be set out and options to have been considered.</li> <li>• Removal of the phrase 'exceptional circumstances'.</li> <li>• Include a detailed strategy for the protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows.</li> <li>• The policy should seek to secure a significant increase in tree cover, possibly by indicating that proposals that will deliver increased (native) tree cover will be considered favourably (providing they conform to other policies in the Strategy).</li> <li>• Ancient hedgerows, ancient woodlands and veteran trees should be given a greater degree of protection than that which this policy correctly gives to other valued trees, hedges and woodland. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• The 'overriding reasons' for allowing damaging development should include a demonstration of the need – rather than potential profitability or demand – for the development. (CPRE Cheshire)</li> <li>• Use of the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard to calculate the amount of new woodland required.</li> <li>• Have an enforceable definition of "exceptional circumstances".</li> <li>• Policy should be tightened to reduce any loopholes generated around the phrases 'not normally' and 'in exceptional circumstances'.</li> <li>• Amendment to para 13.37 - To the sentence 'They may have historic importance...(as) keys to the history of the landscape by identifying former highways, settlements and field boundaries', add 'land use'.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>Woodland, trees, and hedgerows within Cheshire East are important visual and ecological assets which not only provide a significant contribution to the Borough's local distinctiveness but also play a role in mitigating and addressing climate change.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the National Trust consider that this policy is a helpful and practical policy, amongst other support, and therefore with the addition of a reference to hedgerows within bullet point 1 and include the support of biodiversity to ensure the policy is fully robust, it is considered that the policy as a whole is succinct and sufficiently robust. Any additional wording would be overly prescriptive at this time.</p> <p>As outlined in the policy only in 'exceptional circumstances' will development be permitted which would harm Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland. Any application will be judged on its own merits, and only considered favorably where there are</p>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | clear overriding reasons for allowing the development and there are no suitable alternatives available.                            |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | Add reference to hedgerows and biodiversity to Policy SE5 bullet point 2, and within the preamble and justification of the policy. |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SE6: Green Infrastructure</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 27 (Support: 11 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 8)</b><br>Green Infrastructure: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SE6: 26 (Support: 10 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 8)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy especially the link between green infrastructure and health and well being; request include trees and woodland in list of GI assets (even though separate policy on trees and woodland)</li> <li>• Support proposals to create good quality green infrastructure in new development – particularly green linear corridors</li> <li>• Policy in accordance with paragraph 73 and 74 of NPPF and Sport England’s Playing Field Policy and Planning Policy Objectives (Protect, Enhance, Provide)</li> <li>• Support policy – request that residential gardens/greenspace be acknowledged in justification; also add Lindow Moss Landscape Character Area which includes Lindow Common to list of Strategic Green Infrastructure Assets.</li> <li>• The strong approach advocated to protecting and enhancing green infrastructure is endorsed and supported</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for stronger protection of green spaces – recreational, environmental and historical in and adjacent to towns – e.g. area between Newbold Astbury and older parts of Congleton</li> <li>• GI multi-functional but conflict can occur – suggested addition to part 2 – new functions are encouraged where they do not conflict with existing; add Nantwich Riverside park to list of strategic assets; need for more rigorous data and assessment – full landscape and habitat assessment.</li> <li>• Provision of open space supported but table should refer to children’s play and outdoor sport requirement only as per national requirement of 2.4 ha per 1,000 (FIT standard). Amenity green space, allotments and green infrastructure connectivity should be dealt with separately. No evidence to support requirements. Object to developer contribution for outdoor sports – may affect viability – viability considerations should be referred to in policy.</li> <li>• Part 3 should be supporting text; part 4 should be stand alone policy; need for evidence for changes to outdoor sport requirement – standard to developer contribution; contributions should be properly tested and viable.</li> <li>• Policy should refer to Local Green Space where it is designated in a neighbourhood plan – for consistency with the NPPF – paragraphs 76-78</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements as set out will add to cost of development and may be affected by viability testing. This needs to be recognised.</li> <li>• Green wedge between Lamberts Lane and urban fringe of Congleton needs to be protected from development</li> <li>• Seek to secure greenways between and through settlements for walkers, cyclists and horse riders in section 4 of the policy</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Significant contribution” needs a definition or open to abuse</li> <li>• Careful monitoring re towns surrounded by green belt e.g. Wilmslow; development should be outside green belt</li> <li>• Complete policy and section are excellent but need to be carried into specific policies and spatial plans e.g. southern towns deficit of green space – spatial plans need to increase green space</li> <li>• Biodiversity offsetting at a pilot stage – will need more guidelines</li> <li>• GI assets listed in SE6 part 3 not evidence based in relation to biodiversity – no reference to biodiversity networks identified by Econet or UK BAP habitat. Nothing to suggest further ecological modelling has or will take place<br/>Implementing Regulation 9A of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 relating to the provision of sufficient diversity and area habitat for wild birds</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider viability as part of the policy</li> <li>• Addition of green wedges e.g. south of Congleton to Lamberts Lane</li> <li>• Seek to secure greenways between and through settlements for walkers, cyclists and horse riders in section 4 of the policy</li> <li>• 13.44 – add pedestrian access to countryside from towns and villages, and car parks by rural footpaths</li> <li>• Need for more guidelines re biodiversity offsetting – e.g. in a Nature Conservation Strategy</li> <li>• Need reference to biodiversity assets e.g. biodiversity networks as identified by Econet; provision of sufficient diversity and area habitat for birds</li> <li>• Request include trees and woodland in list of GI assets (even though separate policy on trees and woodland)</li> <li>• Request that residential gardens/greenspace be acknowledged in justification; also add Lindow Moss Landscape Character Area which includes Lindow Common to list of Strategic Green Infrastructure Assets.</li> <li>• Suggested addition to part 2 – new functions are encouraged where they do not conflict with existing; add Nantwich Riverside park to list of strategic assets</li> <li>• Developer contributions for outdoor sport – should be deleted from table; policy should also include reference to the need for viability considerations to be taken into account when applying standards.</li> <li>• Part 3 should be supporting text; part 4 should be stand alone policy; need for evidence for changes to outdoor sport requirement – standard to developer contribution; contributions should be properly tested and viable.</li> <li>• Policy should refer to Local Green Space where it is designated in a neighbourhood plan – for consistency with the NPPF – paragraphs 76-78</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>This policy accords with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”. The policy is also in accordance with Section 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework “Promoting healthy communities” in particular paragraphs 73 and 74 and Sport England’s Planning Policy Objectives (Protect, Enhance, Provide).</p> <p>Policy SE6 Green Infrastructure provides opportunities for providing a variety of environmental benefits including recreation and biodiversity as part of the network of multi-functional green spaces and has a crucial link with health and well-being. The Green Space Strategy (2013), part of the Council’s Evidence base, provides</p>   |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>a strategic overview in relation to green infrastructure looking at open space, country parks, rights of way, landscape and biodiversity. Some of the detailed queries/responses to policy SE6 are dealt with under different policies such as policy SE3 “Biodiversity and Geodiversity”, Policy SE5 “Trees Hedgerows and Woodland” and in the Green Space Strategy.</p> <p>This is a strategic policy for the whole of the Borough and so very detailed site specific matters will be covered at the Site Allocations stage.</p> <p>Policy amendments in relation to some detailed questions/responses are proposed to strengthen the policy and add clarity; plus cross references to other policies.</p> <p>Information regarding viability and Local Green Space designations will be added to the text.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criterion 1: Add trees and woodland and wildlife habitats to list of assets.</li> <li>• Criterion 3 – add to list “The ecological network of habitats identified in policy SE3”.</li> <li>• Add to justification: “Viability considerations will be taken into account with any development proposal especially when applying open space standards.”</li> <li>• Add to justification: “Paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF consider Local Green Space designations and set out when they might be appropriate. Local Green Space designations proposed in Neighbourhood Plans can be considered at the Site Allocations stage.”</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SE7: The Historic Environment</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 26 (Support: 9 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 11)</b><br>Historic Environment: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SE7: 25 (Support: 8 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 11)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see Abbey Fields (or Part) included as a Heritage Site. An OS Map dated 1843 indicates the land as parkland with tracks and buildings on it and the Roman Road runs across it.</li> <li>• CPRE Cheshire supports this policy</li> <li>• Strongly support Policy SE7, Historic Environment and the reasoned justification that underpins it.<br/>Comment: suggest that Policy SE7.6 is expanded to read ‘positively manage the historic built environment and historic landscapes</li> <li>• Support Part 4 of this policy. However, consider policy needs to go further, to state that where appropriate, heritage assets can be altered and extended to enable their longer term economic use for sustainable tourism. Recognition is required in part 4 of the need to consider the viability of development prior to consideration of mitigation and compensation measures.</li> <li>• Welcome Part 5 of the policy. However, consider that the policy should provide explicit and in-principle policy support, subject to a list of development management criteria to be met, for specific development proposals. To be consistent with national policy, the policy should fully reflect paragraph 140 of the NPPF.</li> <li>• Historic Environment 13.13-66, Policy SE7 Excellent.</li> <li>• While supporting this point, recognition must be given that alternative uses or redevelopment of non-designated heritage assets will be considered favourably and flexibly by the local planning authority where it would secure the occupation of important heritage assets or landmark buildings.</li> <li>• The intention to allow &amp; encourage good contemporary architecture to complement the historic environment is supported.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage: Whilst we acknowledge the intention to produce a future Development Management DPD, there is little in this policy that is place specific, at the moment this policy could be applied anywhere and does little to identify the important aspects of the historic environment in the Borough. This criterion should require all new development to make a positive contribution to not only character and setting but also the significance and local distinctiveness and identity. Introduce place specific elements on historic environment; recognise contribution to character and setting of new development. Wording should be more positive. Point 6 should refer to heritage at risk.</li> <li>• Good in parts but heritage policy needs to recognise the different approach to assessing impacts upon Grade I and II* assets compared with Grade II; there is inadequate reference to relevant local advice on the historic environment</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>and heritage at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to point 4 of Policy SE7 - does not accord with paragraphs 14 &amp; 135 of NPPF or presumption in favour of sustainable development. It refers to a presumption in favour of retaining non-designated assets unless any harm that would result is outweighed by benefits. NPPF says sustainable development should be permitted unless the benefits are significant &amp; demonstrably outweighed by harm.</li> <li>• The robustness of this policy is weakened by 'seek to avoid or minimise' as it may lead to heritage assets not being conserved, such as the erosion of the Nantwich battlefield site through permissions for housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General point: Support the intention to allow and encourage good contemporary architecture to complement the historic environment.</li> <li>• Question criteria for judging the justification for development affecting the historic environment: will it be public or private benefit?</li> <li>• What provision of protection will there be for such sites in the event of vandalism/accidental/wilful or criminal destruction especially if the possibility of future development may arise?</li> <li>• Support the policy but include reference to ancient trees</li> <li>• Comments regarding housing development on Green Belt land close to heritage assets. This would be contrary to the main aims of the Core Strategic Plan.</li> <li>• Policy SE 7 should include a requirement for all greenfield sites to be subjected to detailed archaeological assessment (by field evaluation) prior to development in order to ensure that currently unknown historical evidence is detected, retained and not destroyed by development. This should be at cost to the developer.</li> <li>• There is wide recognition of Knutsford's significant historic environment - one of the town's two USPs. Welcome this policy and suggests an addition to paragraph 3ii: "Justification shall include consideration of alternative proposals and reasons for their rejection."</li> <li>• Several references to individual heritage assets in Wilmslow, and the need for surveys of local heritage assets.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a reference to the need to protect ancient, veteran and notable trees because of their role as important historical and cultural, as well as environmental, assets.</li> <li>• Policy SE 7 should include a requirement for all greenfield sites to be subjected to detailed archaeological assessment (by field evaluation) prior to development at cost to the developer.</li> <li>• Amend split infinitive in 6. 'to positively manage'.</li> <li>• Sub section 3 Criterion i add – 'and their settings' at the end of the sentence<br/>Criterion iv reword as follows 'Use of appropriate legal agreements or planning obligations to secure the benefits arising from a development proposal where the loss, in whole or in part, of a heritage asset is accepted'<br/>Sub section 4: Insert the following after non-designated assets in first sentence '(including buildings on the local list)'<br/>Sub section 6 Add - 'in particular buildings and areas identified as being at</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>risk' to the final sentence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In justification paragraph 13.63 bullet 2 architecture should be 'architectural'</li> <li>• Amend paragraph 4 to comply with presumption in favour of sustainable development.</li> <li>• Reword policy to recognise the important aspects of the historic environment in the Borough. Criteria 1 and 2 shall be amended (or combined) to incorporate the important aspects of the historic environment in one clear criterion. The policy should be expanded to include reference to key elements of the historic environment in the Borough. Note that the justification text includes a lot of this information. An additional criterion should be introduced to indicate what is required to be submitted with applications that affect the historic environment.</li> </ul> <p>Point 5 - Replace "heritage context" with "historic environment" or "heritage assets".</p> <p>Point 6 - Include the term "Heritage Assets".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments to pick up the issues identified in Section 4 above... some re-drafting in consultation with English Heritage is recommended, National Trust would be pleased to provide further advice/comment if invited to do so.</li> <li>• Strengthen the wording to give more protection</li> <li>• Change required to make it sound:<br/>The part of paragraph 4 of Policy SE7 which starts with "The presumption..." through to the end of that paragraph is not consistent with NPPF and should be deleted.</li> <li>• Abbey Fields should be recognised as a Heritage Site.</li> <li>• Policy SE7.6 is expanded to read 'positively manage the historic built environment and historic landscapes' to reflect the references to the historic landscape in paragraphs: 13.58, 13.59, 13.60, 13.62 and 13.63</li> <li>• Policy needs to go further, to state that where appropriate, heritage assets can be altered and extended to enable their longer term economic use for sustainable tourism.</li> <li>• Recognition is also required in part 4 of the need to consider the viability of development prior to consideration of mitigation and compensation measures.</li> <li>• Part 5 of policy should provide explicit and in-principle policy support, subject to a list of development management criteria to be met, for specific development proposals. To be consistent with national policy, the policy should fully reflect paragraph 140 of the NPPF.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p><u>Place-specific references:</u> English Heritage and others state that there should be references to specific heritage assets and locations in the policy. It is accepted that the existing development plans have separate policies for conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, ancient monuments, etc. However these plans were drawn up under the old national planning regime, which has been substantially changed. References to the heritage assets of Cheshire East are contained in the supporting text, 13.57-63, and are too many to list in a policy. Additional designations could be made within the Plan period and their exclusion from a policy may weaken their protection. Site specific references will be included in the site allocations and development policies document and in supplementary planning guidance.</p>  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p><u>Heritage at risk</u>: Taking action to protect listed buildings at risk is a statutory duty under the LB and Ca Act 1990. Similarly protection of Ancient Monuments is the responsibility of English Heritage. Other heritage assets have no statutory protection. There is specific reference to buildings at risk in paragraph 13.66, and also in paragraph 130 of NPPF section 12.</p> <p><u>Archaeology</u>: this is safeguarded by the policy and explained by the supporting text paragraphs 13.60-61. Part 2 of the policy will require an archaeological assessment for development proposals affecting archaeological sites.</p> <p><u>Use of legal agreements</u>: this is relevant but does not need to be stated here as s106 agreements are a tool of policy, not a policy in themselves.</p> <p><u>Ancient trees</u>: they are referred to in policy SE5. It would be possible to include a reference to veteran trees and ancient woodlands in paragraph 13.59.</p> <p><u>Sustainable tourism</u>; This is dealt with under part 6 of policy SE7.</p> <p><u>Compliance with NPPF section 12- enabling development</u>: this is already mentioned in part 6 of the policy by reference to positive management. Enabling development is normally an exception to policy rather than a policy in itself. .</p> <p><u>Policy regarding alteration to listed buildings</u>: a policy is unnecessary as it would repeat existing legislation and guidance.</p> <p><u>Text changes</u>; these are minor changes not going to the heart of the Core Strategy. Heritage context is a clear phrase- it could be replaced with a much longer one, as it includes locations with important historic features which may be important for many reasons, not just historic reasons. Application validation requirements are detailed as part of the 1APP system.</p> <p>The suggestion by English Heritage for re-wording of part 3iv of the policy is agreed.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include reference to veteran trees and ancient woodlands in the supporting text paragraph 13.59.</li> <li>• Amend point 3 of the policy to refer to ‘The Council will seek to avoid or minimise conflict between the conservation of a designated heritage asset and any aspect of a development proposal by:’</li> <li>• Reword point 3 iv of policy SE7 as follows: ‘The use of appropriate legal agreements or planning obligations to secure the benefits arising from a development proposal where the loss, in whole or in part, of a heritage asset is accepted.’</li> <li>• In paragraph 13.63 bullet 2 architecture should be ‘architectural’.</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SE8: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 22 (Support: 8 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 10)</b><br>Renewable and Low Carbon Energy: 2 (Support: 2 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SE8: 20 (Support: 6 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 10)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support but need positive statements of how carry everything out in practice</li> <li>• Support removal of 10% requirement (on-site renewable) in previous policy</li> <li>• Support policy – would like to see all new development to have south facing roofs to enable the installation of solar panels</li> <li>• Support fuller policy wording especially re constraints such as landscape sensitivity</li> <li>• Support addressing impacts of climate change in terms of mitigation and adaptation</li> <li>• Any criteria for assessing renewable and low energy schemes should be stringent; need for detailed assessments of impact on surrounding land uses particularly re visitor/tourist destinations; especially important re wind farms and impact on landscape and wider economic considerations</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While CPRE supports the Government’s carbon commitments, and has indeed elsewhere urged CEC to take a firmer and clearer line on emissions reductions in this Strategy, we would suggest re-casting the latter part of this sentence as “will be positively supported where their economic, social and environmental benefits outweigh any adverse impacts, for example on the landscape”</li> <li>• Unproved ideas; concern on effect on the landscape; need for good design criteria</li> <li>• Policy wording just provides statement of intent to support low carbon technologies and how in some instances appropriate mitigation may be necessary</li> <li>• Feel policy SE8 should follow SE9; so either amend point 2i to read: “The surrounding landscape, natural, built, historic and cultural assets and townscape; including buildings, features, habitats and species of national and local importance and adjoining land uses; and / or ” B) Move Policy SE8 to after Policy SE9.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any renewable energy scheme must be cost effective, reliable and efficient; wind turbines must not be considered – blight on landscape</li> <li>• To limit damage, from wind turbines propose that Cheshire East should include policies in its Local Plan which specify: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Separation distances between wind turbines and dwellings and also between bridleways and footpaths.</li> <li>2. A process for dealing with complaints about wind turbine noise</li> </ol> </li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unknown housing standards may affect policy – may become outdated quickly</li> <li>• Refer to woodfuel as a source of renewable energy; small-scale biomass projects are supported</li> <li>• All new development should incorporate all proven technology</li> <li>• Height limit to be applied</li> <li>• Welcome reference to consideration of aircraft safety. Certain energy developments can adversely impact radar/aircraft operations. It is essential this has been recognised in the CS. Must be supported by development management policy on aerodrome safeguarding and restricting development in public safety zones at Manchester Airport.</li> <li>• Would like to see reference to carbon capture through the landscape; policy should set high standards; should have carbon neutral estates; there are more helpful energy hierarchy diagrams; re house building need ambitious energy and carbon criteria</li> <li>• Need to consider flood defences and storm drains (climate change effects); need to link renewable energy and carbon reduction with proposed house building and include measures to water use, mitigation re flooding etc; impact of structures – can be disguised; links with transport measures – CO2 emissions, energy reduction etc; salt as an energy resource overlooked</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To limit damage, from wind turbines propose that Cheshire East should include policies in its Local Plan which specify: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Separation distances between wind turbines and dwellings and also between bridleways and footpaths.</li> <li>2. A process for dealing with complaints about wind turbine noise</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In paragraph 13.74 refer to woodfuel as a source of renewable energy</li> <li>• Require all new development should incorporate all proven technology</li> <li>• Height limit to be provided</li> <li>• Welcome reference to consideration of aircraft safety. Certain energy developments can adversely impact radar/aircraft operations. It is essential this has been recognised in the CS. Must be supported by development management policy on aerodrome safeguarding and restricting development in public safety zones at Manchester Airport.</li> <li>• Refer to potential for carbon capture through the landscape; policy should set high standards in relation to new development and energy and carbon reduction</li> <li>• Amend first sentence: “will be positively supported where their economic, social and environmental benefits outweigh any adverse impacts, for example on the landscape”</li> <li>• Feel presentationally policy SE8 should follow SE9; so either amend point 2i to read:<br/> “The surrounding landscape, natural, built, historic and cultural assets and townscape; including buildings, features, habitats and species of national and local importance and adjoining land uses; and / or ” B) Move Policy SE8 to after Policy SE9.</li> <li>• All new development to have south facing roofs to enable the installation of solar panels</li> <li>• Any criteria for assessing renewable and low energy schemes should be stringent; need for detailed assessments of impact on surrounding land uses</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>particularly re visitor/tourist destinations; especially important re wind farms and impact on landscape and wider economic considerations</p>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The policy accords with Section 10 of the NPPF “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change particularly paragraph 95 and the move towards a low carbon future.</p> <p>Criterion 1 considers development in the context of sustainable development; therefore economic, social and environmental factors will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Minor wording changes are proposed to Criterion 2i to emphasize the importance of landscape.</p> <p>Certain energy development can adversely impact radar/aircraft operations – this is emphasized in criterion 2iii</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>Amend point 2i to read:<br/> “The surrounding landscape including natural, built, historic and cultural assets and townscape; including buildings, features, habitats and species of national and local importance and adjoining land uses.”</p>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy SE9: Energy Efficient Development</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 32 (Support: 5 / Object: 18 / Comment Only: 9)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing demand for and consumption of energy is the most effective and cost-efficient way of reducing carbon emissions, as well as reducing other problems such as fuel poverty.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any additional requirements will create viability problems in low value market areas</li> <li>• Paragraph 95 of the NPPF states that local authorities should be adopting the Government’s National Zero Carbon Policy as the local standard for energy efficiency and carbon reductions. This policy is being implemented through the Building Regulations which are setting progressively more challenging carbon reduction targets. It is highly likely that meeting the 2013 iteration of the Building Regulations will require renewable energy technologies in development proposals and therefore we suggest that the inclusion of a 10% target within Policy SE 9 is unnecessary as it is duplicating mandatory legislation.</li> <li>• Policy SE9 requires development within the District Heating Network Priority Areas to connect to any existing decentralised heating networks. In many cases, a commercial and technical assessment has concluded that connection to a local network is not the most cost effective mechanism to reduce carbon emissions and provide low carbon heat.</li> <li>• The forthcoming changes to the Building Regulations and the Governments push towards zero carbon will already require significant carbon savings from new buildings and will prove economically challenging for the development industry. These additional requirements proposed by the Council will create substantial additional burdens for the industry</li> <li>• To some extent the Council is faced with a choice: it can either prioritise affordable housing supply by easing off on other policy objectives, or else it can prioritise other policy objectives, such as higher standards of construction sustainability and regeneration but only at the expense of affordable housing provision.</li> <li>• Part 3 of this policy is too prescriptive, as it automatically requires the provision of a district heating network, unless this is not viable.</li> <li>• Part 2 of SE9 requires developments over 10 dwellings to secure at least 10% of its predicted energy requirement from decentralised or renewable or low carbon developments unless it is not feasible or viable. This requirement is unduly onerous and may threaten the viability of development, contrary to guidance in the Framework [§173]. Policy SE9 should only be applied to very large schemes where it can be shown to be deliverable and viable.</li> <li>• Overly prescriptive sustainable energy policies may act to deter development, which would be contrary to the key objective of the Framework to ‘significantly</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>boost' the supply of housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We object to the proposed requirement in Policy SE 9 for developments of over 100 dwellings to install site-wide district heating networks (3. i.). This proposed threshold is far too low for such networks to be viable, and does not provide sufficient flexibility nor incentive to explore other, potentially more effective methods of carbon reduction (for example, energy saving measures built into the fabric of the building). This threshold appears to derive from an assumption that residential development should take place at a minimum density of 55 dwellings per hectare (para. 13.85). Such a density would be excessive on many sites, especially greenfield ones on the edges of urban areas or smaller settlements, and would lead to a built form which is incongruous with the character and vernacular of those existing built-up areas. As such, Policy SE 9 and paragraph 13.85 are neither “justified” (in not being soundly evidenced) nor “effective” (in potentially impeding housing delivery, notwithstanding the apparent caveats of feasibility and viability in applying this element (3.) of Policy SE 9). If</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In many cases HSA's will achieve CfSH without need for energy production (photo cells etc), which reduces overall energy demand – should be recognised that renewable are not required to reduce fuel poverty .</li> <li>• A clear statement should be made that 10% renewable on S106 sites should be distributed to all homes and not focused on affordable units.</li> <li>• High standards and requirements should be set, not merely 'look favourably on'</li> <li>• 10% target insufficient to meet carbon reduction targets (refer to energy saving trusts recommendations.)</li> <li>• Any development that cannot meet a 10% target for renewable energy cannot be considered feasible or viable in terms of sustainable development</li> <li>• Noted that the energy hierarchy as identified above, is addressed within the Core Strategy under section 13.79. However, the statement made is that of efficiency standards exceeding the requirements of Building Regulations on large sites being unlikely to occur without a requirement in place. In which case, Cheshire East Council would be shirking their responsibilities as they are the only ones with the power to enforce the requirement in relation to the CS30 site and all other proposal sites.</li> <li>• A fabric first approach is taking a lead in the industry and relates to the first stage of the energy hierarchy by reducing energy demand – this is not mentioned in the CS document</li> <li>• CfSH is not mandatory yet can be enforced by local planning policies</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should be aspirational rather than mandatory</li> <li>• Extension to final para to clarify that this aim cannot be achieved via a 'fabric first' approach i.e. building in energy savings</li> <li>• Clarity needed on how achieving the policy will be encouraged</li> <li>• Remove reference to impact of wind turbines on landscape</li> <li>• Replace the energy hierarchy diagram 1. (base of pyramid) reduce demand by passive measures 2. Use energy efficient equipment 3. use renewable energy or allowable solutions (top of pyramid)</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon zero development and Allowable Solutions should be targets here</li> <li>• All strategic sites should require consideration of de-centralised energy and this should be emphasised in this part of the policy. Suggest inserting in after Network priority Areas</li> <li>• The policy should be amended to require an assessment of the benefits that a district heating network would bring to a development, when compared against alternative proposals.</li> <li>• Policy SE9 should be reworded to only request district heating to be delivered in exceptional circumstances and on schemes of over 600 dwellings.</li> <li>• Whilst the use of renewable resources should be encouraged the Local Plan should not include detailed and prescriptive policy setting out required efficiency ratings. Impact on viability. This level of detail would be more appropriately included within Building Regulations. District heating network element should be removed.</li> <li>• If this element is to be retained, we consider the threshold should be raised from 100 to 1,000 dwellings as an absolute minimum, at which scale the feasibility and viability of district heating networks may potentially become more evident.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The policy allows a proportionate approach to development proposals and strikes the balance between requirements that are mandated by existing statute and regulation and those aspirations which are identified to contribute to delivery of energy efficient development.</p> <p>The energy hierarchy diagram is considered sufficient to demonstrate the approach to delivering energy efficient development</p> <p>A fabric first approach is not ruled out by the policy and specific reference to Building Regulations, Code for Sustainable Homes, BREEAM, CEEQUAL and Building for Life/Lifetime homes is made to ensure a fabric first approach can contribute to the delivery of energy efficient development.</p> <p>The justification for on-site low carbon energy targets is drawn from the Cheshire East 'Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Planning Research' and the Zero Carbon Hub 'Carbon Compliance: Setting an Appropriate Limit for Zero Carbon New Homes – Findings and Recommendations' February 2011.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>No material changes required.</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Minerals and Policy SE10: Sustainable Provision of Minerals</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 22 (Support: 6 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 11)</b><br>Minerals: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 2)<br>SE10: 20 (Support: 6 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 9)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the broad objectives, recognition of the need to identify suitable locations for potential salt extraction in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document and policy seeking to safeguard Cheshire East's important mineral resources including salt, through the definition of Mineral Safeguarding Areas.</li> <li>• Support Policy SE10 in that it confirms that environmental criteria will be set out in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document against which mineral proposals will be assessed.</li> <li>• Justification also acknowledges other afteruses for underground salt cavities e.g. include brine waste disposal, hydrogen / carbon dioxide storage etc.</li> <li>• Welcome this policy overall &amp; in particular Clause 8 which supports locally-sourced building &amp; roofing stone for the repair &amp; long term maintenance of many built heritage assets.</li> <li>• Make reference to peat working, as currently undertaken at Lindow Moss</li> <li>• Make reference to the likelihood of exploratory drilling for shale gas given the very extensive deposits of both the Upper and Lower Bowland shale formations underlying Cheshire East, as identified in the British Geological Survey's Gas-In-Place Resource Assessment.</li> <li>• Welcome the inclusion of point 8 in support of the extraction of building and roofing stone for heritage purposes. Policy would benefit further through the safeguarding of sites of important local materials.</li> <li>• Support the principles established by Policy SE10 towards minerals which include a commitment to designating Mineral Safeguarding Area(s), establish overarching suitable policy criteria against which new mineral proposals will be assessed and achieving high standards of restoration and aftercare. We note that further policy criteria will be set out in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.</li> <li>• This document has responded positively to the comments we made at the last consultation stage on the Policy Principles.</li> <li>• Considers that Policy SE10 broadly conforms with the NPPF and we (<i>The Coal Authority</i>) will work with the Council in the Site Allocations and Policies Document to safeguard the whole of the surface coal resource in Cheshire East, without any exceptions in order to meet the requirements of paragraph 143 of the NPPF.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is really no possibility of increasing mineral extraction in this crowded</li> </ul> |

county, especially when another 28,000 houses are to be built.

- Council need to insist on bulk materials being moved by rail services, not by road.
- Clarification as to the context of the use of the word “conserve” in the preamble to the Policy needed. If this means to “protect” (e.g. protect from sterilisation by other developments) then this is in effect safeguarding which is already mentioned in the sentence. If this means to “save” or to “keep” then this imparts a different meaning and would imply seeking to restrict mineral development rather than to protect for future use.
- Point 3 – says that the Council will “... seek to maintain stocks of permitted silica sand reserves ....”. NPPF paragraph 146 goes further and requires Local Authorities to *provide* a stock of permitted reserves.
- Aim to safeguard mineral resources supported. However, needs to be expanded to comply with the British Geological Survey practice guide to mineral safeguarding (2007). This could well be as part of the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and if this is the case this should be noted here.
- Commitment to safeguard minerals associated infrastructure against development welcomed. This should include safeguarding of potential future minerals related infrastructure. As drafted the policy appears to seek to safeguard against other developments constraining the outward expansion of minerals infrastructure. Concern expressed about other developments effectively restricting current lawful use due to tightening of environmental controls.
- High standard restoration and aftercare of sites supported. Restoration should however deliver the potential for appropriate afteruses (since afteruse itself is not a matter for mineral planning). Restoration of mineral sites should seek to benefit the local area (for example restoration to agriculture) as well as potentially the environment and/or community.
- Policy should prioritise (rather than merely “encourage and support” the provision and use of alternatives to land-won minerals.
- The policy does not specify how much aggregates are required to provide a steady and adequate supply. The agreed sub regional apportionment endorsed by the AWP should be mentioned in the policy (not just in the supporting text).
- Plan’s statements about the future definition of MSAs the policy is not completely in line with the recommendations for best practice by the BGS. The policy should say: a. whether environmental areas, urban areas and buffer zones will be included b. where development management criteria may be found
- Policy in relation to small scale stone extraction remains in present form unsound because the mpa fundamentally misunderstands the nature of the modern industry which is trying to develop new markets to survive. Unless the plan is amended it will not fulfill NPPF policy to ensure there is “...a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs.” (para 142), and provide “...for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals.
- Concern over the claims of claims of geologically feasible the need to ‘ensure

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>appropriate integrity &amp; safety measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mineral Workings should refer to PEDL197 licence for gas exploration that covers a large area to the east of Macclesfield.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPPF requires MPA to “provide for a stock of permitted reserves” (of silica sand) rather than only an expectation that this raw material is provided which is our interpretation of the second sentence. There should be a firm commitment to deliver through the Plan process.</li> <li>We consider your draft Plan to be sound. We look forward to engaging with you in more detail, once you publish draft Minerals and Waste Policies and Site Allocations documents.</li> <li>Have potential impacts of ‘fracking’ in the Congleton area been considered in the choosing of the new (housing) sites and what measures will be put into place to ensure minimum (preferably zero) impact on the local communities on these new sites?</li> <li>Proactive approach to be taken in considering the future restoration of mineral workings so that all opportunities are appropriately appraised. The framework provided by planning policy at this stage should present a flexible base so that a diverse range of restoration schemes can be explored. Opportunities that can be delivered by the restoration of mineral workings which, in turn, can deliver a range of benefits to the local economy and the community.</li> <li>New workings that rely wholly or in part on road based transport for minerals should only be allowed where the road network is suited to carrying the size and type of vehicle proposed.</li> <li>Acknowledging that it is proposed to confirm provision for aggregates through the proposed Site Allocations and Development Policies document, it remains a concern whether a steady and adequate provision can be made without placing reliance on sources of aggregate outside the Plan area. More evidence is required to confirm that proposals for aggregate provision are effective particularly in view of proposals for growth in house building and other development.</li> <li>Policy needs policing - the policies and planning permissions are too easily flouted with impunity.</li> <li>There are substantial coal deposits shown on the map, but no policy to encourage/discourage its exploitation.</li> <li>There is no policy to either encourage or discourage exploration for shale gas and oil.</li> <li>Also recognise the afteruse of underground salt cavities for Compressed Air Energy Storage - which is even safer near populations.</li> <li>Mineral working can interrupt countryside access and take significant land areas ‘out of bounds’ for long periods. Need for see specific reference to reinstating and strengthening the countryside access network in during restoration of mineral workings.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be a firm commitment to provide silica sand through the Plan process, e.g. a minimum stock of permitted reserves will be maintained for at least 10 years production at individual silica sand sites or for at least 15 years at new or existing sites where significant new capital investment is required.</li> </ul>   |

- Landbanks to be calculated with reference to NPPF Technical Guidance (March 2012)
- Request that the justification (for afteruse of brine cavities) also acknowledges that, in accordance with national policy, cavities created following extraction of salt (in brine) also have other potential afteruses for storage purposes (and have been employed as such in Cheshire East). This could include brine waste disposal, hydrogen / carbon dioxide storage etc. The plan should acknowledge these acceptable uses, subject to site specific and environmental assessment, in order to ensure that the plan is flexible to changing demand and requirements.
- Consider impacts of 'Fracking in the Congleton area in the choosing of new sites and the measures to ensure minimum impact on local communities.
- It is requested that such merits restoration at Dingle Bank Quarry are considered as part of the Site Allocations stage of the Local Plan. In this regard, the landowner wishes to engage in early discussions with the Local Authority to explore these opportunities further.
- The use of the word 'encourage' is meaningless. Item 5 should simply read 'Support the provision of ....'. Item 9 should read 'Wherever practical minerals should be transported by methods other than by road.'
- More evidence is required to confirm that proposals for aggregate provision are effective particularly in view of proposals for growth in house building and other development.
- Make specific reference to reinstating and strengthening the countryside access network in Policy SE10.10 during restoration of mineral workings.
- Clarification as to the context of the use of the word "conserve" in the preamble to the Policy.
- Make commitment to *provide* stocks of permitted silica sand reserves to be consistent with National Policy.
- Aim to safeguard mineral resources needs to be expanded to comply with the British Geological Survey practice guide to mineral safeguarding (2007). This could well be as part of the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and if this is the case this should be noted here.
- As drafted the policy appears to seek to safeguard against other developments constraining the outward expansion of minerals infrastructure. Concern expressed about other developments effectively restricting current lawful use due to tightening of environmental controls.
- Restoration should deliver the potential for appropriate afteruses (since afteruse itself is not a matter for mineral planning). Restoration of mineral sites should seek to benefit the local area (for example restoration to agriculture) as well as potentially the environment and/or community.
- Re word policy to prioritise (rather than merely "encourage and support" the provision and use of alternatives to land-won minerals.
- .Make appropriate provision for the supply of aggregates having regard to Cheshire East's apportionment of sub-national supply guidelines and Local Aggregate Assessments. 0.71 Mtpa for sand and gravel and 0.04 Mtpa of crushed rock. This will require the identification of provision for 17.42 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period 2010-2030.
- In relation to MSAs policy should say:

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>a. whether environmental areas, urban areas and buffer zones will be included</p> <p>b. where development management criteria may be found. The following amendment to Policy SP10 criterion 6 should be made:</p> <p>‘6. Safeguard Cheshire East’s important mineral resources of silica sand, sand and gravel, sandstone, salt and surface coal through the definition of Mineral Safeguarding Areas, which will be defined in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and will include environmental areas, urban areas and buffer zones, plus development management criteria. Within these areas, mineral resources will be protected from unnecessary sterilisation by other development.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment criterion 8 to: ‘Support extraction of natural building and roofing stone for both new build and architectural heritage purposes where environmentally acceptable’.</li> <li>• The policy should add that the Allocations &amp; Development Policies Document will provide further information of the Cheshire cavities on this risk to assure the public that safety for a wider area has been adequately researched &amp; found to be beyond doubt.</li> <li>• Also add the exclusion of any possibility of storing nuclear materials either as waste or for reuse in these cavities [if not in the Waste policy SE11 or Waste DPD].</li> <li>• Make reference to peat working, as currently undertaken at Lindow Moss</li> <li>• Make reference to the likelihood of exploratory drilling for shale gas given the very extensive deposits of both the Upper and Lower Bowland shale formations underlying Cheshire East, as identified in the British Geological Survey’s Gas-In-Place Resource Assessment.</li> <li>• The policy should be amended to include reference to the safeguarding of sites of important local materials.</li> <li>• Position in relation to peat extraction to be clarified</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Comments concerning the reference of peat in the policy are accepted. Policy to be amended to make reference to peat and outline approach in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Comments concerning the need for reference to shale gas and impacts of its potential exploration and extraction are acknowledged. The policy recognises that there is for potential unconventional hydrocarbon resources to be found and worked although the authority has yet to receive applications concerning their exploration or extraction. Therefore uncertainty remains over the potential for these resources. More detailed, specific policies are to be drafted as part of the Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD concerning (unconventional) hydrocarbon exploration, appraisal and development in line with the NPPF with reference to the PEDL Licence areas covering parts of the Borough.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the wider Core Strategy is proposing significant new development in the borough over the Plan period the land use pressures this may bring. However, to be found sound, the Plan must contain policies to plan for a steady and adequate supply of minerals and give great weight to the benefits of mineral extraction including the economy. As Cheshire East has an established and economically important minerals industry, planning policy must reflect this set</p>   |

within the limits of the environment.

Comments concerning the impact of increasing the transportation of minerals via the road network and the requiring policy to insist on alternative methods are acknowledged. However, in reality it is often not feasible or practicable for minerals in Cheshire East to be transported by other methods due to the rural location of most quarries. It accepted that potential exist for impacts on the road network and policies specific policies are to be drafted as part of the Site Allocations and Development Polices DPD to address/mitigate these. Policy wording will be amended to strengthen support the use of alternative methods where practicable.

Comments concerning the clarification of the meaning of term to 'conserve' mineral resource in the context of the policy have been considered. The term has derived from the MPA's interpretation of the NPPF's requirement 'to secure the long term conservation of finite natural resources' seeking to ensure that primary minerals are put to the best use and suitable alternatives such as secondary/recycled aggregates are used where practicable. Policy wording and supporting text will be amended to clarify this.

Comments concerning the wording of policy and supporting text regarding the provision of sand have been considered. Policy text will be amended to better reflect the requirements of the NPPF.

It is acknowledged that cavities created following extraction of salt (in brine) also have other potential afteruses for storage purposes (and have been employed as such in Cheshire East). In line with national policy, policy justification will be amended to reflect and acknowledge other acceptable uses e.g. brine waste disposal, hydrogen / carbon dioxide storage etc. subject to site specific and environmental assessment, in order to ensure that the plan is flexible to changing demand and requirements.

It is acknowledged that the policy concerning mineral safeguarding will need to align with the best practice guidance produced by the BGS. Policy will be expanded to comply with this guidance. It is the intention that policy concerning mineral safeguarding will be addressed in more detail of the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Policies.

Concern that policy appears to seek to safeguard against other developments constraining the outward expansion of minerals infrastructure and concern expressed about other developments, effectively restricting current lawful use due to tightening of environmental controls, has been considered. It is the intention to safeguard appropriate minerals related infrastructure to prevent encroachment from non-compatible non-mineral development. Policy wording will be reviewed and clarified where necessary.

Comments concerning policy for the restoration of mineral workings and potential for appropriate afteruses to be reviewed to ensure flexibility so that a diverse range of restoration schemes can be explored have been considered. Policy

wording will be reviewed to ensure its effectiveness. Reference to reinstating and strengthening the countryside access network in during restoration of mineral workings will be considered as part of specific detailed policies in the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Policies.

Comments concerning prioritisation of the provision and use of alternatives to land-won minerals are acknowledged. Policy will emphasise need to consider the conservation of natural resources and support provision of suitable alternatives.

It is acknowledged that coal deposits are shown on the map, but no policy to encourage/discourage its exploitation. Policies concerning all mineral development regardless of the resource will be contained in the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Policies. This will include considering development management policies concerning the attaching of specific conditions to planning permissions for mineral development to ensure impacts are monitored.

Concerns expressed whether a steady and adequate aggregates provision can be made without placing reliance on sources outside Cheshire East and the need for more evidence to confirm that proposals are effective, particularly in view of proposals for growth in house building and other development, have been acknowledged and considered. As part of preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Policies, detailed evidence will be prepared to review all existing minerals allocations and assess any new potential sites and/or areas needed to meet future sand and gravel demand and maintain landbanks.

Comments regarding the inclusion of the sub-regional aggregate apportionment figures in the policy text have been acknowledged. The table in the supporting text will now detail total provision figures beyond plan period. However, it is considered that the policy as worded which makes reference to the figures in the supporting text is sufficient and is as effective. It is considered that the inclusion of the figures in the policy could run the risk of time limiting the policy should the supply figures change over the plan period. The NPPF and MASS guidance states that account should be taken of national and sub-national guidelines when planning for the future demand for and supply of aggregates and that the Government will continue to publish guidelines. The MPA is therefore concerned that should these new guideline figures be published and apportioned to Cheshire East, or should new evidence come to light in annual Local Aggregate Assessments, then the policy should be flexible and future proof enough to accommodate these.

It is acknowledged that policy extraction supporting the small scale extraction of natural building and roofing stone may be unduly restrictive and not reflect the nature of the building/dimension stone working - a point accepted in light of the detailed information provided offering industry insight. Policy to be amended to remove restriction to 'small scale'.

The comment relating to the policy amendment to include reference to the safeguarding of sites of important local materials has been noted. The policy does state that building stone is considered of economic importance and will be

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>therefore will safeguarded. The policy has been amended to note the inclusion local building stone (sandstone) as part of the safeguarding process, the best available information will be used in the identification of MSAs. This will include information published by English Heritage on building stone in Cheshire.</p> <p>Request that the policy justification should state that relevant information to ensure the safety of brine cavities for gas storage purposes will be required by policies in the Site Allocations &amp; Development Policies has been noted. Policy justification has been amend to emphasise need to secure the safety and integrity. Proposals for afteruses of mineral working will need to accord with all relevant policies in the Local Plan Strategy and forthcoming Site allocations and Development Policies DPD (not just minerals policy). Consideration will be given to specific policy concerning the afteruse of salt cavities for natural gas (or other) storage.</p> <p>Comments concerning the possibilities of storing nuclear waste in underground brine cavities have been considered. The siting of any underground geological disposal facility would be subject its own proposed process outline by DECC under which development consent would only follow after several defined stages including community involvement and investigations to ascertain site suitability. The authority is not aware of any information suggesting the suitability of sites in Cheshire East for such a facility.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>In response to consultee comments and to better reflect national policy and relevant guidance, minor amendments should be made to the policy and its supporting justification concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to peat and the non support of its extraction in line with NPPF in policy and justification.</li> <li>• Reference the need to address hydrocarbon development in the Site Allocations Document (as mineral development) in policy justification.</li> <li>• The ‘support’ rather than just encouragement the use of alternative methods of transport where practicable in policy.</li> <li>• Clarification of the interpretation of ‘conserving’ mineral resources (as referenced in the NPPF) and support provision of suitable alternatives in policy and justification</li> <li>• Closer alignment to NPPF policy wording on the provision of silica sand in policy and justification.</li> <li>• Closer alignment with the NPPF on acknowledgement that there are other acceptable storage uses for brine cavities in justification.</li> <li>• Expansion of policy concerning mineral safeguarding to better comply with BGS guidance in policy.</li> <li>• Clarification of policy wording concerning safeguarding of minerals infrastructure in justification.</li> <li>• Amendment to policy and supporting text wording concerning restoration to recognise all benefits and that afteruse.</li> <li>• Inclusion in justification of figures and detail on sub-regional/national aggregate apportionment to indicate amount rolled forward beyond the</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Remove restriction to small scale building and roofing stone in policy and justification.</li><li>• Reference to the safeguarding local building stone in justification.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Waste and Policy SE11: Sustainable Management of Waste</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 13 (Support: 7 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 5)</b><br>Waste: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SE11: 12 (Support: 6 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 5)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support this policy. However, should also include a provision requiring all new development to be designed so as to maximise opportunities for driving the management of waste up the hierarchy</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst supporting the policy's waste hierarchy, the Waste Development Plan should expressly advocate minimising use of primary raw minerals, making the link with the Minerals policy &amp; to educate those companies &amp; bodies that produce waste to know the potential uses for their materials to replace raw minerals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not see how the stated policy of treating waste as a resource is to be met. I also do not see any policy for re-greening existing land-fill sites or potentially mining them for re-usable products.</li> <li>In general, your waste policies and text are also sound, but do not mention radioactive waste management at all. It is likely that there would be some Very Low Level radioactive waste from the two major hospitals in CE. A statement on whether you have such waste arisings, plus the current and intended future disposal methods, would be welcome, if not at this stage, then in your future Waste DPD.</li> <li>The proposed policy is not consistent with paragraph 16 of PPS10 and does not address issues as identified in the Waste Needs Assessment Report 2011 that indicates the need for more facilities to achieve diversion of waste from landfill and a reliance on waste facilities outside the Plan area. The policy does not provide an appropriate strategy for sustainable waste management and as indicated in the justification to the policy the intention is to address waste issues by preparing a separate waste development plan document.</li> <li>The Waste Development Plan should remove the Clayhanger site from those that might be considered for waste management.</li> <li>Include a policy to minimise the transportation of waste within the borough i.e. manage and dispose of waste close to the point of waste generation.</li> <li>There is no mention of anaerobic digestion, or of the harvesting and use of consequent gas production, both of which will considerably enhance the environmental performance of the borough. Nor any mention of an incinerator which can extract energy from otherwise unusable waste, and vastly reduce landfill.</li> <li>Care should be taken as to where to site plants, AD waste and power</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>plants should not be sited near homes in quiet rural areas. A minimum distance from homes should be set.</p>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update LDS to detail production of Waste DPD.</li> <li>• Amend to take account of the strategic nature of waste and the movement of waste across administrative boundary</li> <li>• Amend to address issues as identified in the Waste Needs Assessment Report 2011 that indicates the need for more facilities to achieve diversion of waste from landfill and a reliance on waste facilities outside the Plan area.</li> <li>• Include policy on re-greening existing land-fill and potential for mining to extract re-usable material (as in Holland and Germany).</li> <li>• Add statement on LLN waste arisings, plus the current and intended future disposal methods, would be welcome, if not at this stage, then in your future Waste DPD.</li> <li>• The Waste Development Plan should expressly advocate minimising use of primary raw minerals, making the link with the Minerals policy &amp; to educate those companies &amp; bodies that produce waste to know the potential uses for their materials to replace raw minerals.</li> <li>• Include a policy to minimise the transportation of waste within the borough i.e. manage and dispose of waste close to the point of waste generation.</li> <li>• Should be policy assurance that there will be no nuclear waste storage either as waste or for reuse in underground cavities following salt extraction, which has been suggested in the past</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>Comments concerning the accounting for Very low Level Radioactive Waste arisings in Cheshire East are acknowledged. This waste stream will be considered in the Updated Waste Needs Assessment and appropriate measures to ensure its disposal addressed in the forthcoming Wastes DPD.</p> <p>Comments concerning the consistency of the policy with current national waste policy and policy not addressing issues identified in evidence on waste have been acknowledged and considered. Policy wording will be amended to re-emphasise the requirements of national waste planning policy to include the commitment to plan for sufficient opportunities for the provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations. This will be met through the forthcoming waste DPD.</p> <p>Supporting text to the policy will be amended to recognise the issue of cross boundary waste movement. As part of preparation for the Waste DPD, an updated waste needs assessment will be prepared focussing on quantifying the borough's waste management needs (including for landfill disposal), capturing an up to date picture on the extent to which waste is imported to and exported from Cheshire East and indicating reliance on facilities outside the plan area. This evidence will then inform the development of policy to address the Borough's waste management needs in line with national policy.</p> <p>Comments concerning the removal of Clayhanger Hall Farm as a waste allocation have been considered. As part of preparation for the Waste DPD, all existing allocations in the Cheshire Waste Local Plan will be reviewed. The Waste DPD will need to identify new sites and areas to meet the need identified in the update Waste Needs Assessment.</p> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>Comment concerning the impacts of waste transportation have been acknowledged. As a principle of waste management, waste should be as close to the point of origin as possible taking into account the where the most appropriate facility is. Policy in the waste DPD will also need to acknowledge the proximity principle in line with national planning policy. Policies to address and mitigate adverse impacts of waste management facilities will be included in the Waste DPD to compliment generic development management polices seeking to address the impact of all development.</p> <p>Comments concerning the mention of Anaerobic Digestion (AD) and other energy from waste technology have been noted. Reference is currently made to recognising the potential for new technologies to help drive the management of waste up the Waste Hierarchy, which would include AD. Policies in the waste DPD will need recognise and allow for new waste technologies such as AD to be sited. Policy and methodology behind the siting of all waste management facilities will need to take into account a range of factors and criteria to ensure proposals do not endanger human health or cause environmental harm.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledges that an updated Local Development Scheme (LDS) is essential to outline the timetable for the production of the Waste DPD in order to ensure that the adequate and timely provision of properly located new waste facilities. Policy justification has been amended to make explicit reference to the commitment to produce the LDS.</p> <p>Comments concerning the policy exclusion of storing nuclear waste in underground brine cavities have been considered. As a national issues, the siting of any underground geological disposal facility would be subject its own proposed process outline by DECC under which development consent would only follow after several defined stages including community involvement and investigations to ascertain site suitability. The authority is not aware of any information suggesting the suitability of sites in Cheshire East for such a facility.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>In response to consultee comments and to better reflect national policy and relevant guidance, minor amendments should be made to the policy and its supporting justification concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-emphasise need to ensure sufficient opportunities for the provision of waste management facilities to meet CE's needs in appropriate locations</li> <li>• Policy justification to add that timetable of Waste DPD will be outlined in the LDS</li> <li>• Policy justification clearer over production of evidence in support of Waste DPD</li> <li>• Reference to the strategic nature of waste planning and recognition of the cross boundary movement of waste with regard to neighbouring authorities</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Pollution and Policy SE12: Pollution and Unstable Land</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 16 (Support: 4 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 6)</b><br>Pollution: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)<br>SE12: 14 (Support: 4 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheshire East has a considerable amount of mining legacy which results in land instability being a locally distinctive issue within Cheshire East. Deficiencies in Policy SE12 have now been amended to positively refer to unstable land with welcome introduction of the topic into Policy SE12. Policy criterion considered to be appropriate having regard to paragraphs 106, 120, 121 and 166 of the NPPF. <i>(Made by the Coal Authority).</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This strategy, in accelerating the uptake of emissions fuels and technologies, is to be welcomed but should not be restricted to ‘in and around development sites’</li> <li>• Artificial light can cause environmental harm as well as wasting energy although many installations are outside planning control [paras. 13.121 13.122]. There is increasing research indicating adverse impact also on wildlife &amp; ourselves. This should be recognised through policy. There is an opportunity to give guidance through subsequent planning policy or Supplementary Planning Documents [Para 13.126].</li> <li>• Poor lighting designs can result in a waste of valuable energy and the policy should also encourage developers, architects and lighting designers to consistently provide energy efficient lighting designs.</li> <li>• Concern that policy does not expressly bring about improvement of the control over the impact of new development through better management of existing situations.</li> <li>• In the list of types of pollution / features to be preserved from pollution, it would be helpful if “tranquillity” were included. This is important because of the strong contrasts in tranquillity between the urban areas within and around the Borough and the rural areas.</li> <li>• Knutsford residents are adversely affected by noise from aircraft using Manchester Airport, and frequently express their concerns. The CS should refer here to this issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference should be made in 13.126 to The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution report on Artificial Light in the Environment 2009 and its findings on including explicit consideration of lighting in planning policy should be reflected in clause 13.126 and policy SE12.</li> <li>• Pollution and Unstable Land should be changed to "Pollution and Land Contamination" as "unstable" suggests geological instability.</li> <li>• There is no cover for non-development of old/disused landfill sites where ground and air contamination is not known and could be a long term issue if</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>the land was developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an existing AQMA at the Rood Hill traffic signal junction in Congleton in the midst of a planned 3500 new homes and expanded employment sites. The Local Plan should reduce road based travel in the area so as to address the air pollution problems at this location.</li> <li>• Land allocation plans fly in the face of this policy by locating housing far from employment and town centres, public transport or using brownfield sites near housing for further housing instead of local employment.</li> <li>• Policy and supporting text should be amended to address land instability/subsidence issues at planning application stage and refer to statutory duty under the Cheshire Brine Pumping (Compensation for Subsidence) Act, 1952 to consult with the Board for all development within certain prescribed " Consultation Areas". (<i>Made by Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board</i>).</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It recommended [&amp; the government endorsed 18 March 2010] that:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. there should be explicit consideration of light in planning policy including a presumption against the provision of artificial light in some areas where it may have a negative impact on species of concern</li> <li>2. local authorities assess the likely ecological impacts of changes to the amount and quality of artificial light</li> <li>3. highways authorities and local authorities reassess the lighting of roads against potential road safety and crime reduction benefits</li> <li>4. local authorities should develop a lighting master plan in consultation with their local communities, professional lighting designers, and their own public lighting engineers</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The CS should refer here to the issue of noise in relation to aircraft using Manchester Airport- CEC should monitor the possibility of achieving reductions in aircraft noise (especially at night), not limited to improvements in aircraft design.</li> <li>• Low emission strategy not to be restricted to in and around development sites.</li> <li>• Remove 'in and around development sites' from the low emission strategy Commit to taking this topic further in subsequent planning policy or SPD &amp; include references as above &amp; any other in the key evidence list.</li> <li>• Policy title should be changed to Pollution and Land Contamination rather than Pollution and Unstable Land as "unstable" suggests geological instability.</li> <li>• There should be no domestic development on old/disused landfill sites.</li> <li>• Address that without significant mitigation, proposed development will make an existing AQMA worse, such as at Rood Hill Congleton.</li> <li>• Include "(including natural dissolution and/or brine pumping related subsidence)" in point 4 of policy. Add new sentence "there is a statutory duty under the Cheshire Brine Pumping (Compensation for Subsidence) Act, 1952 to consult with the Board for all development within certain prescribed " Consultation Areas" as shown on the proposals map" and to include those areas on the proposals map. Consequently, further comments may then be required to be added to the Justification paragraphs, and the 1952 Act should be added to the list of Key Evidence. It may also be appropriate to add brine specific comments to the Core Strategy site Profiles (section 15), where these</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | lie either partially or fully within the consultation areas.  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>Comment concerning the re-titling of the policy to ‘Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability’ in response to comments from Environmental Health accepted to better reflect the scope of the policy.</p> <p>Comments concerning light pollution have been acknowledged. The issue of lighting is referred to in the justification. It is considered that as strategic policy, light pollution has been addressed sufficiently in the policy to ensure it development does not detrimentally affect amenity or cause harm. Further more specific planning policy/guidance concerning light pollution would, were necessary, be subject of subsequent planning documents.</p> <p>Comments concerning the noise impact of aircraft using Manchester Airport have been acknowledged. It is considered that as strategic policy, noise pollution (in general) has been addressed sufficiently in the policy to ensure the location of development does result harmful or cumulative impacts. Further more specific planning policy/guidance concerning aircraft noise, would were necessary, be subject of subsequent planning documents produced if necessary in co-operation with Manchester Airport.</p> <p>Comment concerning the scope of the Council’s low emission strategy have been considered and noted. A commitment to further guidance in subsequent planning policy or Supplementary Planning Documents is given in the policy justification.</p> <p>Comments concerning the inclusion of reference to brine related subsidence and statutory duties under the Cheshire Brine Pumping (Compensation for Subsidence) Act have been noted and policy and justification wording amendments have been made were necessary to address this.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | <p>In response to consultee comments, minor amendments should be made to the policy and its supporting justification concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The re-titling of the policy to ‘Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability’ in response to more accurately reflect the policy’s scope.</li> <li>• Reference to brine subsidence and statutory duty to consult with the Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board for all development within certain prescribed consultation areas.</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Flood Risk and Water Management and Policy SE13: Flood Risk and Water Management</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 18 (Support: 8 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 7)</b><br>Flood Risk and Water Management: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)<br>SE13: 17 (Support: 8 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 7)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important not to look at each planning application in isolation in relation to flood risk but the potential cumulative flood risk when several applications are geographically close and especially if the closely related to SSSI's.</li> <li>• In many areas of S. Cheshire the drainage is already over its limits and this will be compounded if there is no joined up assessment of multiple applications.</li> <li>• Creation of green infrastructure amongst other measures to manage surface water and reduce run off helping to alleviate danger of flooding supported.</li> <li>• Some reference to the important role which tree planting and woodland creation in appropriate locations can play in helping to alleviate flooding should be included.</li> <li>• It would be helpful if the Strategy could include information about forecasts for water stress for the Borough and surrounding areas over the Plan Period.</li> <li>• Strongly support this Policy. (Environment Agency)</li> <li>• Water is a precious resource and needs appropriate management e.g. reduce flood risk by the use of SUDs. The approach set out in this Policy is appropriate and is supported by National Trust</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan could make contribution in assessing possibility of increasing the risk of flood by increased housing in areas of flooding risk, building of roads with associated run-off and general concreting over areas where flood water could be retained.</li> <li>• Should be a policy of retaining and extending areas of woodland, wet-land etc that can act as a reservoir for flood water.</li> <li>• Policy does not encourage improvements to flood risk other than through control of development. There are opportunities for linking with green infrastructure multifunctionality</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water management policy takes no account of hydropower. Planning decisions relating to this should restrict water diverted to turbines so as to keep a reasonable permanent river flow and prevent the erection of any barriers that prevent fish moving up and down stream.</li> <li>• There appears to be little evidence of thinking strategically when considering river systems within Cheshire as a vital part of our environment.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of multiple hydropower units on the same water course and an application for a larger unit for a small development.</li> <li>• United Utilities PLC will seek to work in co-operation with the Council throughout the plan process as a means to ensure your aspirations for future growth can be supported by the necessary sustainable infrastructure. Emphasise the need to encourage new development to explore all methods for mitigating surface water run-off. Wherever possible, developers should look at ways to incorporate an element of betterment within their proposals as a means to reduce further the risk of flooding within the site and the wider area. <i>(Made by United Utilities)</i>.</li> <li>• There is a general lack of emphasis and understanding of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). WFD requires improving the physical state of water courses and improving in-channel habitat must also be included. Council have a duty to have regard to the objectives of the River Basin Management Plans or their supplementary plans (section 17 of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003.) Prominence of WFD could be increased within the document and it could be used to strengthen policies and referenced as evidence.</li> <li>• There is no strategy periodically to review rainfall and sea water level forecasts in order to determine impact on the borough and any corrective measures required, before crises are reached.</li> <li>• There is no mention of rainwater harvesting, or the use of soak-aways instead of drains, or of permeable road and driveway surfaces, or water consumption reduction, all to reduce water abstraction and sustain the water table</li> <li>• The RSPB note that the Borough of Congleton Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (June 2008) identifies that the main source of fluvial flood risk is from the River Dane.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of hydropower management in water management policy taking into account their cumulative impact on a water course and impact on flow strength and wildlife (fish) movements.</li> <li>• Amend paragraph as follows<br/>‘This should include appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and Green Infrastructure to store, convey and treat surface water prior to discharge with the aim of achieving a reduction in the existing runoff rate, but must not result in an increase in runoff. It is not sustainable to dispose of surface water via the public sewer systems; applicants seeking to drain to the public sewers must demonstrate there are no other more sustainable viable options. Where appropriate, opportunities to open existing culverts should be identified.’ <i>(Made by United Utilities)</i>.</li> <li>• Emphasise need to encourage new development to explore all methods for mitigating surface water run-off. Wherever possible, developers should look at ways to incorporate an element of betterment within their proposals as a means to reduce further the risk of flooding within the site and the wider area.</li> <li>• As higher levels of housebuilding are proposed would be helpful if the Strategy could include information about forecasts for water stress for the</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Borough and surrounding areas over the Plan Period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 13.144 states that 'The main responsibility for the Council is to work with the Environment Agency to develop links between river basin management planning and the development of Local Authority plans, policies and assessments.' We would like to remind the Council that in exercising their functions, all public bodies and statutory undertakers (that is most reporting authorities) have a duty to have regard to the objectives of the River Basin Management Plans or their supplementary plans (section 17 of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003.) We feel that the prominence of WFD could be increased within the document and it could be used to strengthen policies and referenced as evidence.</li> <li>• Policy should expressly refer to encouragement of &amp; opportunities to make improvements through other means than control of new development. This links with the green infrastructure multifunctionality &amp; suggest in clause 4 diverting surface water from combined sewer systems across the borough be investigated to reduce flooding during extreme rainfall events &amp; its unnecessary treatment.</li> <li>• In para 13.132 suggest change 'watercourses can often be modified' to 'watercourses have often been modified'.</li> <li>• Add a reference to role of trees in water management and flood alleviation. The EA in its "Woods for Water" projects in the Midlands</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Comments concerning the cumulative impact of hydropower schemes on a water course and impacts on flow strength and wildlife (fish) movements are acknowledged. The impact of all renewable energy schemes is considered to be adequately addressed in Policy SE 8 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy.</p> <p>Comments concerning the importance of tree planting and woodland creation in to alleviate flooding considered. To manage surface water, the policy seeks the provision of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and Green Infrastructure to store, convey and treat surface water prior to discharge with the aim of achieving a reduction in the existing runoff rate. Green Infrastructure, as a collective term, includes tree planting and woodland creation amongst other measures.</p> <p>Comments concerning disposal of surface water via the public sewer system in the policy wording acknowledged and policy has been amended to address these.</p> <p>Comments concerning the overall strategy for flood risk have been acknowledged. The policy justification sets out the Council's commitment and responsibility for developing a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) for their area covering local sources of flooding.</p> <p>Comments concerning the responsibility of the Council to work with the Environment Agency to develop links between river basin management planning and the development of plans have been acknowledged. Additional wording to the policy justification have been added to refer to the improvement of the physical state of water courses and improving in-channel habitat and reference to the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003) listed as key evidence. The policy justification outlines the</p> |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | responsibility of the Council to work with the Environment Agency to develop links between river basin management planning and the development of plans policies and assessments and highlights the programme of actions (measures) needed within the River Basin Management Plan.  |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>In response to consultee comments, minor amendments should be made to the policy and its supporting justification concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional text to policy concerning dispose of surface water via the public sewer systems</li> <li>• The requirements of the Water Framework Directive in relation to River Basin Management Plans.</li> <li>• Reference to the Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003 as key evidence.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Policy SE14: Jodrell Bank</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 13 (Support: 7 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 5)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jodrell Bank should be supported in its world class research. No development should be allowed which puts the research of this facility at risk.</li> <li>• Question whether development within this zone, eg to the north of Congleton and south west of Macclesfield this is acceptable, in particular in terms of maintaining the efficiency of the radio telescope and its ability to receive radio emissions from space without interference.</li> <li>• Jodrell Bank is an important and iconic structure within the Cheshire landscape and its protection in the wider landscape of Cheshire should be maintained.</li> <li>• Comment from others about a rail station and development as a science hub is nonsensical. There is a perfectly adequate station nearby at Goostrey within easy walking distance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current wording “development will not be permitted if it can be shown to impair efficiency of the telescopes” is too vague and provides no explanation or criteria in relation to how impairment will be judged.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it address the issues of development of Jodrell as a science hub and the potential of having a rail station?</li> <li>• Requirements restricting development near Jodrell bank need to be more specific, as challenging current policy at Appeal has demonstrated the complexity of the subject.</li> <li>• As you note this is a world class research centre - development must not be allowed to restrict in any way the future viability of the site as a research centre, i.e. it must be able to develop in its own right.</li> <li>• Jodrell Bank can be developed into the centre of a major educational and tourist attraction. The council should develop plans, with Manchester University.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Justification paragraph 13.147 add after (Grade I Listed Building) ‘the curtilage of which includes associated buildings, which fall within the protection therefore of the listing of the principal building’</li> <li>• Jodrell Bank can be developed into the centre of a major educational and tourist attraction. The council should develop plans, with Manchester University</li> <li>• Council should explain how they are currently considering providing further detailed policy and advice in a future policy document. Detail and clarity should be provided up front as part of this policy. As the policy stands it is vague and offers no clarity for developers.</li> <li>• Re-consider appropriateness of major development proposals within this zone.</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Comment concerning 'vagueness' of the meaning 'impair' considered. It is up to the Jodrell Bank/University of Manchester upon their consultation to determine this on a case by case basis; the Council therefore considers that the policy wording needs to be sufficiently flexible. The current policy is considered to provide sufficient clarity to developers that development proposals within the consultation zone will be subject to the advice of the statutory consultation body (University of Manchester). Commitment is made in the policy justification to prepare further detailed policy and advice within the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. This will reflect relevant the guidance being prepared by Jodrell Bank.</p> <p>Comments concerning the inclusion of the text relating to the curtilage of the building have been considered. As it is generally accepted that Listed Building status includes what lies within the curtilage of the principal building, sufficient consideration/protection will be afforded to buildings associated with principal building i.e. The Lovell Telescope.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>No material changes proposed.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Policy SE15: Peak District National Park Fringe</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 10 (Support: 5 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPRE Cheshire supports this policy.</li> <li>• Policy relating to land that does potentially have an impact upon the National Park but which by definition is outside the jurisdiction of the Peak District National Park Authority.</li> <li>• It is noted that a significant part of the area in question is adjacent to the historic landscape and related heritage assets at Lyme Park.</li> <li>• It is important to ensure that the setting of the Peak District National Park is safeguarded and where possible enhanced.</li> <li>• Support references to ‘experience of tranquillity and quiet enjoyment, easy access for visitors and experience of dark night skies’.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No objections have been registered against this policy</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak District National Park Fringe is branded as Cheshire's Peak District and is a valuable tourism asset to Cheshire East</li> <li>• Any development even on the fringe must be in keeping with the Park, building materials etc. To have such a distinct landscape on our doorstep is a pleasure and should be treated as an asset.</li> <li>• Concern that none of the hills visible from the likes of Macclesfield and Congleton are protected in any way. We would want to see these hills together with The Cloud and Congleton Edge become an AONB.</li> <li>• The Council is potentially acting against its own strategy by development of housing on green belt areas adjacent to the national park on the east side of Macclesfield. This is a huge asset for the region and should be aggressively supported against the demands of developers.</li> <li>• There are no proposals as to how to benefit economically or otherwise. Handicrafts, and manufacturing using local materials could be promoted, e.g. wool, slate, stone, clay, wood, straw, and heather.</li> <li>• Tourism could be promoted e.g. traditional ropemaking, pack horse treks, courses and holidays, Tea houses and cafés, farm shops and petting / join-in-the-work farms.</li> <li>• Congleton could be marketed as another gateway to the Peaks. Bus services could be run for walkers between Macclesfield and Congleton.</li> <li>• Hard standing should be created and marked on maps, for walkers' cars, to encourage visitors.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More positive aggressive strategy to maintain the green belt areas adjacent to the national park.</li> <li>• Promote tourism and Cheshire East as gateway to the Park.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | Comments concerning maintenance of green belt areas and the economy, promotion of tourism have been acknowledged. The Council considers that these are sufficiently addressed through other relevant policies. |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | No material change proposed.   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Chapter 14: Connectivity</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 15 (Support: 1 / Object: 4 / Comment Only:10)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note the benefits that close proximity to Manchester Airport can create, and the potential advantages that improved transport connections to the Airport can bring to the borough. Pleased that these points have been recognised within the Core Strategy, notably at Chapter 14 Connectivity. Manchester Airport is one of the major assets to the region, with considerable potential to stimulate and attract economic activity. Promoting transport measures and improved accessibility to the Airport, as is identified in the chapter, will therefore help to facilitate economic growth and development within Cheshire East and we strongly welcome the Borough's desire to achieve this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives set in this section will be impossible to achieve</li> <li>• CE could have an annual "Go to work by public transport only day" for all their staff.</li> <li>• It must be recognised that for a majority of people, because of location, age etc, car travel will remain the most suitable, and for some journeys, the only viable means of transport.</li> <li>• Parking provision should seek to meet likely needs including in residential areas. There is an implied assumption in this section that the provision of employment opportunities near to a residential area will result in local employment.</li> <li>• The rural areas must not be forgotten from the Local Plan. They should have transport provided whether either via a commercial bus service or by community transport. Bus clubs for the rural villages should be looked at to co-ordinate the delivery of public transport to the rural areas. Rural transport is vital in the rural areas to keep the communities vibrant &amp; viable.</li> <li>• To commit to develop the public transport improvements identified in the SEMMMS transport strategy</li> <li>• Cheshire East should comply with the NPPF in seeking to reduce car use by reducing its development aspirations and reducing the extra highway capacity it seeks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused statement on a clear strategy on how to provide a public transport service that serves the working community as well as the local community to directly reduce the need to take the "car" to work.</li> <li>• The Infrastructure Plan must include measures to reduce car based travel from the existing development in order to create sufficient headroom (capacity) to accommodate car based trips from the new development. This will require a complete overhaul of the bus network and significantly increased provision for walking and cycling from existing developments</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All good sounding broad statements, but nothing concrete, or targets about a modal shift to walking or cycling</li> <li>• Introduce 20mph zones</li> <li>• CEC must get people to move and become fitter. Avoidable deaths from inactivity hugely outnumber road casualties by a factor of 12.</li> <li>• Reducing road danger through slower speeds is key to promoting active travel.</li> <li>• Have a target to double cycling and walking by 2020. In Crewe, cycling has reduced from 40% in 1983 to 8% 2010 and now down to below 6% while every where else it is increasing</li> <li>• Improve interconnectivity of sustainable transport modes. Improvement needs to be based on a fully integrated Rail / Bus / Road and Cycle network.</li> <li>• Go for a town wide residential street limit as a statement of intention to make our streets safer, friendlier, cleaner, healthier, or in the jargon, simply more liveable.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused statement on a clear strategy on how to provide a public transport service that serves the working community</li> <li>• Introduce 20mph zones</li> <li>• To commit to develop the public transport improvements identified in the SEMMMS transport strategy</li> <li>• Parking provision should seek to meet likely needs including in residential areas.</li> <li>• Bus clubs for the rural villages should be looked at to co-ordinate the delivery of public transport to the rural areas</li> <li>• The Infrastructure Plan must include measures to reduce car based travel from the existing development in order to create sufficient headroom</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | The objectives and policy wording of the introduction to this section, alongside the provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework are considered to reduce the need to travel, improve facilities for cyclists, pedestrians and travel via public transport.   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | No material change proposed.   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy CO1: Sustainable Transport and Travel</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | <b>Total: 44 (Support: 13 / Object: 13 / Comment Only: 18)</b><br>Sustainable Transport and Travel: 8 (Support: 1 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 4)<br>CO1: 36 (Support: 12 / Object: 10 / Comment Only: 14)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy CO1 on ‘Sustainable Travel and Transport’ is supportable although the addition of a specific commitment to introduce more ‘safe routes to school’ would be well received.</li> <li>• Encourage the provision of public transport to meet the needs of an especially ageing population reducing the need to travel by car and that new development reduces the need to travel. It is essential that public transport is truly integrated</li> <li>• Note and welcome the amendment to the wording of part 1, bullet point i of this policy, where the reference to “most sustainable and accessible locations” has been changed to “sustainable and accessible locations or locations that can be made sustainable and accessible.” This element of the policy now aligns more closely with the ethos of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</li> <li>• Support intentions under this policy. It will be important though that there are sufficient staff resources within the council's highway/transport/planning function to take advantage of opportunities arising through development/land changes.</li> <li>• Fully endorse your support for HS2.</li> <li>• The approach to sustainable transport is supported being consistent with national advice and having regard to the local circumstances in Cheshire East.</li> <li>• Support Policy CO1 because it seeks to reduce the need to travel.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include cycling infrastructure in the Local Plan develop cycling strategies for each area.</li> <li>• More commitment to improving local rail networks and bus connectivity.</li> <li>• No mention of the school run – re-introducing school buses</li> <li>• Would like a stronger commitment to 20mph limits in residential areas</li> <li>• Need top refer to improvements to railway and to improve Macclesfield Bus Station as well as Crewe</li> <li>• Proper cycling routes on the Dutch model linking neighbouring towns - e.g. Macclesfield to Congleton, Knutsford, Poynton , Wilmslow etc</li> <li>• Need to refer to a new station in Middlewich</li> <li>• Need to refer to importance of town to town bus services - improve interconnections throughout the Borough.</li> <li>• Add the potential for a rail station at Jodrell Bank and improved linkages between attractions</li> <li>• Improve public footpath connections from Goostrey to Jodrell Bank</li> <li>• A specific proposal for the movement of freight within the borough should be considered.</li> <li>• Strategic housing sites do not meet the requirements of this policy.</li> </ul> |

- Guiding development to 'sustainable and accessible locations or locations that can be made sustainable' has altered from the draft objective of guiding development to the most sustainable and accessible location. This needs better definition.
  - Policy should be restructured and separated into two distinct parts. One addressing the strategic elements (such as rail and bus infrastructure) and the other part more specific to providing the policy requirements for developments.
  - Policy CO 1 should prioritise integrated public transport over all other means of transport and, especially, the construction of new roads.
  - Policy CO1 4 v is too weak in referring to "considering options to enhance bus priority at junctions and the provision of dedicated bus lanes". These should be commitments rather than "considerations". Bus provision in Cheshire East is in decline, close to terminal in its impact. The Local Authority needs to act quickly to make bus travel a practical option.
  - Need to manage down car based travel from the existing development to provide the headroom (capacity) to accommodate the balance of car based trips from the new development.
  - Like to see a policy that aims to achieve an average across the Borough (including rural areas) of 10% of all journeys by sustainable modes. To achieve this, the larger towns - Crewe, Macclesfield and Congleton should be achieving 20% of travel by sustainable modes.
  - No tangible evidence is there that "HS2 will have significant benefits for the Borough and the sub-region"?
  - No evidence of direct HS2 benefits
- Comment Only**
- Staffordshire CC - Further transport evidence work needs to be undertaken as discussed during our Duty to Cooperate meetings to assess the cross boundary implications of the quantum of growth in Crewe, Alsager and Congleton on North Staffordshire. The outcome of this work should then identify what, if any, amendments to appropriate policies are required to mitigate the impact and/or take advantage of any opportunities.
  - Stoke-on-Trent City Council believes that there is a need to increase connectivity between North Staffordshire, Cheshire East and the wider North West and that where practical improvements in all modes of transport should be promoted and developed.
  - Like to see consideration given to including 20mph speed limits ("20's plenty") which can improve safety and wellbeing to individuals and lead to fewer emissions and less pollution (including noise).
  - The rural areas require commercial bus service or community transport
  - Bus clubs in rural villages should be looked at to co-ordinate the delivery of public transport to rural areas
  - Nantwich should become a transport hub for the south of Cheshire East
  - High quality bus stations in all towns and villages with good electronic signage of bus due times etc.
  - Locate new development within and on edge of existing well connected settlements and where people can more easily walk or cycle to shops and services.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add paragraph after 14.9, ‘Investment in a high quality public realm linking housing, employment and town and village centres encourages people to walk and cycle and positively manages vehicular access that enables more sustainable patterns of travel. It can also act as a focus and arrival points to key uses and promotes the legibility of towns and villages, encouraging more sustainable lifestyles.’</li> <li>• Remove "HS2 will have significant benefits for the Borough and the sub-region" because a) it is unproven and b) it is political and so should not be in a plan</li> <li>• Leave out the “whenever possible” in 3 v. A good reference regarding the prioritisation of cyclists is provided in the Department for Transport’s Local Transport Note 02/08 – Cycle Friendly Infrastructure Design, 1.3.4. which should be included in the Local Plan: “... Supporting the Hierarchy of Users which places pedestrians at the top (including the access requirements of people with disabilities), followed by cyclists, then public transport, with unaccompanied private car users last.”</li> <li>• Re-cast 1 i to read: “Guiding development firstly to locations that are highly accessible by sustainable means, especially walking and cycling, and where people can as far as possible meet their needs locally; and secondly to locations that can be made so”</li> <li>• Insert a new bullet 1 vi: “Support the introduction of more ‘safe routes to school’” to reduce unnecessary traffic at peak times.</li> <li>• Insert a new bullet 4 i d: Supporting the aspiration to re-open the Middlewich railway station.</li> <li>• Policy CO1 Point 2ii) add “and parents with pushchairs”</li> <li>• Point 4 We welcome this section on improving “public transport integration, facilities, service levels access for all users and reliability” but would like to see specific references given to more commitment to improving local rail networks and bus connectivity and better access for people with mobility or disability issues and parents with small children</li> <li>• Part 1 should be amended to read: “Reduce the need to travel by: Ensuring development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport within its design where appropriate;”</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Council acknowledges the importance of safe routes for schools and appropriate wording has been added to the policy wording (Point 2(iv))</p> <p>The Policy as currently worded emphasised the importance of the integration of modes of sustainable transport, in particular public transport integration.</p> <p>The wording of the policy currently emphasises the importance of cycling infrastructure in the Borough.</p> <p>Point 2 (Vii) has been introduced to the policy to ensure a selective and ongoing review of speed limits.</p> <p>The Council considers that the current policy wording delivers safe and pleasant links travelling around the Borough.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the importance of sustainable freight transport and as</p>  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>such policy wording has been introduced to point 5 of the policy.</p> <p>The Council has included reference to Middlewich Train Station in the policy.</p> <p>The Council considers that the policy is appropriately structured and will promote sustainable travel and transport in the Borough. This is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>The existing policy reference to ‘considering options to enhance bus priority at junctions’ is appropriate in its flexibility</p> <p>The indicators included in the Local Plan Strategy are considered appropriate to monitor the success of the policies and whether any change of approach is required. These will be monitored via a Monitoring Report produced on an annual basis.</p> <p>Comments from Staffordshire County Council and Stoke On Trent City Council will be addressed separately through a statement on Duty to Co-operate issues.</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>The following changes should be made to the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add additional point as follows - Point 2 (vi) Supporting measures to introduce safe routes to schools. The following text has been added to justification - Policy Y1 (Travel to Education) of the Local Transport Plan 2011 -2026 states that the Council will work with schools and colleges to enable sustainable travel to education, including appropriate provision for those eligible for free or assisted transport.</li> <li>• Add additional point as follows - Point 2 (Vii) Ensuring a selective and ongoing review of speed limits, as appropriate. The following text has been added to the justification - Policy H8 (Road Safety) of the Local Transport Plan states that the Council will improve road safety and take account of vulnerable road users. This includes the consideration of where reduced speed limits would be appropriate (e.g. 20s Plenty Campaign for residential areas)</li> <li>• Add additional text to Point 4 (ib) Supporting the aspiration for re-opening the Sandbach to Northwich railway line to passengers including the opening of a station at Middlewich</li> <li>• Add additional point (point 5) to the policy - Improve and develop appropriate road, rail and water freight transport routes and associated intermodal freight transport facilities in order to assist in the sustainable and efficient movement of goods. Additional text added to justification - an effective freight network is essential for delivering sustainable economic growth. However roads through residential areas would not be considered appropriate.</li> <li>• Add additional paragraph to the justification section - investment in a high quality public realm linking housing, employment and town and village centres encourages people to walk and cycle and positively manages vehicular access that enables more sustainable patterns of travel. It can also act as a focus and arrival points to key uses and promotes the</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>legibility of towns and villages, encouraging more sustainable lifestyles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Add additional text to point 2 (ii) - Supporting safe and secure access for mobility and visually impaired persons including mobility scooter users and parents with pushchairs</li><li>• Add additional point to point 4 (i) - Supporting proposals for rail infrastructure and the provision of rail facilities as appropriate</li></ul> |
|--|--|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Policy CO2: Enabling Business Growth Through Infrastructure</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 55 (Support: 13 / Object: 20 / Comment Only: 22)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support the sustainable transport policies (Chapter 14) and specific reference to provision for walking and cycling in CO1, CO2 and CO4. There is no reference here to horse riding and perhaps that could be mentioned in Enabling Business Growth through Transport Infrastructure (Policy CO2.2.ii).</li> <li>• Welcome improvements to M6 J16 and 17.</li> <li>• Support is given to highway schemes for the Congleton Northern Link Road, improvements to Crewe Green roundabout and Crewe Green Link Road.</li> <li>• Support the reference in Policy CO2, to supporting development that enables transport infrastructure improvements. We note that Policy CO2 point 2 (i) lists specifically, the improvements to Crewe Green roundabout.</li> <li>• The policy is in general appropriate and welcomed. We support the specific reference under 2 i (b) to the Poynton Relief Road, given its importance to the area and supporting future growth.</li> <li>• Broadly support the Council's approach towards the delivery of major highway schemes as set out in Policy CO2</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• London Road and Butley Town residents along the A523 N of Macclesfield overwhelmingly request an off-line section of road West of existing A523 to be constructed between the Silk Road and Bonis Hall Lane passing behind Butley Ash pub.</li> <li>• Parts of Policy CO2 are premature. There is no business, funding case or timetable for the Poynton Relief Road or the Congleton Northern Link Road &amp; and the case for the A6-Manchester Airport Relief Road is poor/based on traffic projections that have not materialised.</li> <li>• The geographical location of Disley coupled with poor connectivity into East Cheshire presents poor access to services.</li> <li>• No tangible evidence is there that HS2 will have significant benefits for the Borough and the sub-region?</li> <li>• Cheshire East will not be able to influence HS2 proposals as stated in this policy</li> <li>• Whilst this policy includes reference to supporting the improvement of rail infrastructure (section 2.iv) it is noticeably silent on the need to improve supporting infrastructure on the national motorway network.</li> <li>• Policy CO2 includes a requirement (criterion 2ii. that supports measures to improve the walking, cycling and sustainable travel environment.) Still is no specific reference to the problems in rural areas.</li> <li>• Need to reduce car based travel from existing development by a substantially increasing the provision of sustainable travel across the Borough (too create sufficient headroom (capacity) to accommodate car based travel from new developments)</li> </ul> |

- Policy CO 2 Point 2 i - the significant list of current schemes in 2 (i) appears to be in conflict with policies in CO1 “to encourage modal shift away from car travel to public transport
- Policy should refer to the need for a second access to the Parkgate site, Knutsford
- This policy needs revising in order to achieve a clear policy approach. Part two of this policy appears to provide a ‘wish list’ rather than policy. Parking standards should be separate policy.
- Reference to recharge points should be removed as unrealistic.
- The re-opening of the Middlewich link and the provision of an hourly train service into Manchester/Chester will significantly help to reduce road traffic.
- Create a Knutsford by pass
- New bridge should be constructed on Crewe Green Link Road to support second rail track and electrification together with improvements to arched section between Crewe and Bartholmeay.
- No mention whatsoever of Manchester Airport (how can we take best advantage of its proximity? How can we improve connections to it?)
- Infrastructure should be built for cyclists not motorists
- Section 2 (i) consist of a number of road-building schemes that conflict fundamentally with: Many of the aims and policies of the Strategy and Local Transport Plan.
- Note there has been no planned infrastructure improvement for the redevelopment of Alderley Park
- The Poynton Relief Road and A523 ‘improvements’ would run entirely through Green Belt, and the Congleton Northern Relief Road and the land it captures for development would be almost entirely within the Jodrell Bank Zone, and be likely to affect the workings of the telescopes which receive much recognition elsewhere in the Plan.
- Motorway Service Areas play a key role in the safety and welfare of users of the motorway network. Recognition of this is required and failure to do so renders the plan unsound i.e. it has not been positively prepared - in that it does not meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.
- Paragraph 14.14 Consistency in information on references to CO2 emissions - slightly different average figure and reference used here compared to Paragraph 3.28 in the Environmental section in Chapter 3 Spatial Portrait

**Comment Only**

- Staffordshire County Council - Further transport evidence work needs to be undertaken as discussed during our Duty to Co-operate meetings to assess the cross boundary implications of the quantum of growth in Crewe, Alsager and Congleton on North Staffordshire. The outcome of this work should then identify what, if any, amendments to appropriate policies are required to mitigate the impact and/or take advantage of any opportunities.
- Paragraph 14.14 slightly different average figure and reference used here to 3.28.
- To maximise the benefits of HS2, the interchange station needs to be next to the existing station with good passenger facilities such as parking which

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>should be built from the start to avoid future modifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new road schemes should incorporate healthy, a safe &amp; pleasant off-road cycle routes</li> <li>• A broader mix of infrastructure, to include specific items overcoming physical barriers to improving walking/cycle access. For example in Crewe, ten bridges severely restrict access, and will require significant investment</li> <li>• Infrastructure delivery must be coordinated with the delivery of development.</li> <li>• Road schemes should be accompanied by cycle schemes, and the Council should identify specific rail and bus service improvement schemes in the Plan as well as well as road schemes</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horse riding could be mentioned in Policy CO2.2.ii.</li> <li>• This policy needs revising in order to achieve a clear policy approach. Part two of this policy appears to provide a ‘wish list’ rather than policy.</li> <li>• Reference to recharge points should be removed as unrealistic.</li> <li>• Paragraph 14.14 slightly different average figure and reference used here to 3.28.</li> <li>• Remove references in the policy top major highway schemes in particular Congleton Link Road, Poynton Relief Road and A6 corridor.</li> <li>• Policy should refer to supporting motorway facilities infrastructure</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Policy will facilitate sustainable development in terms of encouraging sustainable locations for development and enabling supporting transport initiatives to encourage sustainable transportation modes whilst ensuring appropriate consideration of issues such as Parking Standards.</p> <p>The structure of the policy and its coverage of issues are considered appropriate in order to deliver the sustainable transport in Cheshire East through the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The delivery of High Speed 2 with appropriate safeguards will deliver significant economic benefits in particular in Crewe and the references in this policy are designed as a statement of intention to support the economic benefits of the scheme whilst ensuring that environmental and community impacts are minimised.</p> <p>The schemes referenced in Part 2 (i) of the policy are supported by information in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will be supported by appropriate funding and delivery mechanisms as and when the schemes are brought forward. The Council has recently had the Compulsory Purchase Order confirmed on the Crewe Green Link Road South scheme as an example of a scheme which is being delivered in the Borough. Other examples include the Congleton Link Road which is currently consulting on potential route options for the scheme delivery. It is therefore not considered unreasonable to include the list of highway schemes noted in the policy. Further detail in a number of these schemes will be included in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document alongside normal planning and highway procedures and future iterations of documents including the</p> |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Progress on the delivery of Highway Schemes noted in CO2 will be monitored as part of the indicators set out in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The improvement provided to key transport links on the highway network will facilitate a better use of the network for bus users and cyclists and most highway schemes provide transportation along those routes for cyclists.</p> <p>The Council considers that horse riding is covered as part of the reference to sustainable travel environment on routes relieved of traffic</p>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 2 (i) to read ‘Supporting schemes outlined in the current infrastructure delivery plan / local transport plan’</li> <li>• 14.17 justification to include an additional para and read as follows - A selection of the major highway schemes listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improvements to the Crewe Green Roundabout junction and completion of Crewe Green Link Road South</li> <li>○ Macclesfield Town Centre Movement Strategy</li> <li>○ Congleton Link Road</li> <li>○ Poynton Relief Road</li> <li>○ Middlewich Eastern Bypass</li> <li>○ Junction improvements on the A51 corridor north of Nantwich</li> <li>○ Improvements to the A534 corridor in Sandbach, including the M6 and A533 junctions</li> <li>○ Improvements to the A34 and A555 corridors in Handforth</li> <li>○ Improvements to the A537/A50 corridor through Knutsford</li> <li>○ Improvements to the junction of B5077 Crewe Road/B5078 Sandbach Road in Alsager</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Digital Connections and Policy CO3: Digital Connections</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | <b>Total: 9 (Support: 3 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 3)</b><br>Digital Connections: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)<br>CO3: 8 (Support: 2 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential that super fast broadband is provided in rural communities to meet business and community needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that masts should be “appropriately located and kept to a minimum”, but request that there is also a specific requirement to take steps to integrate them into the landscape where necessary and possible.</li> <li>• Reference should be made in the policy to the particular difficulties of broadband infrastructure provision in rural areas</li> <li>• Need to consider how to implement the policy. Suggest the Council considers B4RN (Broadband for the Rural North) in Lancashire, and Connecting Cumbria for some ideas</li> <li>• Policy CO3 Part (2). It is considered that Part (2) is contrary to national planning guidance in the Framework [Para 173] as it may threaten the viability and deliverability of development by imposing unnecessary cost upon new development. In any event, it is the responsibility of telecommunications providers to provide the cabling and masts etc. for telephone and mobile communications networks and these providers are responsible for identifying the locations where infrastructure needs to be provided. The onus should not therefore be placed upon developers to provide this infrastructure in new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding a further point to encourage and invest in digital infrastructure to existing hamlets outside the major towns and new developments.</li> <li>• Need more clarity on how this will be applied to rural areas of Cheshire East.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove policy CO3 Part (2)</li> <li>• Landscape requirement should be added to point 1 of the policy</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The Council considers that the wording of the policy is appropriate and provides an appropriate context for the delivery of digital communication networks in the Borough. Policy wording such as ‘being appropriately located and kept to a minimum’ will be considered alongside the other policies in the Local Plan Strategy / Development Plan and will deliver the objectives set out in the document.</p> <p>Point 2 of the policy is important in order to ensure the provision of physical infrastructure to support digital communication networks. The NPPF makes it clear that Local Plans should support the expansion of electronic communication networks, including high speed broadband and this policy goes some way to deliver on that objective.</p>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | No material change is proposed to the policy.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Policy CO4: Travel Plans and Travel Assessments</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 16 (Support: 5 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 6)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodate a reasonable increase in car use for work commensurate with the increase in dwellings and employment locations. There really is no alternative</li> <li>• It is essential that all major developments that are likely to generate significant additional journeys must be accompanied by a Transport assessment and where appropriate, a Travel Plan.</li> <li>• This section of the policy now aligns more closely with the NPPF (para 32).</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel Plans need to be tied in to legal agreements and so a breach is a breach of planning conditions, but in most cases do not work, instead you need sufficient parking spaces on site.</li> <li>• Travel Plans and Transport Assessments should involve considerable field study and be independently validated at the cost of the developer.</li> <li>• In relation to part 5 of this policy (major developments will be required to monitor traffic generated by the development and share data with the Local Authority). Unsure why this has been included. Suggest that this requirement is not necessary or appropriate and that this element of the policy should be removed.</li> <li>• At points 3 or 4 can you please include a requirement that Travel Plans include agreed (with CEBC) targets for travel by sustainable modes?</li> <li>• At paragraph 5 it is not good enough to simply require monitoring of Travel Plans, what happens if a developer reports very low levels of sustainable travel, what can CEBC do about it - hence why we ask for targets and where these are not met there must be a requirement for the developer (in agreement with CEBC) to identify and implement appropriate measures to increase sustainable travel.</li> <li>• Mandatory Travel Plans with targets to reduce car driving or increase cycling or both</li> <li>• There should be a commitment to taking corrective action if plans are not fully implemented or are shown not to be effective in delivering their aims.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional point to be added to 2. with reference to be made to supporting community planning initiatives which improve quality of life for affected communities</li> <li>• Assume that by 'major development' in this context refers to the thresholds for Transport Assessments as given at Appendix B of the Guidance on Transport Assessments - if this is the case, for clarity, this should be stated.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel Plans should be tied to legal agreements</li> <li>• Remove point 5 of the policy wording</li> <li>• Points 3 and 4 should include targets for sustainable transport modes</li> <li>• Point 5 should refer to actions being undertaken if monitoring of the travel plan</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | does not meet appropriate targets  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | The wording of the policy is considered to be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework and will assess the likely transport impacts of development and look to mitigate potential future impacts through the Travel Plan. The current practice of requiring travel plans as part of planning conditions attached to planning applications is considered a suitable mechanism to ensure that the travel plan is implemented successfully. It is not considered appropriate to include targets in the policy at this time. Further detail relating to the implementation of this policy is included in separate guidance notes produced by Cheshire East Council. |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | No material change proposed to the policy wording  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Chapter 15: Core Strategy Sites and Strategic Locations</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 64 (Support: 0 / Object: 31 / Comment Only: 33)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None received</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence that the viability of the Core Strategy has been assessed against their implications on the infrastructure of the Borough, e.g. railway line constraints, bridges, M6 Junctions</li> <li>• Need to ensure there is suitable amenities/infrastructure available for the proposed level of development</li> <li>• Area classed as BLG13 (Green Belt Assessment) should be classed as making a major contribution to the Green Belt as it is a recreational area. Site 4091 stated as developable. Unsuitable for development and would lead to overlooking. No need for development on Green Belt Land.</li> <li>• Windfall development should not be permitted, this is unplanned development. Monitoring Report indicates that there is a poor take up of sites, this should be a sign of over provision</li> <li>• Need for development to be jobs-led</li> <li>• CPRE, like Council Michael Jones and the communities of CE place a high value on protecting green and pleasant land in the Borough in general. Core Strategy need to reflect this and should be Brownfield first approach with the release of Greenfield/green belt land in exceptional circumstances only</li> <li>• Level of Greenbelt release is unjustified</li> <li>• Only areas which are very sustainable and related to existing urban form should be considered</li> <li>• Sequential approach should be used even on Allocated Greenfield sites to assess the availability of brownfield sites before allowing development on Greenfield</li> <li>• Sainsbury's support the general approach of Chapter 15, in attempting to identify locations/proposed growth areas throughout Cheshire East authority where retail developments would form a key service provision to new development and would generally be locations that will benefit a new population/wide demographic. However it should be noted that the floorspace figures included in the locations should not be considered as a ceiling to the amount of retail development that could be delivered in these locations.</li> <li>• The plan should incorporate flexibility to allow other locations to be considered for retail development when and if they arise over the plan period.</li> <li>• Prestbury Parish Council objects to the sites put forward which would impact on Prestbury, and consider that the Council's argument that not all the strategic sites may materialise and come forward and it is necessary to be flexible and build in a contingency is not an acceptable one</li> <li>• Object to the level of housing proposed in Congleton, which has been allocated the same as Macclesfield which is a larger town</li> </ul> |

- Provision of secure cycle storage should be required within the policies
- Provision for housing for the aging population should also be considered
- Object to development on Carday Business Park, Lindley Lane, Alsager, part of site is a wildlife area, junction is busy – lack of open space in Alsager
- The House Builders Federation – note that although the plan states a provision of over 8% more housing over the plan period than needed – the draft Core Strategy and CIL Viability Study identified that a number of sites are problematic due to viability issues and when removing problematic sites this leaves an oversupply of only 2% which leaves little room for error of the assumptions upon delivery rates and quantum from the identified sites
- Strategic Sites such as Handforth East are not supported by the evidence; in fact, the evidence to support them has only just been produced.
- There are many sites that are dependent on the provision of new roads. The entire concept is unsustainable and robust cases have not been made for the roads or the sites. They should be dropped from the Plan and a much more sustainable one drawn up.
- Gladmans consider that none of the strategic sites are strategic in nature as they are not critical to the overall delivery of the strategy.
- Gladmans object to the lack of evidence produced during the plan process which clearly states the reasons why certain sites have and have not been selected for proposed development. The production of the Pre- Submission Preferred Sites background overview is the first time the Council has provided any detail of its reasoning for choosing sites and as many are the same as the Development Plan produced a year ago it is clear that the Council only wished to explain the process after the decision had been made.
- Object to the SHLAA site 4036 (Bollington) (Henshall Road/Hall Hill/Moss Brow/Albert Road and Springbank) being designated as developable and site opposite – site is a flood plain and area of local habitat for wildlife, local amenity area for dog walking, existing issues with parking and issues within existing utilities.
- Natural England welcome the inclusion of the provision for habitats for Great Crested Newts and other protected species is included within the Site CS3 Leighton West, Crewe however there has not been a consistent approach across all sites allocated within the Core Strategy
- Insufficient land is proposed for housing development Land at West Street/Dunwoody Way, Crewe (Bombardier Transport site) should be allocated for development.
- Paragraph 15.6 shows the process was not commenced by an impartial assessment of suitable locations for growth based on local needs of settlements and their carrying capacity including setting, character, impact on the community's sense of place. The bias of interested parties is likely to have negative consequences for appropriateness of locations, scale and impacts and questions plan of soundness
- HOW Planning support development proposals on site Land to the South of Wardle and at Barbridge, Cheshire – residential proposal to compliment the Wardle employment site
- Hourigan Connolly of behalf of the Trustees of the Peckforton Children settlement support development proposal on Vicarage Lane, Bunbury

- Millington Estates puts forward the development site at land adjacent to Junction 7 of the M56 – Spode Green Farm as a possible employment site – site was not considered as part of the Green Belt Assessment even though it has been put forward for development on several occasions
- Barton Willmore support development at Land at Sandbach Road, Congleton for sustainable urban extension, 120 dwellings. More homes required in the plan, for Principal Towns and KSCs. Open Countryside; west of Congleton, adjacent to settlement boundary; sloping agricultural land; access via Sandbach Road; suitable; well-contained site; accessible to local centre; bus route
- SL3 South East Crewe is subject to planning constraints and should not be a preferred site for a growth village. Gorstyhill sites is unconstrained and should be considered for a new village.

**Comment Only**

- Plumley – the land in Trouthall Lane should be kept for public open space – playing field
- Plumley – the field between the rail station and Maltkiln should be used for housing – the land is owned by The Crown Estate and would enhance the village
- Manchester Rugby and Cheadle Hulme Cricket Club suggest that the Manchester Rugby Club would be a more suitable location for development than Handforth East
- Sustrans offer the following, in general terms, as key design/site issues:
  - Quality of public realm
  - Quality of green infrastructure particularly linear corridors
  - Establishing 20mph zones in all residential areas
  - Significant improvements to public transport
  - Integration between new developments and adjacent areas, particularly with greenways away from traffic for pedestrians and cyclists
  - Giving a time advantage to pedestrians/cyclists and public transport to reach popular, adjacent destinations
  - Travel planning with a sense of purpose and regular monitoring
  - Storage areas for residents' buggies/bikes for smaller properties
- It is essential that development is delivered at the same time as the necessary infrastructure, not just the identified road improvements, but also the provision of location services, employment, improved sustainable travel etc.
- Housing numbers for Wilmslow – 400 new homes is accepted
- No additional houses are required over and above sites CS25 Adlington Road and CS26 Royal London – along with existing permission
- Object to any development on the sites to the east of Stockton Road, Chesham Road and Welton Drive - site is inappropriate for housing development (WLM15 in the Green Belt Assessment)
- Environment Agency note that many of the Strategic Site areas adjacent to water bodies which has not been considered
- Recommend that watercourses are viewed in a more positive way and not as a constraint
- All of the major areas strategic locations/sites should require consideration of

de-centralised energy and energy masterplanning (or future proofing for retrofit on smaller sites), and there is a need for public realm contribution toward respective centres that they are associated with. This should be emphasised in each respective policy and the associated justification. All strategic sites should also be subject to a design/development brief or Masterplan and larger and multi phased sites should also be subject to Design Codes.

- Land adjacent to the Manchester Airport Operational Area – safeguarded land for taxiway alongside Runway 05R/23L – in allocations document
- No exceptional justification for the roll back of the green belt and safeguarding of land
- Green belt review should have included neighbouring authorities
- Greater flexibility should be built into the plan – eg. Alderley Park site should be mixed use employment and housing
- SHLAA site 4036 is unacceptable for development
- JR Consulting - Include SHLAA site 3638 land off Wilmslow Road, Alderley Edge – site is deliverable and developable, sustainable, logical extension of Alderley Edge, the new bypass has created a permanent edge to the settlement, possibility for bespoke high designed parkland setting – with green infrastructure. Possibility of Employment space on adjoining site also.
- HOW Planning - Land at the Meadows, Alderley Edge lies between Alderley Edge and Wilmslow and fulfils a valuable Green Belt role, and forming a clear buffer between the two settlements. This site is privately owned but could be used for a Country Park which would help to enhance linkages with the town this would be an acceptable Green Belt use – site would enable development at the fringes of Wilmslow such as CS35 (Safeguarded) Prestbury Road, Wilmslow and Alderley Edge to be balanced by the creation of a new area of green space
- Bloor Homes – School Lane, Bunbury site has been reduced from previous scheme put forward. Sustainable location, site is enclosed within the village envelope, with limited impact landscape character
- Support the landscape driven approach to the masterplan for the Nantwich Area. This should be used to mitigate against the visual impact on existing development as well as proposed new development
- NHS England note that only CS30, CS20 and CS23 include the need for contributions towards health infrastructure. Detailed assessment has been carried out (attached) showing the costs relating to all development proposed in the core strategy and these should be included with the policies/site allocations.
- Plan 8 Town Planning Consultancy – Poynton (SHLAA site 3418) and additional land adjacent to Poynton Tip is put forward for 90 dwellings. Partly a brownfield site this would help to reduce the need for significant new Greenfield development in the Green Belt
- Not all Core Strategy sites have been consulted upon – eg. White Moss, Alsager without any reduction of housing required elsewhere
- Concerns over the allowing of planning applications outside the Core Strategy sites
- Hourigan Connolly - Site at Main Road, Goostrey currently open countryside/agricultural use, centrally located and available for development,

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>sustainable location near village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important that all the policies for the Core Strategy take account of the need for development to be viable and deliverable. Therefore (where relevant) policies should have flexibility for viability to be assessed</li> <li>• Reference to the HS2 should not be written specifically into policies given the early stage of the consultation of this</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – support development at Land off Lymewood Drive, Disley for residential development</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – support redevelopment of Land at Four Seasons Nurseries, Chelford Road, Ollerton</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – support development at The Orchard, Holmes Chapel, Brereton Heath</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – support development at Clough Bank, Bollington</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – supports development at land opposite Rose Cottages, Holmes Chapel Road, Brereton Heath, Congleton</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – supports development at Land West of Willaston</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – supports development at land off Alderley Road, opposite the Crescent, Mottram St. Andrew</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – supports development at the Grain Store, Bridge Lane, Blackden, Goostrey</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership are considering options for development at Hiverley Cottage, Twemlow Green</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership – supports development at 59 Shringley Road, Bollington</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership support development at former Arclid Hospital site. Arclid is a sustainable settlement for additional development.</li> <li>• Emery Planning Partnership are considering options on land at the Paddock adjoining By the Bridge, Withinlee Road, Prestbury – possible option for residential development</li> <li>• Emery Partnership supports development at Pavement Lane Farm, Mobberley</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the field between Plumley Railway Station and Maltkiln for housing</li> <li>• Consider using Manchester Rugby Club site for housing</li> <li>• Sustrans - The following should be considered, in general terms, as key design/site issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of public realm</li> <li>- Quality of green infrastructure particularly linear corridors</li> <li>- Establishing 20mph zones in all residential areas</li> <li>- Significant improvements to public transport</li> <li>- Integration between new developments and adjacent areas, particularly with greenways away from traffic for pedestrians and cyclists</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure that all Strategic Sites include information on water bodies and other nature conservation features if they are present and that they also include enhancement opportunities.</li> <li>• Do not list watercourses as constraints but view them in a positive way, with regard to sites.</li> </ul>   |

- Greater flexibility needs to be built into the plan
- Remove all Green Belt sites from proposed development
- Include SHLAA site 3638 land off Wilmslow Road, Alderley Edge in the Core Strategy/Site Allocations DPD
- Include Land at the Meadows, Alderley Edge in the Core Strategy/Site Allocations DPD as a Country Park
- Include School Lane, Bunbury within the Core Strategy/Site Allocations
- Traffic impact on local communities should be monitored again a baseline.
- NHS England request that financial constrictions are sought for health services infrastructure in all sites
- Include SHLAA site 3418 and land adjacent to Poynton Tip within the Core Strategy
- Site at Main Road, Goostrey should be allocated for housing in the Core Strategy
- Policies need to ensure that full account is taken of the need for viability and deliverability.
- Reference to HS2 should not be made in Policies
- Site at Land off Lymewood Drive, Disley should be allocated for residential development in the Core Strategy
- Site at Land at Four Seasons Nurseries, Chelford Road, Ollerton should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at The Orchard, Holmes Chapel, Brereton Heath should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at Clough Bank, Bollington should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at land opposite Rose Cottages, Holmes Chapel Road, Brereton Heath, Congleton should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at Land West of Willaston should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at land off Alderley Road, opposite the Crescent, Mottram St. Andrew should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at the Grain Store, Bridge Lane, Blackden, Goostrey should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at Hiverley Cottage, Twemlow Green should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at 59 Shringley Road, Bollington should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Site at the former Arclid Hospital should be allocated within the Core Strategy
- Consider land at the Paddock adjoining By the Bridge, Withinlee Road, Prestbury – possible option for residential development
- Site at Pavement Lane Farm, Mobberley should be considered for allocation within the Core Strategy
- Ensure there is suitable infrastructure in place before allowing large housing developments
- Remove the ability to allow windfall sites
- Amend policies to require brownfield first approach with limited development within the Green Belt
- Sequential approach should be used even on Allocated Greenfield sites to assess the availability of Brownfield sites before allowing development on Greenfield

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should incorporated flexibility; to allow other locations to be considered for retail development when and if they arise over the plan period.</li> <li>• Provision 16 of Policy SL4 should be removed</li> <li>• No Green Belt Safeguarding</li> <li>• Recent successful examinations, such as Selby and Ryedale include a buffer of sites to allow for any under delivery from allocated sites as well as mechanisms for early review should new sites be required as a consequence of none delivery or new evidence of greater housing need.</li> <li>• All sites which are dependent on the provision of new roads should be dropped from the plan. The Plan should be revised to a more rational and sustainable one which recognises current and projected economical conditions, climate change implications and other environmental implications.</li> <li>• The terminology, identification and selection of sites should be undertaken in a clear and transparent manner.</li> <li>• Natural England recommends that the approach taken for Leighton West in relation Great Crested Newts and other PS should be applied to other sites where Great Crested Newts and other PS are present within the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Site at Land at West Street/Dunwoody Way, Crewe should be allocated for residential development in the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Site at Land to the South of Wardle and at Barbridge, Cheshire should be allocated within the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Site at Vicarage Lane, Bunbury should be allocated for residential development within the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Site at Spode Green Farm should be allocated for employment opportunities within the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Site at Land at Sandbach Road, Congleton should be allocated for housing within the Core Strategy</li> <li>• NPS – Site at Gorstyhill should be considered and allocated within the CS.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>This section sets out each Strategic Site/Location and the area in which it relates to. The aim of this chapter is to set out the Local Strategic sites and Locations. This consultation points explains the process the Councils has gone through to get to this point and what each of the different allocations means. This chapter focuses on identifying development proposals in and around Principal Towns and Key Services Centres as informed from the Settlement Hierarchy. The Council will be preparing a Site Allocations and Development Policies document in the future which will identify the remaining site for development.</p> <p>Many of the additional sites which have been put forward within this round of consultation are not Strategic in size and relate to the smaller Local Service centres and other settlements. The intention of this document is to allocate strategic sites for development, with a Site Allocation and Development Policies Development Plan Document to be created and address smaller sites in the future. It is considered that any strategic sites which have been posed at this stage are too late in the process, as this is a draft plan, there is no additional time for consultations on new sites. Each Strategic Site and Location has been considered against the evidence base and consulted upon.</p> <p>There have been several general comments made about specific sites and individual site related comments have been addressed in relation to each site</p>  |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p>within the relevant consultation point.</p> <p>Modelling work has been carried out to assess the impact of the proposals in the Plan on the highways network and a combination of some alterations to the existing road network and new roads is proposed to ensure appropriate highways infrastructure is in place and contributions are sought where relevant improvements are required, through CIL/S106 Agreements.</p> <p>Greenbelt release is only permitted by the NPPF in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt has been assessed and those sites which have been allocated to be removed from the Greenbelt are considered to be the most appropriate to achieve the Council's vision and strategic objectives.</p> <p>The Housing numbers are based on the Council's Population Projections and Forecasts background paper (September 2013).</p> <p>With regards to protected species habitats there is a specific policy SE 3 which relates to the need for survey and mitigation should development have any potential impact on protected species. Where it is known that there is a need for the provision for habitats for Protected Species this has been specifically included with the policy for a site.</p> <p>Note the concerns raised by the Environment Agency in relation to water bodies and their proximity to the strategic sites. There are policies within the plan which protect the environment and within some of the site specific policies constraints such as water bodies are highlighted as a key constraint on the site. It is noted that the Environment Agency object to the use of the word constraint, however this is meant as a way to flag up to a developer that there is something on/adjacent to the site which needs attention, and must be considered and retained.</p> <p>Contributions for infrastructure improvements will be included within the CIL, and contributions for improvements such as Health Services etc may be considered thoroughly when CIL is put in place.</p> <p>Comments in relation to HS2 consider that the plan should not make reference to the proposal given the early stages of the consultation. However given the plan period is for the next 15 years some reference is required and an area of potential impact is now proposed around the existing railway line on Crewe to ensure any future development potential is available. If the HS2 proposal come forward it is envisaged that the Council will produce an Area Action Plan for the potential impact area or it may trigger an early review of the Local Plan.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | Reference needed within the 15.7 to include the Pre-submission Core Strategy consultation which has informed the final document – Local Plan Strategy.  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Crewe</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 30 (Support: 9 / Object: 12 / Comment Only: 9)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all new housing developments around Crewe, which will help to provide new and better roads/cycle ways in and around Crewe.</li> <li>• Support the policies but consider that National Government will overrule local opinions anyway, along with house builders</li> <li>• Well constructed plan, the additions to allow more housing seem sensible, the green gaps and cycle lanes seem sensible. Suggest a green gap or safeguarded area to the north of Leighton Hospital would be helpful.</li> <li>• Housing for the aging population is required</li> <li>• Support the new green belt proposal to the south and west of Crewe</li> <li>• Support the decision to exclude the area south of Gresty Lane as a site for development and preservation of the Green Gaps</li> <li>• Rope Parish Council support the decision to not include any sites around Rope and this is widely supported by the residents,</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK support the Council's identification of sites in figure 15.1 particularly East Shavington, however land at Coppenhall East which has outline planning permission for 650 dwellings has not been included.</li> <li>• Muller Property Group support the allocation of site CS5 (Sydney Road, Crewe) and also consider that the site could be increased in size. The sites are available for housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the disproportionate level of housing proposed around Crewe area versus the rest of the Borough.</li> <li>• A number of Pochin Prosperity's sites have not been allocated for development; this puts the Plan in jeopardy of being found unsound. Undeveloped land at Admiral Court on Electra Way should be allocated in the Core Strategy for employment.</li> <li>• Richborough Estates object to the non-allocation of Land off Eastern Road, Willaston for new residential development. Additional housing requirement will be required and this site will deliver a sustainable urban extension supporting the Council's aspirations for the town;</li> <li>• Object to the New Green Belt around Crewe/Willaston/Nantwich Area</li> <li>• Richborough Estates objects to the non allocation of Land off Moorfields, Willaston for new housing which is subject to a current planning application for up to 170 dwellings,</li> <li>• Richborough Estates object to the non-allocation of Land off Crewe Road, Haslington for residential development, which is subject to a planning application for 250 dwellings which includes a parkland edge to the site; this site could be delivered in the short term, sustainable location, the site would not impinge on the gap between Crewe and Haslington; the site is close to employment opportunities;</li> </ul> |

- Object to the level of proposed residential development in Cheshire East and consider the number of houses proposed around Crewe to be too low;
- An allowance of 250 dwellings from brownfield and windfall sites is not justified and contrary to the NPPF;
- East Shavington and Shavington Triangle housing numbers have been included with the Crewe allowance, however Shavington is correctly identified in the Plan as a Local Service Centre and therefore this allocation should be allocated against the LSC allowance, therefore there is a shortfall in housing for the Crewe area,
- There is no mention of flexibility within the plan which would address the under delivery of housing;
- Wainhomes (Developments) Ltd are promoting a sites at the West of Willaston (52 Acres) for housing on a strategic level
- Wainhomes (Developments) Ltd are promoting a site at Land at Rope Lane, Shavington additional 80 dwellings
- Adam's Planning and Development Ltd support proposals for a relief road on the Western side of the A534– to ensure road infrastructure improvements are delivered inline with the level of residential and employment development proposed. Should be denoted on the Plans like the Congleton Link Road.
- Adam's Planning and Development Ltd support residential development at Poole Meadows, Haslington.
- Object to green gap/green belt around Crewe. The area should be allowed to expand and develop
- Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council support the removal of development previously indicated in the plan, located around Junction 16 of the M6 and the formerly included area of search for a new village around Barthomley, is strongly supported. It is considered that the alternative approaches to accommodating growth will allow for development in more sustainable locations and development which will have a lesser impact on the planned regeneration of North Staffordshire. The reduction in development to the south east of Crewe by some 1,000 units is strongly supported.
- The Duchy of Lancaster supports the allocation of housing on land identified in the Crewe Town Map at Crewe Green.
- The Duchy of Lancaster also support in principle the identification of a Strategic Location for housing at South Cheshire Growth Village, - however the allocation should be one of a Strategic Housing Sites and not simply a Strategic Location
- Haslington should be upgraded from a Local Service Centre to a Key Service centre due to its proximity to Crewe Town Centre.
- Adams Planning and Developments Ltd support proposal at Broughton Road, Crewe for residential development.
- Pochin Development support development at Land at Crewe/Gateway for employment development which is currently allocated as an employment site within the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan.
- WCE Properties object to the exclusion of land off Clay Lane, Haslington. Site is in easy walking distance to the local facilities and services, transport links to Crewe Town centre, and is not within the Green Gap.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Crewe Town Council generally welcomes proposals to develop industry and resultant jobs in the Crewe area.</li> <li>• The Crewe Council does not support the development of industry in the North of the Town if it is developed on existing farmland in the green gap.</li> <li>• The Crewe Town Council is concerned about the large number of housing developments planned for Crewe and its surrounding area. It considers there is too much proposed housing on the plan, which has failed to recognise planning applications for housing that have already been agreed.</li> <li>• The Crewe Town Council is pleased that the plan recognises the need to update the infrastructure in and around Crewe. However, it regrets that the developed plans are only for major access roads. The plan offers little detail about how the congestion problems in the town centre will be addressed.</li> <li>• New housing around Crewe should encourage occupants to cycle and walk rather than use unsustainable travel methods such as the car.</li> <li>• Limited employment opportunities within Crewe – Railway engineering virtually gone and Bentley Motors are controlled remotely from Germany</li> <li>• Improvements to the area of Crewe should include Crewe Railway station to include HS2 station; improve the bus station to include Coach station; Airport links, improved bus service, town centre improvements required; improved retail park offering off the A500 with leisure facilities included; new parks and open spaces; improved hospital facilities; new crown court and prisons; education on improving the environment; new housing and businesses around Crewe; tourism improvements.</li> <li>• The plan for Crewe shows houses being built far away from employment. New employment needs to be positioned near areas of deprivation,</li> <li>• Significant amount of new jobs needed in this area;</li> <li>• Crewe will be a business tourism hub</li> <li>• Significant level of affordable housing within Crewe and there is no need for a 30% requirement in the new housing proposal – housing prices are below national average in the area of Crewe</li> <li>• Firmer policies required in relation to the HS2 lines</li> <li>• Persimmon Homes North West have put forward a new site for consideration at Crewe Road, Shavington.</li> <li>• Mactaggart and Mickel support the allocation of the Shavington Triangle within the Core Strategy</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a Master Plan for Green Spaces/Wildlife area</li> <li>• Crewe should be a business tourism hub</li> <li>• Consider new site a Crewe Road, Shavington as a preferred option in the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Remove proposal for extended Green Belt between Crewe/Nantwich/Willaston</li> <li>• Undeveloped land at Admiral Court on Electra Way should be allocated in the Core Strategy for employment.</li> <li>• Consider site at Land off Eastern Road, Willaston, Crewe for 200 dwellings</li> <li>• Site Land off Moorfields, Willaston should be allocated within the Core Strategy for residential development</li> <li>• Site at Land off Crewe Road, Haslington should be allocated within the Core</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Strategy for residential development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove or justify the allowance for windfall sites,</li> <li>• Allocate additional land to meet and exceed (sufficiently to provide flexibility) a revised, increased housing requirement for Crewe;</li> <li>• Count Shavington allocations against the Local Service centre ‘allocation’</li> <li>• Sites at the West of Willaston (52 Acres) for housing should be considered within the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Sites at Land at Rope Lane, Shavington for housing within the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Land should be allocated for a relief road to the north of Crewe</li> <li>• Site at Poole Meadows, Crewe should be allocated as a strategic housing site in the Core Strategy</li> <li>• More growth opportunities</li> <li>• Remove Green gap/green belt proposals</li> <li>• Include land at Coppenhall East within the Core Strategy – site has permission for 650 dwellings at outline.</li> <li>• Land at Broughton Road, Crewe should be allocated as a strategic housing site in the Core Strategy</li> <li>• Land at Crewe Green should be allocated as employment land in line with the designation within the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan.</li> <li>• Land at Clay Lane, Haslington should be allocated for residential development within the Core Strategy</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Crewe is Cheshire East’s biggest spatial priority and the Council has developed the ‘All Change for Crewe: High Growth City strategy’ in response to this and outlined the position Crewe will be in by 2030.</p> <p>A number of sites have been put forward around Crewe and the surrounding the area, most of these sites have previously been discounted and others are not strategic sites and therefore these will be dealt with when the Council produces the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.</p> <p>Around Crewe to the south and west of the town a new area of Green Belt is proposed, this is to prevent the merging of the Crewe with Nantwich and other surrounding settlements. The detailed boundaries of this new area of Green Belt will be defined through the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. The details of this proposed Green Belt extension are considered further in Policy PG3 of the Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Highway Network in Crewe is heavily constrained, largely due to the limited number of railway crossings. A study has been carried out and mitigation schemes have been produced which will help to manage the level of impact of future development on the highway network. It is envisaged that funding for the works will come through CIL, and funding bids from central government.</p> <p>The Government has announced its proposal for a High Speed Rail Line which links the West Midlands with Manchester and the current proposals will have a potential impact on Crewe. It is therefore considered reasonable to highlight an area around Crewe Railway Station where an Area Action Plan can be developed</p> |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>to help mitigate the impact of the proposal should it come forward. The potential impact of HS2 may also trigger a review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is accepted that the Strategic sites which are allocated around Shavington (e.g. East Shavington and The Triangle) are considered within the housing numbers the Crewe area, and that Shavington is designated as a Local Service Centre in its own right. This is due to the function relationship between the two settlements and there intrinsic link, in relation to employment opportunities.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>New plan and heading included within the 'Crewe' overview to highlight the potential impact area of the HS2 proposals.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Policy</b>   | <b>Strategic Location SL1 Central Crewe</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 41 (Support: 4 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 34)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support paragraph 15.23 which emphasises the focus for connectivity between the town centre and the Railway Station.</li> <li>• Initiatives to improve traffic flow around Crewe are supported.</li> <li>• Important that open spaces are improved and enable multi-functional uses</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Shopping Area (PSA) should be defined in the Core Strategy and not deferred until later DPDs. The PSA should be defined to reflect the retail core around the Market Centre, Victoria Centre and Queensway and Market Street. It is important that this is defined in the Core Strategy (as opposed to subsequent DPDs) because it underpins the delivery of retail priorities. Failure to identify the PSA would be contrary to national guidance and would mean that the strategic policy would fail to be effective.</li> <li>• If SL1 does not seek to consolidate retail provision at the heart of the town centre, the trend for poor linkage, disparate uses and lack of linked trips, to the detriment of the health of the town centre, will continue.</li> <li>• Object to the formal provision of 5,000 sq m of retail at Mill Street (point 14).</li> <li>• Object to the wording of paragraph 15.25. Note that it refers to any retail use needing to be complementary, but this is not specific enough and may lead to substantial floorspace being delivered in an out of centre location to the detriment of the town centre.</li> <li>• Question deliverability and viability given outcomes of Council's Viability Assessment and the fact no delivery partner or mechanism has been identified</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on 'capacity' should be provided to demonstrate 250 dwellings can be provided within Central Crewe.</li> <li>• Need to retain sufficient parking</li> <li>• English Heritage – expect assessment of town's industrial history in any development proposals. Should also demonstrate that redevelopment proposals will conserve elements that contribute to Listed Building status and their setting.</li> <li>• Pedestrian / cycle links are key and should run throughout the policy.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to development of a cultural offer around Crewe Lyceum should be made in the policy</li> <li>• Reference to pedestrian and cycle links should be added</li> <li>• Hotel and Conference Venue should be referenced</li> <li>• Quality public realm linked to Crewe Rail Heritage</li> <li>• Point 2 should read 'The provision of comparison retail including at least one anchor store in the Primary Shopping Area within the town centre boundary. The plan should confirm the town centre boundary and the PSA and be</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>included in the Core Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 14 relating to Mill Street, Crewe should be deleted.</li> <li>• Paragraph 15.25 should be reworded to read 'ongoing improvements to Crewe Railway Station with small-scale (300 sq m gross) retail, complimentary commercial and leisure uses will support the role of the Railway Station as a key transport interchange.'</li> <li>• Paragraph 15.29 should be reworded 'The town centre boundary and primary shopping area (PSA) is as defined on the map below'. The map should maintain the town centre boundary as per the proposed Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan and the PSA should focus on the key existing retail areas.</li> <li>• Assessment of towns industrial heritage required</li> <li>• Should also demonstrate that redevelopment proposals will conserve elements that contribute to Listed Building status and their setting.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The Council will further define the boundaries of the Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area through the Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. Until that document is adopted, the boundary of the Town Centre is confirmed as that defined in the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan Proposals Map.</p> <p>The 5,000 square metres of retail use included in the policy relates to a current planning permission for a mixed use scheme at Mill Street in Crewe. This approach is considered appropriate in its approach.</p> <p>The wording in paragraph 15.25 is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The figure of 250 dwellings in Appendix A relates to a windfall allowance in the urban area of Crewe. This will be made clear in Appendix A and is considered achievable and deliverable within the timescale of the Local Plan Strategy. Pedestrian and Cycle links are already referenced in point 8 of the existing policy and is considered sufficient for the Local Plan Strategy. Point 9 of the existing policy refers to appropriately rationalised and improved car parking and is considered sufficient for the Local Plan Strategy.</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>The following changes to the policy are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 5 amended as follows: 'Support for an enhanced cultural offer in particular around the Lyceum Theatre'</li> <li>• Point D has been amended as follows: 'New buildings should be of a high design quality and respond to Crewe's Railway heritage and contemporary living. The new development should sensitively retain and incorporate any heritage buildings and/or structures within them'</li> <li>• Point H has been amended as follows: 'Depending on the location within the town, a cultural heritage desk based assessment of the surviving fabric of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Railway town and its industrial heritage may be required; proposals should also demonstrate that redevelopment proposals will conserve elements that contribute to Listed Buildings status and their setting'</li> <li>• Policy Context: National Policy: Delete reference to paras 7 (sustainable development principles) and 17 (planning principles), add paras 100, 101, 102 (flooding). Strategic priorities: add Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality. Add: 'Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment' to Local Evidence.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS1 Basford East, Crewe</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 25 (Support: 4 / Object: 13 / Comment Only: 8)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site can perform a strategic employment function</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the principle of employment development only on the site. As a key gateway location into Crewe</li> <li>• Housing on this site is not consistent with the economic ambitions of the Core Strategy, the Council and Local Economic Partnership</li> <li>• The housing in terms of land take will dominate the site over economic development</li> <li>• Basford East is not a sustainable site as demonstrated by the Sustainability Appraisal</li> <li>• Objection to the indicative site delivery given the infrastructure requirements on the site. Therefore a cautious delivery rate should be given</li> <li>• 1,000 dwellings undermine the overall employment focus</li> <li>• Query deliverability of this site given its constraints – there are better located and more deliverable sites around Crewe</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding accesses to A500/A5020</li> <li>• 1000 should constitute the upper limit for housing for the site</li> <li>• Reference should be to the ability of, and provision for, Weston and surrounding areas to share some of the key facilities proposed within Basford East</li> <li>• Point V – before including the requirement to consider the effects of HS2 on the development, the Council should be satisfied that this is a requirement in law at the time the planning application is submitted.</li> <li>• HS2 phase II proposals will clearly have implications for the development and marketing of housing on the adjacent land</li> <li>• Need to provide viability evidence to support any deviation away from employment led site and the introduction of housing.</li> <li>• Updated evidence is required for revisited habitat and species surveys to ensure development will not cause adverse impact to current biodiversity and landscape of the site in response to changed circumstances.</li> <li>• No biodiversity loss, and gain, should be a key site objective.</li> <li>• Should mention the accessibility of the "pedestrian bridge" to bikes.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point A relating to phasing is worded too prescriptively. It is understood that to comply with the Crewe Green Link Road ecology mitigation, development towards the north of the site should take place later in the plan period. This should be articulated in an alternative, more flexible way.</li> <li>• Point E could be supplemented to add ‘the great crested newt mitigation areas shall be contiguous with that provided for the Crewe Green Link Road, within a zone adjacent to the northern [and western] boundary of the site.’</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to a pedestrian link within the policy over the Crewe Green Link Road should be omitted as a policy requirement. The provision of a footbridge to link both sides of the site will be predicated on viability and land ownership dependencies therefore should not be expressed so explicitly within the policy. It would be more appropriate to state that planning applications should seek to ensure connectivity between uses on the site.</li> <li>• Also in Point A, 'The Council will not permit the development of small portions of the site' is inflexible in its drafting. This should be amended to read 'The Council will permit a phased approach to the submission of planning applications on the site where it can be demonstrated that...'</li> <li>• Point C and D should be supplemented to make it clear that the provision of affordable housing and highways contributions will be appraised having regard to viability.</li> <li>• The residential component of draft policy CS1 evolved as following the provision of a detailed viability assessment which showed that the site could not be delivered purely for employment. It is unclear why the policy now requires the provision of further viability work and at what stage in the delivery of the residential development. The policy requires more precise drafting to reflect this.</li> <li>• Should mention the accessibility of the "pedestrian bridge" to bikes.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The site presents the opportunity for a high quality employment led vibrant and sustainable mixed use development, adjacent to the existing urban area of Crewe with good access to existing transport infrastructure (that is the A500/M6 and Railway). The site performs a strategic economic function in a key location to the south of Crewe. The provision of up to 1,000 homes is appropriately linked to viability evidence in order to deliver the economic and employment intentions of the site. The Council contends that the site is therefore deliverable and developable. The Compulsory Purchase Order for the Crewe Green Link Road South has now been confirmed with construction due to start in 2014 and the scheme expected to be completed by 2015. This will assist the overall delivery of the site. The site is being promoted by a major national conglomerate, with significant land interests.</p> <p>Any future planning application on the site would need to be supported by appropriate ecological assessments.</p> <p>The Council considers that points C and D and the reference to viability in point 2 of the policy are important for the overall delivery of the site and therefore will be maintained.</p> <p>The Council considers that points A and E are worded appropriately in order to deliver appropriate ecological mitigation established as part of the Crewe Green Link Road South Compulsory Purchase Order. Point A is also considered important as to deliver a comprehensive scheme and to deliver the overall objectives of the site.</p> <p>Point 6 and the reference to the pedestrian link are considered a key element of the scheme in respect connectivity of uses and will be maintained in the policy.</p> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>The Hybrid Bill for phase 1 of HS2 has been deposited at Parliament on 25 November 2013. Whilst this only deals with HS2 up to Birmingham, the intention of the Government is quite clear to deliver HS2 and therefore the reference in the policy for future proofing of HS2 impacts is considered appropriate in the policy.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplement Point 6 to refer to the need for the pedestrian bridge to be suitable for cycle access</li> <li>• Replace paragraph 15.37 of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy with updated information regarding the Crewe Green Link Road South as follows: 'The Crewe Green Link Road (South) scheme (CGLRS) is a 1.1km dual-carriageway link running north-south between the Weston Gate roundabout on the A5020 Weston Road and the A500 Hough-Shavington Bypass. The scheme was granted planning permission in October 2011. A revised planning application was progressed through 2012, and this was granted in January 2013. A Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) for the land required to construct, operate and maintain the scheme was made in January 2013, and a CPO public inquiry was completed in August 2013. The CPO was confirmed in November 2013 with modifications. Construction of the scheme is expected to start in the summer of 2014 to be completed in 2015'.</li> <li>• The site plan has been amended to reflect the route of the Crewe Green Link Road South</li> <li>• Policy context: add paras 109 and 112 to National Policy, add Priority 3: protecting and enhancing environmental quality to strategic priorities. Add: 'Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk assessment' to Local Evidence.</li> <li>• Criterion a. of Site Specific Principles of Development: change compliment to complement.</li> <li>• Criterion e of Site Specific Principles of Development: remove capitalisation from great crested newts.</li> </ul> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS2 Basford West, Crewe</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 19 (Support: 6 / Object: 9 / Comment Only: 14)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the principle of employment development at Basford West as the site is well placed to support the Council's "aspirations for employment led growth" (ref. para 8.5) with Crewe as the Council's main spatial priority.</li> <li>• SHLAA site 2909 should be included within Basford West.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basford West is not in a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Allocate for employment use only.</li> <li>• Should the legal agreement not be signed on development resolved to grant planning permission then the housing should not be allocated.</li> <li>• Consider the site not to be deliverable due to impacts of HS2.</li> <li>• HS2 phase II proposals include an infrastructure maintenance depot on the western section of this site. This will lead to a reduction in the developable area and this should reduce the deliverable housing area and not the employment area.</li> <li>• Object to the wording of this policy which is inflexible, is onerous in relation to ecology and landscape issues which have already been secured on the site through recent planning applications and makes no reference to viability and as such could have a detrimental impact upon site viability.</li> <li>• Reference to HS2 is questioned given that HS2 should not be taken into account given the early stage in the consultation process. Consequently, it is considered that this reference within the policy should be deleted in order to be sound.</li> <li>• Consideration needs to be given to the visual impact of the development on existing residents - height restriction to buildings should be considered and adequate screening provided.</li> <li>• Looks like a new settlement.</li> <li>• The delivery of uses is not considered viable / deliverable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should now be considered a committed site.</li> <li>• Viability evidence needs to be provided to justify provision of housing on the site.</li> <li>• The policy offers no flexibility, is very detailed and states "the development will" along with a list of requirements. Some of these requirements are considered to be onerous and should be addressed at the planning application stage when a clear need can be demonstrated. There is also no reference to viability which was a key consideration in planning application reference 13/2874N.</li> <li>• Ecological review required since time elapsed since site clearance began. Updated evidence is required for revisited habitat and species surveys to ensure development will not cause adverse impact to current biodiversity and</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>landscape of the site in response to changed circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No biodiversity loss, and gain, should be a key objective of the site.</li> <li>• Speculative development without pre-lets or pre-sales is not currently viable, nor fundable. In this case, the Basford West scheme requires upfront substantial capital outlay on infrastructure for the delivery of the employment units. Goodman have therefore secured a resolution to grant permission for higher value mixed uses, including residential and retail (13/2874N) on the western part of the allocation to bring the wider Basford West site forward and to confirm their contribution towards the Crewe Green Link Road (CGLR), A500 and to provide a spine road through the site as detailed in the draft policy and submission for (13/2874N). As such, this reference to viability should be deleted from the policy as it is inaccurate and is therefore unsound.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to conference facilities when referred to the provision of a hotel</li> <li>• Pedestrian and cycle links should be provided from Crewe to Shavington</li> <li>• SHLAA, site 2909, which lies immediately north of the A500, and to the east of Crewe Road, this site should be included within Basford West (CS2)</li> <li>• The policy refers to “A significant depth of native woodland screening and wildlife habitats along the southern and western boundaries, of a minimum width of 40 metres with an average width of 70 metres” however this is considered by to be onerous, prescriptive and should be considered at the planning application stage rather than being such a prescriptive policy.</li> <li>• The wording in reference to the site and floor areas proposed for each use are considered not to be precise. As such, “up to” and “about” should be replaced by ‘approximately’.</li> <li>• With reference to landscaping and the inclusion of the following text in the plan “the Basford area has a 'typical' Cheshire landscape, characterised by a flat topography broken up with a dense network of field hedges interspersed with mature hedgerow trees. The development of Basford West will need to respond to this sensitive landscape setting.”the Basford West site has been allocated for a considerable number of years as a strategic employment site. It has the benefit of outline planning application reference P03/1071 for employment uses on the site. Furthermore, recent planning applications 12/1959N and 13/2874N have both been submitted with detailed landscaping schemes which have been approved. As such, the inclusion of this text is irrelevant, onerous and renders the policy unsound. Similarly, the inclusion of Figure 15.4 conveying the Ecological and Landscape Areas is inflexible, onerous and not required given that these areas have already been secured through legal agreements attached to planning application references P03/1071, 12/1959N and 13/2874N and therefore it is questioned why this plan has been included at this stage. Consider the inclusion of this plan to be irrelevant, onerous and renders the policy unsound. As such, the policy at present is considered to be ineffective, at odds with recent planning decisions on the site as well as national guidance in relation to viability and HS2 and is therefore unsound. To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the Council should amend the policy as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of Basford West over the Core Strategy period will be achieved through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Delivery of approximately 0.16 hectares of B1 employment uses and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

through highway improvements the delivery of approximately 22 hectares of employment uses.

- 2. Delivery of up to 370 new homes, ancillary to the delivery of employment uses on the site. The delivery of more than 370 new homes on the site will only be permitted if this can be justified by the submission of a viability study. Such a study will be independently evaluated, on behalf of Cheshire East Council, such costs to be borne by the developer(s);
- 3. Creation of a new local centre including approximately 1,200 square metres of retail floorspace for local use:
- 4. Restaurant / takeaway;
- 5. Hotel;
- 6. Car showroom;
- 7. Protection of the amenity of residential properties along Crewe Road;
- 8. Continued access to and servicing of the adjacent railways; and
- 9. Incorporation of Green Infrastructure, including:
  - i. A significant depth of native woodland screening and wildlife habitats along the southern and western boundaries, to offset detrimental visual impact to the open countryside and residential amenity and to provide a habitat of ecological value;
  - ii. Existing hedgerows and mature trees should be incorporated wherever possible
  - iii. Community woodland;
  - iv. Open space, separating the residential development from the ecological mitigation areas, including Multi Use Games Area; outdoor gym and equipped children's play space.
- Site Specific Principles of Development
- A. Where it can be shown to be needed and viable, the development should deliver the following:
  - 1. Contribute towards road infrastructure improvements in the area, including the Crewe Green Link Road South, A500 link capacity improvements, the provision of a spine road; improvements to Junction 16 of the M6 and other traffic management and regulations;
  - 2. Improvements to existing and the provision of new pedestrian and cycle links to connect the site to existing and proposed residential areas, employment areas, shops, schools and health facilities.
  - 3. Fund tree planting at appropriate location
  - 4. Where appropriate, relevant contributions towards transport and highways, education, health, open space and community facilities
  - 5. Provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in Policy SC5 (Affordable Homes)
  - 6. Contribute to improvements to existing and the provision of new public transport links to Crewe railway station, Crewe town centre and local villages
- B. The development would be expected to allow continued access to and servicing of the adjacent railways;
- C. The site has potential for the provision of rail sidings with good rail access for the trans-shipment of freight between railway and road and/or rail connected warehousing and distribution.
- D. Development should incorporate Green Infrastructure and reflect 'The

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Green Infrastructure Action Plan for Crewe' (TEP, 2012), including tree planting; the creation of tree lined boulevards with the provision of greenspaces within new developments. This should include the creation of green spaces, including those linking green infrastructure with safe and secure pedestrian and cycle routes that should be integrated into any development proposals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E. The masterplanning of the site will need to ensure that the development is located within the site in such a way that it will not have any adverse impact on existing and proposed protected species habitat including established Great Crested Newt habitat areas;</li> <li>• Figure 15.4 should be omitted from the plan.</li> <li>• Also further to the objection in relation to Policy EG5, a request is made that a cross reference is included within this Policy that relates to the development of small scale retail development to meet specific local needs at this specific site.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The Council considers that the policy wording in the Local Plan Strategy, alongside the existing planning permissions and legal agreements on Basford West will ensure the delivery of the site. The Council therefore contends that the site is deliverable. This is supported by the resolution to grant planning permission for residential and other mix of uses (13/0336N) on part of the site and the fact that the site has a mix of other employment permissions as set out in paragraphs 15.44 – 15.46 of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy.</p> <p>The current policy wording contained in the Local Plan Strategy is not considered to impact on the deliverability of the site and is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Ecological assessments have been included in recent planning applications on the site. References to viability in point 2 of the policy are considered appropriate to ensure that the employment objectives of the site are delivered.</p> <p>The Hybrid Bill for phase 1 of HS2 has been deposited at Parliament on 25 November 2013. Whilst this only deals with HS2 up to Birmingham, the intention of the current Government is quite clear to deliver HS2 and therefore the reference in the policy for future proofing of HS2 impacts is considered appropriate.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combine points 3-6 to bullet point list for local centre.</li> <li>• Policy Context: National Policy: add paras 109 and 112 to National Policy, add priority 3: protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS3 Leighton West, Crewe</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 27 (Support: 3 / Object: 19 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the identification of this site and strong support is given to figure 15.5.</li> <li>• Part G - support is given to a requirement to provide a green buffer on land between Leighton Hospital and Bradfield Green.</li> <li>• Natural England welcome the fact that the site includes 'Provision of habitat for Great Crested Newts and other protected and priority species and habitats as required'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not acceptable to build homes to fund infrastructure improvements</li> <li>• Mid Cheshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (MCHFT) - remain deeply concerned that the local infrastructure would not accommodate such large scale housing development and your paragraph 10.8 stating that infrastructure requirements will be assessed on their own merits adds weight to that concern.</li> <li>• MCHFT - concerns about the mini-roundabout on Smithy Lane/Flowers Lane/Minshull New Road - vehicles back up along Smithy Lane at certain times of the day. This creates access issues for inbound and outbound blue light vehicles approaching the hospital from Crewe. We understand that this island will be re-modelled as part of the Parkers Road development but this will not address the issues, and further works will need to be undertaken as part of the Leighton West housing plan. Also concerns in relation to cycle routes where the land ownership for potential routes back into Crewe are not within the gift of either the Council or the Developer. Existing footpath routes should be improved.</li> <li>• MCHFT - the council publish a master infrastructure plan and show where funding is coming from.</li> <li>• MCHFT - the council should undertake a full Traffic Impact Assessment at peak times of the day</li> <li>• The need to minimise development of Greenfield sites has led to increasing the density of this site to 1,000 dwellings from 750 dwellings, without identifying a larger boundary. – this will restrict the quality of development that can be delivered. There is a need to focus on the quality of the environment and new residential neighbourhoods, to help to deliver economic success.</li> <li>• The site should include a range of house types which may not be delivered at the density that is envisaged.</li> <li>• The provision of residential development in locations near key employers such as Bentley Motors and Leighton Hospital can help to support the trend of sustainable travel.</li> <li>• The Fairfield Partnership's adjacent land offers a highly sustainable location for residential development and could play a significant part in the successful Masterplanning of the wider development area, including the delivery of highway improvements and a new primary school.</li> </ul> |

- Realignment of A530 is not required - The Fairfield Partnership have been advised by Cannon Consulting Engineers, who state that access to Leighton Hospital can be improved with junction improvements and that the accident record does not support this requirement. They do not consider that realigning the A530 would be of any significant benefit in achieving this objective.
- An in-depth accident review should be undertaken by the local authority.
- The Fairfield Partnership understand that the council's highway model has underpinned the Core Strategy, and the traffic studies have shown there to be capacity for at least 1,800 new dwellings at Leighton.
- A joint allocation for the land covered by CS3 and SL2 should be made, to ensure full masterplanning; the delivery of a range of house types; sustainable travel and highway and other infrastructure can be delivered.
- The Fairfield Partnership's view of Soundness is:
  - Not Effective
  - Not Justified
  - Not consistent with National Policy
  - Not Positively Prepared
- Appearance at Examination
  - I wish to appear at the Examination to discuss this issue, as it is key to the soundness of the Core Strategy, and relates to complex and interrelated spatial planning issues, the exploration of which I believe would be useful to the Inspector.
- The developers instructed ecologists to undertake a Great Crested Newt survey on the site this year. This survey confirms no Great Crested Newts were found on the site, nor any other protected species – reference in the Policy should therefore be removed.
- Imposing affordable housing requirements can prevent the deliverability of a site.
- Additional land should be included within the site to support the delivery of a realigned Smithy Lane
- The developers have previously promoted the 2 parcels of land marked A and B on the enclosed plan as future development parcels to support the expansion of Leighton Hospital and provide further deliverable residential development land, along with a new road connecting Middlewich Road with Flowers Lane. Development at this site should include this land.
- Part 10 - highways analysis undertaken by Croft Transport has previously considered the request by Cheshire East Council to realign Middlewich Road This categorically confirmed there would be no safety or highway capacity benefits. This requirement should be deleted.
- Part 11 (and part a) refer to the provision of an improved “emergency portal”, it is not clear how this will be achieved, the developers request clarification and highways justification.
- Part B is repetitive – amendment is suggested.
- Part 5 is very specific and the developers do not consider it meets the aspirations of the NPPF, which states policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances – revised wording is suggested.
- It is unnecessary to specify that retail is for local needs only, it is not made

clear anywhere what is considered a local need. Where maximum floor areas are specified, clearly the location of the retail provision within CS3 will serve the existing adjacent residence, the hospital and businesses. Revised wording is suggested.

- The developer's request that part 4 iii is amended to allow greater flexibility at the masterplanning stage, should there be a requirement for more than one public house.
- The Policy wording should reflect the NPPF and ensure flexibility – amended wording is proposed.
- There are a number of significant constraints on the site - highway capacity issues; expansion land should be reserved for the hospital; power lines and a pipeline run through the centre of the site; potential land contamination; amenity issues in respect of the Pyms Lane Household Waste Recycling centre located on the southern edge of this site; Great Crested Newts are also known to be present in the area.
- The Inspector dealing with the Sandbach North appeal cast doubt over whether this site can be delivered - the southern part of this site is SHLAA site 4405 and is considered "not suitable for development" in the SHLAA. This proposed allocation is therefore out-of-step with the Council's own evidence.
- not located in the most sustainable location confirmed in the Council's own Accessibility Assessment, which forms part of Appendix K of the Sustainability (Integrated) Appraisal.
- The total housing allocation should be reduced or removed and we propose alternative potential housing land
- Build rate is too high - the Council's SHLAA (February 2013 update) suggests a build rate of 50 dwellings per year for sites over 200 units. The proposed build-out rate set out for site CS3 is therefore far in excess of that applied in the Council's own evidence. It is also noted that the Inspector in the recent Sandbach Road North decision (appeal ref 2195201) considered "it is more proper to take a cautious and conservative approach to delivery rates." The delivery rate should be calculated at a rate at or below the Council's suggested delivery rates in the 2013 SHLAA
- There are other, more suitable sites available.
- This site is not deliverable, due to constraints and costs.
- 3,500 sqm retail is not justified in retail capacity terms. Is this considered necessary 'for local needs only'? By way of comparison, at Basford East (to serve 1,000 new houses), only up to 1,000 sqm of retail space is suggested 'for local needs only.' Quite why 3,500 sqm is required to serve 250 fewer homes is unclear. There might be a good explanation for this, but that is not set out in the document and we object accordingly. The lack of evidence base for the Plan falls well short; the Plan is unsound.
- Question the need for, deliverability, viability and sustainability of the local centre and community facilities. How has this been assessed / established? There is no way that interested parties can properly consider whether it is truly necessary and object as justification is flimsy and the Plan is unsound.

**Comment Only**

- Site capacity for the stated preferred levels and types of use is over optimistic given the site constraints.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency - does not mention that Leighton Brook runs through the site in culvert, the removal of the culvert and the renaturalisation of the brook could be a positive outcome from the development of the site.</li> <li>• Bentley factory is on the local list and this needs to be highlighted.</li> <li>• When further brownfield opportunities become available, apparent current need for development here may be ameliorated or removed.</li> <li>• This will extend Crewe in a completely unbalanced way on the side furthest from both the town centre and the station; lack of employment; poor access – road improvements needed; new station should be provided here.</li> <li>• It is envisaged a new bus interchange facility will serve existing residents and new residents not just the hospital.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Bentley factory as being on the local list</li> <li>• Include reference to the fact that Leighton Brook runs through the site in culvert, the removal of the culvert and the renaturalisation of the brook could be a positive outcome from the development of the site.</li> <li>• Part I - specific reference to Great Crested Newts should be removed.</li> <li>• Text at paragraph H should be amended to read:<br/>“the Core Strategy site is expected to provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in policy CS5 (Affordable Homes), unless evidence is presented through a viability appraisal of the site to justify alternative infrastructure priorities”.</li> <li>• Part E is too ambiguous and does not relate specifically to the delivery of the Core Strategy site. This should be removed.</li> <li>• Part 9 should be revised to read:<br/>“9. The widening and/or realignment of Smithy Lane, to provide access to the site and improved access”</li> <li>• The site boundary should be modified to include land shown as ‘C’ on attached plan (PRE4415) to deliver a realigned Smithy Lane</li> <li>• Land marked A and B on the enclosed plan (PRE4424) should be identified for development as part of this site or SL2.</li> <li>• Part 10 should be deleted.</li> <li>• Request clarification of how an improved “emergency portal” will be achieved.</li> <li>• Part B is repetitive it states “... the creation of tree lined boulevards with the provision of green spaces within new developments. This should include the creation of green spaces, including ...” This should be revised to read “... these green spaces will link new green infrastructure...”</li> <li>• It is envisaged a new bus interchange facility will serve existing residents and new residents not just the hospital. It is requested that part 7 is revised to read. “7. A new bus interchange”</li> <li>• Part 5 should be revised to read:<br/>“5. The allocation of employment land within the site will be supported, the land will allow for local and inward investment opportunities which may support the advanced/automated engineering and manufacturing industry and may provide land for a science/energy park”</li> <li>• Remove “all for local needs” from point i.</li> <li>• Request that part 4 iii is amended - (iii) public house – should be amended to public house(s)</li> <li>• The developer’s request that part 2 is amended to allow greater flexibility to</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>the number of homes, this is in line with the NPPF - “2. The delivery of around 1,000 new homes (at a variety of densities) subject to a comprehensive masterplanning exercise being undertaken;”</p>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Leighton West presents the opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension to support and complement the adjacent Leighton Hospital and other major employers including Bentley.</p> <p>The density of development on the site has now been reviewed. To allow a variation of densities and range of house types and to reflect the different uses that are proposed to be accommodated on the site, it is now proposed that the capacity of the site is reduced to around 850 dwellings.</p> <p>Additional land that lies to the north, east and west of Leighton Hospital has been identified as a Strategic Location; the detailed boundaries of which will be established in the Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.</p> <p>With regard to the potential presence of Great Crested Newts on the site, it should be noted that the land is within more than one ownership and it is possible that Great Crested Newts may be identified as being present on the site. To ensure that this possibility is covered, it is proposed to retain the clause which will only be of relevance if Great Crested Newts are present on the site.</p> <p>With regard to the provision of affordable housing on sites, the Affordable Homes Policy SC5 includes provision for the viability of development on a site to be demonstrated and alternative provision to be agreed, where it is justified. It is not therefore proposed to amend this Policy in this respect.</p> <p>With regard to the provision of employment land, in part 5 of the Policy, it is envisaged that this will take place upon the land that lies within the ownership of Cheshire East Council, at the southern end of the site. It is proposed that the wording is amended accordingly.</p> <p>With regard to the retail provision on the site, this will be made within a local centre which will serve the new development, along with the hospital and existing nearby housing and major employers. It is proposed that the retail provision is reduced to 2,500sqm, to reflect paragraph 26 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The facilities within the local centre have been proposed by the main site developers and as such they consider that they can be delivered within the development as a whole. The exact mix of facilities to be provided will be established through the masterplanning process.</p> <p>It is recognised that the site does have a number of constraints however an indicative masterplan has been produced, to show how they can be dealt with and incorporated within the site.</p> <p>With regard to sustainability matters, the site is located adjacent to two of the town’s major employers; it is proposed that there will be improved cycle and pedestrian links, along with improved public transport and highway links. The site</p> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>will also include a local centre and a primary school.</p> <p>Build rates for all sites have been reviewed, in accordance with the December 2013 SHLAA.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that Bentley Motors is on the Local List, it is not considered that the Leighton West development would have a direct impact upon the building. It is not therefore proposed to amend the Policy.</p> <p>All of the sites within the SHLAA have been reviewed. Site 4405 forms part of that review and its details will reflect the current position.</p> <p>With regard to the potential to remove the culvert to Leighton Brook, it is not considered that this would be feasible, due to cost and the fact that the brook runs through the former tipped land.</p> <p>Cheshire East Council is content that the proposed development at Leighton West will be able to be supported with suitable infrastructure improvements to the highway network. The Strategic Housing Manager remains convinced that suitable infrastructure improvements can be achieved to support this development.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 2 to read – ‘The delivery of around 850 new homes (at a variety of densities)’.</li> <li>• Last word of point 4 to read ‘including’ instead of ‘comprising’.</li> <li>• Point 4i to read ‘Retail appropriate to meet local needs’</li> <li>• Point 5 to read ‘About 5 hectares of additional employment land will be provided at the southern end of the site, including a science/energy park which could include advanced/automotive engineering and manufacturing’</li> <li>• Point 7 – add to the end of the sentence - ‘and nearby residential areas’</li> <li>• Policy Context: add para 112 to national Policy, add priority 1: Promoting economic prosperity by creating conditions for business growth, and add priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities. In Local Evidence, delete last item, and insert: Geothermal Energy Potential: Great Britain and Northern Ireland</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site SL2 Leighton, Crewe</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 17 (Support: 1 / Object: 13 / Comment Only: 3)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developers strongly support the identification of additional land as a Strategic Location SL2 for a new sustainable urban extension.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support the assumption that it is acceptable to build homes to fund infrastructure improvements</li> <li>• Mid Cheshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (MCHFT) - remain deeply concerned that the local infrastructure would not accommodate such large scale housing development and your paragraph 10.8 stating that infrastructure requirements will be assessed on their own merits adds weight to that concern.</li> <li>• MCHFT - concerns about the mini-roundabout on Smithy Lane/Flowers Lane/Minshull New Road - vehicles back up along Smithy Lane at certain times of the day. This creates access issues for inbound and outbound blue light vehicles approaching the hospital from Crewe. We understand that this island will be re-modelled as part of the Parkers Road development but this will not address the issues, and further works will need to be undertaken as part of the Leighton West housing plan. Also concerns in relation to cycle routes where the land ownership for potential routes back into Crewe are not within the gift of either the Council or the Developer. Existing footpath routes should be improved.</li> <li>• MCHFT - the council publish a master infrastructure plan and show where funding is coming from.</li> <li>• MCHFT - the council should undertake a full Traffic Impact Assessment at peak times of the day</li> <li>• The need to minimise development of Greenfield sites has led to increasing the density of this site to 1,000 dwellings from 750 dwellings, without identifying a larger boundary. – this will restrict the quality of development that can be delivered. There is a need to focus on the quality of the environment and new residential neighbourhoods, to help to deliver economic success.</li> <li>• The site should include a range of house types which may not be delivered at the density that is envisaged.</li> <li>• The provision of residential development in locations near key employers such as Bentley Motors and Leighton Hospital can help to support the trend of sustainable travel.</li> <li>• The Fairfield Partnership’s adjacent land offers a highly sustainable location for residential development and could play a significant part in the successful Masterplanning of the wider development area, including the delivery of highway improvements and a new primary school.</li> <li>• Realignment of A530 is not required - The Fairfield Partnership have been advised by Cannon Consulting Engineers, who state that access to Leighton Hospital can be improved with junction improvements and that the accident</li> </ul> |

record does not support this requirement. They do not consider that realigning the A530 would be of any significant benefit in achieving this objective.

- An in-depth accident review should be undertaken by the local authority.
  - The Fairfield Partnership understand that the council's highway model has underpinned the Core Strategy, and the traffic studies have shown there to be capacity for at least 1,800 new dwellings at Leighton.
  - A joint allocation for the land covered by CS3 and SL2 should be made, to ensure full masterplanning; the delivery of a range of house types; sustainable travel and highway and other infrastructure can be delivered.
  - The Fairfield Partnership's view of Soundness is:
    - Not Effective
    - Not Justified
    - Not consistent with National Policy
    - Not Positively Prepared
- Appearance at Examination
- I wish to appear at the Examination to discuss this issue, as it is key to the soundness of the Core Strategy, and relates to complex and interrelated spatial planning issues, the exploration of which I believe would be useful to the Inspector.
  - Part i - there is no requirement for Great Crested Newt mitigation on parcels A and B. Can the Council confirm they have survey information for the other land annotated within figure 15.6 and this confirms Great Crested Newts on this land? Otherwise part i is not required and the developer's request this is deleted, along with paragraph 15.74 of the justification.
  - The developers have previously promoted the 2 parcels of land marked A and B on the enclosed plan as future development parcels to support the expansion of Leighton Hospital and provide further deliverable residential development land, along with a new road connecting Middlewich Road with Flowers Lane. Development at this site should include this land.
  - Land marked A and B on the enclosed plan (PRE4423) should be identified for development as part of this site or SL2.
  - The developers object to the word 'current' in paragraph 15.71. It is not for the Core Strategy allocations to seek to mitigate against current highways issues, future planning applications must only compensate for any impact of the proposed development not seek to rectify mistakes created by past decisions.
  - Justification - Paragraph 15.69 reads as if the Council own part of the Parkers Road site, this needs to be corrected, the Council do not.
  - Part l - as addressed in these Representations the developers strongly contest the need for the realignment of the A530 corridor, this is supported by technical highways evidence already submitted to the Council by the developers in 2012. This evidence confirms there are no safety or capacity justification reasons for the realignment of the A530. Revised wording is suggested.
  - The developers object to the text in part c, this is too ambiguous; contributions should only be made that relate to the proposed development. The developers request part c is deleted.
  - Imposing affordable housing requirements can prevent the deliverability of a site.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site does not relate well to the existing built up area of Crewe.</li> <li>• Suitable, available and achievable development opportunities exist that are better related to the town of Crewe.</li> <li>• The site is not located in the most sustainable location; this is confirmed in the Council's own Accessibility Assessment, which forms part of Appendix K of the Sustainability (Integrated) Appraisal.</li> <li>• The site is not justified because it does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.</li> <li>• The Inspector dealing with the Sandbach North appeal cast doubt over whether this site can be delivered</li> <li>• There are major highway capacity issues associated with site CS3; development of this site will only make this worse.</li> <li>• The presentation of the strategic location is considered confusing; it should form part of a larger Leighton West site (CS3.).</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May cause more congestion and access problems to the major hospital focus.</li> <li>• Could prejudice any needed future expansion of hospital to the detriment of the Boroughs residents.</li> <li>• Elongates the built up area to the north and west remote from town centre.</li> <li>• When further brownfield opportunities become available, apparent current need for development here may be ameliorated or removed.</li> <li>• it distends the town more (is further from the town centre and railway), adds more housing without employment, destroys much virgin countryside, relies even more on the dreadful road links, and is further from any decent road links.</li> <li>• No requirement for affordable housing – too much in this area already.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No requirement for reference to Great Crested Newts (see comments above.)</li> <li>• The delivery section states that 100 homes will be delivered during 2020-2025 and 250 homes during 2025-2030 yet part 2 of policy SL2 stipulates the delivery of up to 400 homes. The developers request under the delivery section 250 is replaced by 300.</li> <li>• Land marked A and B on the enclosed plan (PRE4423) should be identified for development as part of this site or CS3. Request the red circle annotating the location of the additional 400 homes is moved further north and east to encompass both Parcels of land.</li> <li>• Delete the word 'current' in paragraph 15.71.</li> <li>• Remove reference to the Council owning part of this site, in paragraph 15.69.</li> <li>• The developers request that part I is revised to read - "...location. In order for the additional land in the Strategic Location to be developed then junction improvements at the Flowers Lane and Smithy Lane junctions will be required." Also request that reference to the realignment of Middlewich Road in Paragraph 15.75 is deleted.</li> <li>• The developers request part c is deleted.</li> <li>• The developers request that part d the following text is amended to read: "The Strategic Location will be expected to provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in Policy SC5 (Affordable Housing), unless evidence is presented through a viability appraisal of the site to justify alternative infrastructure priorities."</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site should form part of the Leighton West site (CS3.)</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>This site lies adjacent to site CS3 Leighton West and comprises additional land that lies to the north, east and west of Leighton Hospital; its detailed boundaries will be established in the Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.</p> <p>Great Crested Newts may be identified as being present on the site. To ensure that this possibility is covered, it is proposed to retain the clause which will only be of relevance if Great Crested Newts are present on the site.</p> <p>It is accepted the Cheshire East Council do not own any of the land that is the subject of the Strategic Location. The wording to that effect will therefore be removed.</p> <p>With regard to the provision of affordable housing on sites, the Affordable Homes Policy SC5 includes provision for the viability of development on a site to be demonstrated and alternative provision to be agreed, where it is justified. It is not therefore proposed to amend this Policy in this respect.</p> <p>It is considered that the site does relate well to the built form of Crewe town. The site is located adjacent to two of the town's major employers and immediately adjoins the existing and future built form of Crewe.</p> <p>With regard to sustainability matters, the site is located adjacent to site CS 3 Leighton West which lies adjacent to two of the town's major employers; it is proposed that there will be improved cycle and pedestrian links, along with improved public transport and highway links. The Leighton West site will also include a local centre and a primary school.</p> <p>Build rates for all sites have been reviewed, in accordance with the December 2013 SHLAA.</p> <p>Cheshire East Council is content that the proposed development at Leighton West will be able to be supported with suitable infrastructure improvements to the highway network. The Strategic Housing Manager remains convinced that suitable infrastructure improvements can be achieved to support this development.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete reference to Cheshire East Council in paragraph 15.69 (now 15.73) of the Justification.</li> <li>• Update Figure 15.6 has to indicate the boundaries of the site which will be confirmed in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</li> <li>• Policy Context: add para. 109 to National Policy</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS4 Crewe Green, Crewe</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 16 (Support: 3 / Object: 9 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development of a larger area than identified - land to the north east (NPS2) between the proposed Sydney Road development area and Crewe Green.</li> <li>• The Duchy of Lancaster welcomes and supports the allocation of this site. The site is some 5 hectares, and there is potential for land owned by the Council, to the north west of the roundabout/south of Hungerford Road to form part of the development site, we would advocate that the capacity of the site be increased. This may also necessitate the site boundaries shown on Figure 15.7 being amended</li> <li>• The Duchy of Lancaster disagree that the delivery of highways improvements are to be achieved before the delivery of housing on the site (as is referenced in the Overview Paper) and also in the Policy itself. This is inconsistent to the approach taken to other Strategic Housing Sites We reiterate our position that if the land is to be made available for highways improvements at Crewe Green Roundabout, this will be subject to permission being already in place for residential development of the Crewe Green site. In addition, development of housing must be commensurate with highway improvements here.</li> <li>• The Duchy of Lancaster state that this site is suitable, achievable and available now for development; there is no reasonable justification for delaying the delivery of this site.</li> <li>• The Duchy of Lancaster disagree with the text within the Preferred Sites Background Paper (2013) page 18 that states: "A key infrastructure requirement of this site is the provision of land to Cheshire East Council to facilitate the delivery of highway improvements at Crewe Green Roundabout. The highway improvements are to be completed before the delivery of housing on the site." The text within the Preferred Sites Background Paper on page 18 be amended. This could be amended to read: "A key infrastructure requirement of this site is the provision of land to Cheshire East Council to facilitate the delivery of highway improvements at Crewe Green Roundabout through the provision of land. Planning permission for the residential development of the site will be secured prior to the highway improvements being commenced."</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on this site would be the 'thin end of the wedge' and allow developers to build anywhere within this gap</li> <li>• This site is a key entrance to Crewe and should epitomise the Green Gap vision of the Council- not destroy it</li> <li>• Sacrificing Green Gap land to improve a roundabout is a flawed and inconsistent argument.</li> <li>• Why has the requirement for this improved roundabout suddenly emerged as a strategic need?</li> </ul> |

- Site is isolated by its location and poorly related to any other area of development – it is unsustainable.
- Site lies within the historic Green Gap and within the Core Strategy's own Area of Search for Green Belt to prevent Crewe merging with Haslington/ Crewe Green - its contribution to Green Belt is critical
- A damaging intrusion into the existing Green Gap area separating the distinct communities of Crewe, Haslington and Crewe Green. Site is located in the narrowest point between the two settlements, with flat topography and a gap of only 550m from Sydney Road, Crewe to Crewe Green Avenue, Haslington. This proposal would lead to a further reduction of this gap to 400m. The Council's own study concludes that there is a risk of Crewe merging with Haslington in this location.
- Taylor Young has independently reviewed the Green Gap around Crewe - this site was identified as an important part of the semi-rural surroundings of Crewe and its development was considered detrimental in terms of contributing to merging of Crewe with Haslington.
- Cheshire East have not published any evidence that demonstrates that the loss of any of this area of Green Gap is required to provide road junction improvements.
- If expert evidence is eventually provided that additional land is required to provide the physical space for road improvements, it would only be a small part of the area
- Duchy of Lancaster should donate any land required to improve the Crewe Green roundabout; a highway solution is required now, not in 10 years time
- Infrastructure will not cope, especially the roads
- The site is sensitive in terms of Landscape and Visual Impact terms
- The site's development would breach the natural development boundary of Sydney Road.
- Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the historic assets of Crewe Green Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings associated with Crewe Hall (grade 1 listed) which is also a Registered Historic Garden. Conflicts with Policy SE 7- The Historic Environment.
- The value of the countryside here should be protected and enhanced.
- There are better sites available for housing development.
- Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council responded to the previous consultation version of the Core Strategy with concerns re the scale of development to the south and south east of Crewe and suggested that sites to the north and west of Crewe would be more sustainable

**Comment Only**

- Let the developers get on with it – we need bungalows and we need to sort out the Crewe Green roundabout.
- Was part of Green Gap for a reason. Site should be part of new green belt to protect gradual erosion of the countryside between Crewe and Haslington/Sandbach/Alsager which have their own individual characteristics
- Would add traffic to an already difficult junction.
- Green belt should separate it from Haslington
- Footpath and cycle access to Haslington & the countryside are important to make the site sustainable

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete the site</li> <li>• Duchy request that text at point 1 of the Policy be amended to ‘150 dwellings minimum’ as opposed to ‘up to’</li> <li>• Duchy request the delivery of the site, referred to on page 180 of the Core Strategy should be amended to refer to a minimum of 150 dwellings, commencing in the period from 2015.</li> <li>• Duchy state that their position is that if the land is to be made available for highways improvements at Crewe Green Roundabout, this will be subject to planning permission being already in place for residential development of the Crewe Green site. The Duchy of Lancaster cannot make this land available to the Council if this is not the case. Point 2. of the Policy CS4 must be amended to reflect this</li> <li>• Duchy request amendment to Policy CS4 b to recognise that there are other schemes that will contribute funding towards the improvements to Crewe Green Roundabout.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The site at Crewe Green presents the opportunity to provide a high quality residential development at a key gateway into Crewe, whilst delivering improvements to the transport network in particular the Crewe Green Roundabout.</p> <p>It is recognised that the development of this site will result in the loss of an area of land that is currently designated as Green Gap. This is considered to be necessary, to ensure that the highway improvements to Crewe Green roundabout, which is a key piece of highway infrastructure, can take place. The Policy includes requirements that the development that takes place on the site is of a very high quality and design, recognising that it lies within close proximity to Crewe Green Conservation Area and numerous Listed Buildings.</p> <p>It is not considered that it is appropriate to increase the size of this site, as the reason for releasing this land from the Green Gap is to facilitate the highway improvements for the Crewe Green roundabout, whilst also enabling a high quality residential development to take place on this key gateway site to Crewe.</p> <p>The need for improvements to this key piece of highway infrastructure is highlighted in highway studies and the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan which states that the roundabout suffers from peak period delays and includes it within the ‘Physical Infrastructure Delivery Schedule’, with funding sources being developers, Local Transport Plan and Local Enterprise Partnership. In terms of the capacity of this site, it is considered that, to allow flexibility, the wording should be amended to ‘around 150 homes’.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 1 to read – ‘The delivery of around 150 homes.’</li> <li>• Point 4b to read ‘The development of the site will assist in the facilitation and delivery of highway improvements at Crewe Green roundabout’</li> <li>• Additional paragraph added to the Justification to read ‘This site is a key gateway to Crewe. The development of this site will assist in the delivery of improvements to the Crewe Green roundabout which is a key piece of highway infrastructure and is identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which states that the roundabout suffers from peak period delays and includes</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>it within the 'Physical Infrastructure Delivery Schedule', with funding sources being developers, Local Transport Plan and Local Enterprise Partnership.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy Context: add paras. 109 and 112 to National Policy, add Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS5 Sydney Road, Crewe</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 9 (Support: 1 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 1)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is well contained by existing built development and is within a highly sustainable location.</li> <li>• A planning application (13/2055N) has been approved on part of the site for up to 240 dwellings – it demonstrates that an attractive residential development can be achieved here, providing a mixture of dwelling types and tenures, public open space and retention and reinforcement of key landscape features including a buffer along the railway line and at the western edge of the site.</li> <li>• The site should be increased in size, which would allow for further highway improvements.</li> <li>• There are no technical or environmental issues that would prevent the development of the site for housing.</li> <li>• The site is in Green Gap but will not reduce separation between Crewe and Haslington.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allocation cannot be justified – it is a site/area of land for consideration as being allocated as Green Belt.</li> <li>• An application for 240 homes recently was approved subject to S106 which is not yet signed and there is a risk that site will not come forward.</li> <li>• Damaging intrusion into the existing Green Gap between the settlements of Crewe and Haslington</li> <li>• Site should be Green Belt</li> <li>• Infrastructure will not cope; Crewe Green roundabout is a major traffic problem</li> <li>• No employment provided</li> <li>• Development of this site would conflict with the public statements made by the Leader of Cheshire East Council.</li> <li>• The site is highly sensitive in Landscape and Visual Impact terms, and would protrude from established development boundaries, without a strong defensible boundary.</li> <li>• Site is not sustainable as there would be an over reliance on the private car.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, no employment in the most depressed side of Crewe. This is therefore building a slum for the unemployed.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete site if legal agreement is not completed.</li> <li>• Remove site from the Local Plan and allocate as Green Belt.</li> <li>• Allocate additional land to meet and exceed (sufficiently to provide flexibility) a revised, increased housing requirement for Crewe.</li> <li>• The site should be increased in size.</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>A resolution to grant approval of an outline planning application for up to 240 dwellings (ref 13/2055N) on part of this site, was given, subject to the completion of a S106 Legal agreement, at Cheshire East Council's Strategic Planning Board on 9 December 2013. The planning approval includes the requirement to provide a financial Highways contribution for Sydney Road Bridge and/or Crewe Green Roundabout and shows structural landscaping along the railway boundary and the north-east edge of the site.</p> <p>In relation to the loss of this land from the Green Gap, it should be noted that the Green Gap is comparatively wide at this location and it is a relatively small site. Development of the site will not result in the gap becoming any narrower than it is at the existing narrowest point between Crewe and Haslington. The proposal will not result in any loss of, or reduction in, the perception of separation, or of a gap, of leaving one settlement and arriving in another when travelling between Crewe and Haslington.</p> <p>The site is enclosed by existing housing development, the West Coast Main Line, and Maw Green Road, and therefore is well contained, with defensible boundaries and represents a rounding off of the existing settlement rather than a visually divorced incursion into the open countryside and green gap.</p> <p>It is not considered to be appropriate to extend the size of the site any further, as this could result in an adverse impact on the separation of Crewe and Haslington.</p> <p>In terms of transport links and accessibility, it is accepted that the site is well away from the town centre but there are bus services and local facilities.</p> <p>The council contends that this site is deliverable and viable.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy context: delete para 9, insert paras 109, 112 and 117 in national Policy, add priority 3 Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities, add priority 5 Ensure a sustainable future to SCS priorities.</li> <li>• Add paragraph to justification: The site is subject to a current outline planning application for up to 240 dwellings on the north-western part of the site (13/2055N). The minutes of the Strategic Planning Board held on 9/12/2013 include a resolution to grant permission, subject to a prior legal agreement including highway improvements.</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site SL3 South Cheshire Growth Village</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 67 (Support: 3 / Object: 26 / Comment Only: 38)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location is highly suitable.</li> <li>• Wardle should also be considered as a strategic location.</li> <li>• The requirement that the site should contribute to the provision of a primary school on Basford East and other highways infrastructure should be retained in the final version of the plan.</li> <li>• Welcome growth at this location, but formal allocation would provide certainty.</li> <li>• Growth above 900 dwellings could be achieved.</li> <li>• The policy requirements for contributions should be reduced due to viability impacts and the phasing should be removed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The green belt location is not sustainable.</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstances to warrant green belt alteration in this location</li> <li>• The majority of the land proposed for development formed the original gardens and parkland to Crewe Hall. The National Register of Historic Parks and Gardens lists 201 hectares as the gardens and parkland and there are several listed buildings. No amount of landscaping or tree/hedgerow retention can soften the impact of the proposed development scheme.</li> <li>• There will be a loss of good quality and productive agricultural land, which should be protected and land of poorer quality should be developed as an alternative.</li> <li>• In the event that policy decides a new village is justified, a more sustainable location can be identified within the vicinity of the Crewe Urban Area which is less destructive and better related to existing local services.</li> <li>• The proposed strategic location does not contribute to a policy which has been soundly prepared or justified.</li> <li>• Contrary to NPPF</li> <li>• No justification has been provided in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy to demonstrate why developing a new settlement is the most sustainable way of delivering additional development.</li> <li>• Query the justification of proposal as the adverse impacts outweigh any benefits in view of housing permissions already granted further west.</li> <li>• Object to the location and size of the proposal.</li> <li>• The site is poorly related to other settlements and is therefore unsustainable.</li> <li>• Local roads already operate beyond design capacity, resulting in significant congestion which would be worsened by this allocation.</li> <li>• The site (village A) is isolated and will not link into an existing centre of critical mass. Its creation will require an entirely new level of transport, power, drainage and services/amenities whose deliverability and costs are questionable.</li> <li>• The location of this site could also suggest new residents have a very easy</li> </ul> |

option of accessing the M6 and potentially this could see a pattern of out-commuting by car that would be contrary to the principles of sustainable development. It is also important to consider the infrastructure needed to service such a large development as it is already apparent that there are difficulties accessing Crewe at peak times from the south east and the A500.

- The selected site is not as accessible and would have a greater adverse impact in sustainable transport terms than the Gresty Lane site.
- Strategic Location 3 is not a 'sustainable new settlement'; it is in a sensitive location with important assets of Crewe Hall & Green Belt, and its capacity is likely to be 600 dwellings.
- The location is too close to existing edge of town to become a stand-alone settlement, and is too small to adhere to principles of Garden City as required by NPPF.
- Potential adverse residual impacts on historic sites and landscapes.
- Potential impacts on biodiversity and landscape.
- Impacts on strategic open gap between Crewe and Weston.

**Comment Only**

- Reduce the numbers and density of Village A whilst keeping its boundaries away from Weston, using the railway as a natural break in development.
- Support the efforts of Weston & Basford Parish Council in seeking to reduce the scale and impact of the proposed South Cheshire Village around Crewe Hall.
- Infrastructure is already grossly overloaded with long traffic queues and gridlock in the area particularly at peak times and we are totally opposed to our villages being subsumed into urban sprawl linking them into Crewe.
- The consequent loss of wildlife in what is most attractive countryside will be devastating.
- Undue weight is being given to the proposed housing allocations to the south east of Crewe compared with those in the north of the borough, which seems very much out of balance. If 1000 houses on Basford East along with some housing around Crewe Hall are accepted, there should not be any additional housing development allocated within local villages and request that the Local Plan endorses this point: enough is enough.
- Any residential development here should be low density, quality houses, sensitively designed to fit in with the surroundings.
- There would need to be very strong landscaping reinforcing that Weston is a separate, historic village in a countryside setting.
- The opportunity should be taken to improve infrastructure so that Main Road Weston can be reduced in status and traffic through Weston village be reduced.
- There is no need for retail and other services on this site as it should be an adjunct of Basford East, with pedestrian/cycle links to enable easy accessibility to the services on that site.
- The setting of Crewe Green Conservation Area should be mentioned
- In the Draft Development Strategy (January 2013), this site was identified as a new settlement known as "Village A". In the PSCS however, it is included as an allocation within Crewe. The boundary has been amended and the number

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>of dwellings has been reduced from 1,000 to 900.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There appears to be no justification as to why this site is no longer proposed as a new settlement or why this site is preferred to other potential strategic sites closer to the existing boundary of Crewe.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in house numbers allocated to village A, and a reduction in house density planned within the south Crewe/Cheshire location.</li> <li>• Reduction in the size of the development so that it fits in with its surroundings</li> <li>• Setting of Crewe Green Conservation Area should be mentioned</li> <li>• The housing development South Cheshire Growth Village Strategic Location should be removed from the plan as these sites are not sustainable.</li> <li>• In order to address the conflicts and ensure that the Plan is sound the Strategic Location at south Crewe should be deleted. Reference to the South Cheshire Growth Village should also be removed from all other policies.</li> <li>• Redistribute growth to smaller sites.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of houses for Crewe Hall/Village A and ensure the entire Parish of Weston &amp; Basford is protected against further development via a Section 106 agreement or preferably Green Belt status.</li> <li>• Ideally the site should be deleted and failing that a substantial reduction in size and be located to the north of the railway line.</li> <li>• Part or all of site should be considered as Green Belt</li> <li>• Remove, or justify, the allowance for windfalls.</li> <li>• Allocate additional land to meet and exceed (sufficiently to provide flexibility) a revised, increased housing requirement for Crewe;</li> <li>• Count the Shavington allocations against the Local Service Centre 'allocation'.</li> <li>• Allocate land south of Gresty Lane ahead of other, less sustainable and/or suitable alternatives as identified.</li> <li>• Propose alternative potential housing land at Sydney Road, Crewe (as an addition to proposed allocation CS5) and/or Land South West of Crewe. The housing delivery rate should be calculated at a rate at or below the Council's suggested delivery rates in the 2013 SHLAA rates.</li> <li>• The Policy must be 'trimmed' to ensure that reference is made to a master plan being prepared that explores opportunities for infrastructure in terms of highway, education, health, social and community buildings, as opposed to making it a requirement of the Village's delivery. The Core Strategy should be consistent with the NPPF and seek to significantly boost the supply of housing in the Borough, and the phasing of the site should be brought forward to 2015.</li> </ul> |

**Council assessment  
of relevant issues**

Remove from Plan and redistribute growth to smaller sites: The site makes a valuable contribution towards meeting growth targets for the area. The proposal offers the opportunity to develop a high quality residential environment in an attractive setting, with a full range of local retail and community facilities. It is considered to be more closely related to the strategic vision and priorities than several smaller sites.

Give land green belt status: The green belt will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan.

Reduce dwelling numbers: There are constraints affecting the developable area of the site. Point h of the site specific principles of development states that the land within the Historic Park and Garden and Green Belt will be excluded and account must also be taken of the road and rail corridors through the site. A reduction to 800 dwellings is now proposed.

Use railway line as southern limit of development to keep the gap between Crewe and Weston. Point l of the development principles states that an appropriate green buffer will be provided between the site and the village of Weston.

Use railway line as the northern limit of development and/or reduce scale of development close to Crewe Hall (i.e. north of the railway line). Part 5i of the policy requires woodland planting and screening and point h of the site specific principles of development states that the land within the registered park and garden of Crewe Hall and the green belt will be excluded from the site boundary. Point n requires a high quality designed development in view of its location close to Crewe Hall.

Make reference to the need to preserve setting of Crewe Green Conservation Area. Not a major issue as the CA is well away from site. Weston Conservation Area is nearer but is on the other side of the A500 to the south. Part d of the principles of development refers to a full assessment of the significance of heritage assets affected by the proposal. Not necessary to include a reference to Conservation Areas in paragraph 15.97 as the Conservation areas are not on adjacent land, and land within the HP&G is to be excluded.

Replace requirements for contributions with the masterplan: the preparation of a masterplan is a requirement under point c of the principles of development, and paragraph 15.96. The requirements for any development derive from other policies of the Core Strategy and are consistent with NPPF. It is right that they should be identified in the policy.

Bring site forward in programme to 2015: The site is intended to use community facilities and road improvements provided by the Basford east site and should follow on from this development.

Noise and vibration issues from railway line: this should be mentioned as an issue along with noise and air quality issues with the A500 and other main roads.

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p><u>Traffic congestion.</u> Crewe’s highway network is heavily constrained, a function of the limited number of railway crossings. Tests were undertaken to understand the level of existing traffic delay compared with the level of delay expected in the future with development. This was then used to shape the level and location of development and any necessary mitigation measures.</p> <p>In order to minimise the level of delay a complimentary list of mitigation schemes have been developed to help manage the level of impact on the highway network.</p> <p>There are committed mitigation schemes at the M6 junction 16, A500 and Basford West, and new mitigation schemes are included in the Local Infrastructure Plan and will be funded through the CIL or central government funding for larger schemes.</p> <p>The residual impact on the highway network with the mitigation in place is considered to be broadly acceptable. Furthermore, targeted mitigation on key growth corridors, such as the Sydney Road / A500 / A530 corridor will ensure that the impact of development on the key transport arteries of the town are prioritised.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add point ‘s’ to site specific principles of development:</li> <li>• s. Noise and air quality assessments, if required, relating to the railway and main road passing through or adjoining the site.</li> <li>• Reduce allocation to 800 dwellings following clarification of site boundary.</li> <li>• Amend para 15.98 to read: This site will be able to take advantage of the interchange planned at Crewe for the current preferred route for the High Speed Rail 2 network.</li> <li>• Amend para 15.99 to read: The site has good accessibility to the M6 via the A500, which will be improved by the Crewe Green Link Road.</li> <li>• Policy context: add paras. 112 and 117 to National Policy.</li> <li>• The site is now a Local Plan Strategy Site (CS37) as it has defined boundaries.</li> <li>• Additional text added to the justification, regarding landscaping to the southern boundary of the site</li> <li>• Additional text added to justification regarding the provision of a safe and secure environment for children to travel to school with an example approach provided</li> </ul>                     |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS6 Shavington/ Wybunbury Triangle</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 9 (Support: 1 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 3)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landowner supports the identification of site in the Core Strategy which has now been subject to an outline planning application and has a resolution to approve subject to a S.106 agreement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not in accordance with the Plan strategy, is not justified and there are more appropriate sites available.</li> <li>• The requirements for housing in Crewe should delivered by sustainable extensions to the town itself, as these are more sustainable locations for growth, and are readily accessible by a range of transport modes.</li> <li>• There is no clear rationale for site allocation and the requirements set out in the policy including the retail floorspace.</li> <li>• Sites in Shavington should not contribute to Crewe's housing figures as it is a Local Service Centre; the development is out of scale with the size of the settlement.</li> <li>• Most of the people in the village want to keep the village's identity and not be joined with Crewe, Wistaston or any other neighbouring village.</li> <li>• Residents do not want any more roads or schools as there is enough traffic and people and the village will not take any more.</li> <li>• The adverse impact of extra traffic in the area is a cause for concern.</li> <li>• Site can deliver more than 350 homes. It is considered that the site can accommodate between 400-500 homes.</li> <li>• Creation of an undeveloped buffer zone scheme should be re-phrased to 'detailed development proposals to take account of existing properties and distances between new and existing properties via agreed design principles.' This will take account of existing bungalows on Stock Lane and ensure that new houses are set back with rear garden to gardens offsetting the potential for overlooking. Sensible design parameters can assist in this objective being met without the requirement to have undeveloped areas within a site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no reference to community facilities as a requirement (other than play space) such as shops and doctors' surgeries - yet the current schools and surgeries are already nearly fully subscribed.</li> <li>• Multiple applications and appeals have been presented to the council that will totally swamp Wybunbury, Hough and Shavington.</li> <li>• There is no cumulative flood risk - with particular reference to the Moss, or assessment of cumulative environment transport effects along B roads as well as the route to the M6, as well as cumulative effects on Health and educational services undertaken by planners as each application is treated independently. The result will be total mayhem for the area.</li> <li>• The site is already gone to development and represents a significant loss to the community and risk to the Moss.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This housing allocation should be removed and alternative potential housing Land at Sydney Road, Crewe and/or Land South West of Crewe is proposed.</li> <li>• The land should form part of the Green Belt review.</li> <li>• More detail is required of the contributions and the requirement for developer to provide community facilities</li> <li>• Remove, or justify, the allowance for windfalls.</li> <li>• Allocate additional land to meet and exceed (sufficiently to provide flexibility) a revised, increased housing requirement for Crewe;.</li> <li>• Count the Shavington allocations against the Local Service Centre 'allocation'</li> <li>• Allocate land south of Gresty Lane ahead of other, less sustainable and/or suitable alternatives as identified.</li> <li>• Site can deliver more than 350 homes. It is considered that the site can accommodate between 400-500 homes.</li> <li>• Creation of an undeveloped buffer zone scheme should be re-phrased to 'detailed development proposals to take account of existing properties and distances between new and existing properties via agreed design principles.'</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p><u>Remove the major housing allocation within a village/ local service centre:</u> The development of the site will contribute towards the strategic vision for and housing needs of Crewe. The site is just 4km south of Crewe and is surrounded by existing housing.</p> <p><u>Include site in the Green Belt review:</u> the village of Shavington will be included in the Green belt area of search. The site is enclosed by existing development, and will be a maximum of 2 stories, so will not have a significant visual impact on the surrounding countryside. The development will provide for open space and green infrastructure, and maintains a balance of open areas and built development.</p> <p><u>Vary dwelling numbers.</u> The planning application is for a maximum of 360 dwellings. This figure has been determined following consideration of all planning issues and should be taken forward in the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Buffer zones and separation distances.</u> It is considered that the principles for development will ensure that it is well-related to existing development.</p> <p><u>Provide more detail of contributions and community facilities requirements:</u> the report to Strategic Planning Board on 20/2/2013 detailed 16 heads of terms for the section 106 agreement. These comply with the principles of development set out in the policy. Outline planning permission for a maximum of 360 dwellings was issued on 23/1/2014 on completion of the legal agreement.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>Amend paragraph 15.103: planning permission has now been granted.<br/> Policy Context: delete para 18, add paras 112 and 117 to National Policy.<br/> No significant change to Local Plan Strategy.<br/> Site justification wording has been altered to include; - Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</p>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS7 East Shavington</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 12 (Support: 0 / Object: 11 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Shavington was identified by the previous Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan (CNRLP) Inspector who stated that, 'The site is not within the Green Gap designation, is close to the Basford employment sites and to Shavington village centre, has good access to Crewe centre by public transport.'</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This development will result in an ad hoc extension into open countryside resulting in the loss of agricultural land without any limits.</li> <li>• The site should be removed from the Core Strategy in full and the land form part of the future Green Belt review</li> <li>• As a Local Service Centre, Shavington is a third tier location for new development, and any development should be required to meet local needs. A development of this size is not small scale, and is an inappropriate level of development for one Local Service Centre to take.</li> <li>• This site will impact on Wybunbury Moss (under Ramsar protection) and the SSSI.</li> <li>• Recognise that there is now a resolution to approve the development of the Shavington Triangle for up to 400 houses. Whilst this changes the context in respect of this being treated as a commitment (assuming planning permission is issued pursuant to the resolution) it places greater emphasis on the issues surrounding the proposed East Shavington allocation.</li> <li>• Shavington is a separate, lower order settlement from Crewe. The Plan identifies it as a Local Service Centre that is to accommodate only local needs (with a total of 2,500 homes directed to all of the Local Service Centres). It does not form part of, or represent a 'suburb' of Crewe. It does not have the significant infrastructure and facilities associated with Crewe. The scale of additional housing development consented for Shavington is already out of proportion to the size of the settlement and its lower order position in the settlement hierarchy. Existing households in Shavington total 1,728. The residential commitments total around 500 units and will lead to the increase in the total number of households to 2,208, an increase of 27.8%. Factoring the proposed 275 dwellings, the total number of households could increase by 43.7%. This would lead to a growth far beyond what could reasonably be needed to meet its local needs. Facilities within Shavington are limited, reducing the opportunities for sustainable transport and access by green modes. High levels of car use will result here as, for many journeys it is unlikely that walking or cycling will provide realistic alternative to the car</li> <li>• Suitable, available and achievable development opportunities exist within and particularly on the edge of the principal urban area, and hence better related to the town of Crewe.</li> <li>• It is not a sustainable location and the allocation of the site does not accord</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>with the Plan's strategy (PG2 and PG6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site, by virtue of location may also have a potential impact on regeneration priorities of neighbouring areas in north Staffordshire. It would be easily accessible from the A500 and M6 junction 16 and could attract development that might otherwise take place in Stoke/Newcastle.</li> <li>• No rationale for level of growth or allocations of sites in Shavington</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should include employment land</li> <li>• East Shavington is a less enclosed site and care should be taken to establish a strong boundary, via GB designation, to contain future development on this side of the village.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to all of the green infrastructure requirements such as the provision of a Multi Use Games Area and provision of allotments. There is no evidence to justify that these should be provided on a development of this scale</li> <li>• Objection to the delivery period being post 2020 for 5 year supply, additional land will be required early in the plan period; the site does not prejudice the delivery of Basford East / West and no evidence has been provided to support this assertion. The early delivery of the site has been accepted by the Council as evidence to support the Congleton Road Inquiry. East Shavington can meet the market and affordable housing needs of Shavington.</li> <li>• The Sustainability Appraisal should be revised to show that East Shavington is a sustainable site.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The site is considered a suitable site on the edge of Shavington presenting an opportunity for high quality residential development that meets the housing needs of the local area and which has a close interrelationship with the facilities provided in Crewe. As such the site is included in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal will be considered separately alongside comments made generally to the contents of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The wording of point 'a' in the site specific principles of development is considered to provide appropriate mitigation against any impacts on the Wybunbury Moss Special Area of Conservation.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure requirements are to the benefit of the scheme and reflect the Green Infrastructure Action Plan for Crewe (TEP, 2012). The provision of appropriate Green Infrastructure will also further reduce any potential impacts on European Designated Sites.</p> <p>The retention of hedgerows and trees as stated within the policy will provide an appropriate definition and boundary of the site.</p> <p>The phasing of the site post 2020 is considered appropriate so as to allow improvements to the surrounding highways network (in particular access into Crewe) to be improved prior to the delivery of the site.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>Policy Context: delete para. 18, add paras 100, 112 and 117 to National Policy<br/> No other material changes are proposed to be made to the policy<br/> Site justification wording has been altered to include; - Details of Construction</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites). |
|--|---|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Macclesfield</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 79 (Support: 6 / Object: 62 / Comment Only: 11)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the plan for these areas is joined up and the objectives interrelated</li> <li>• Like the fact that Green Belt preserved</li> <li>• Look forward to utilising green space in Town Centre</li> <li>• Sites identified make sense from a transport perspective (accessible from the Town Centre)</li> <li>• Brocken Cross roundabout development</li> <li>• South West Macc link rd</li> <li>• Objective of new business growth</li> <li>• Development around station area</li> <li>• Plan addresses all 4 strategic areas</li> <li>• Makes sense as a long-term plan; CE facing up to many issues confronting the Authority for next 20 years</li> <li>• Brownfield first approach</li> <li>• Aims, objectives and aspirations</li> <li>• Authority accepts Green Belt alignment is required to accommodate growth levels</li> <li>• BUT, Link road from Macclesfield-Poynton goes through the London Road/Butley Town Community; will affect the residents of this area; existing road is dangerous and heavy; significant issues with this section of the A523 to Prestbury; Support plan to bring forward construction of Woodford/poynton relief road with link to A6MARR; online improvements will not be sufficient; Close to Line option C preferred</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case for new road in South Macc across Green Belt has not been made</li> <li>• No consultation on proposed new road (against national guidance)</li> <li>• Safeguarded land must be preserved as Green Belt</li> <li>• No sound reason for allocating safeguarded land</li> <li>• Ignored Governments revised figures (housing)</li> <li>• Insufficient consideration of windfall sites</li> <li>• No assessment of brownfield sites and therefore case for release of Green Belt land not made</li> <li>• Undermines brownfield regeneration</li> <li>• Contrary to principles of NPPF</li> <li>• Lack of assessment of existing surplus employment land</li> <li>• Fence Avenue site allocated to provide King's School with funds to build a new School; this isn't an exceptional reason to remove land from Green Belt</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on wildlife/nature/biodiversity (contrary to NPPF)</li> <li>• Proposed development sites will increase flood risks and air pollution</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion,</li> <li>• Loss of quality agricultural land (contrary to NPPF)</li> <li>• Core Strategy deeply flawed – no evidence to show exceptional</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>circumstances required for removal of Green Belt land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflicts with purposes of including land in Green Belt in the NPPF (merges Macc and Lyme Green, results in urban sprawl, encroaches into countryside)</li> <li>• Concern of impact on Conservation Area of site CS9</li> <li>• Not convinced that King's School could relocate within the timescale of the plan</li> <li>• Sterilisation of mineral deposits (against national guidance)</li> <li>• Flawed evidence for housing, landscape and Green Belt assessments</li> <li>• Don't agree with insertion of cinema complex in Town; suggest it should be on a business park</li> <li>• 97% Sutton Parish say no to Green Belt change</li> <li>• Impact on ASCV</li> <li>• Impact on SBI</li> <li>• Canal forms well defined Green Belt boundary</li> <li>• Lyme Green overwhelmed</li> <li>• Green Belt assessment notes site makes "significant" contribution to GB</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depict all sites for housing on Map</li> <li>• Join Poynton relief rd with Macc Silk rd or widen A523</li> <li>• Ensure proposed developments do not impact on Town Centre</li> <li>• Developments (South Macc) not sustainable, as lack of bus services</li> <li>• Road layouts into Town will not be able to handle increased traffic due to restricted road widths</li> <li>• Concern about level (3,500) of proposed housing for Macc, given loss of a major employer in the area (Astra Zeneca site at Alderley Edge)</li> <li>• No development in Green Belt (with exception of the South Macclesfield site)</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be used first</li> <li>• Empty, derelict buildings (eg. along London rd) could be replaced with new housing</li> <li>• Housing assessment flawed and doesn't meet full objective assessment of housing need for the Borough (or, therefore, Macc)</li> <li>• Macc capable of accommodating more than 3,500 new houses and more than 20 hectares of employment land</li> <li>• Concern regarding deliverability of some Core Strategy Sites and Strategic Locations</li> <li>• Insufficient land allocated for housing</li> <li>• Insufficient consideration to brownfield sites</li> <li>• Proposals with have a detrimental impact on the character of Macc Town (from rural market Town to sprawling 'clone town')</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depict all sites for housing on Map</li> <li>• Fund bus services properly; ensure buses can access new developments; produce comprehensive traffic management scheme</li> <li>• Clear empty, derelict buildings (eg. along London rd) and replace with new housing and/or refurbish existing buildings</li> <li>• Increase housing fig for Borough to inc. increase in housing fig for Macc</li> <li>• Increase area of employment land for development in Macc</li> <li>• Allocate more Green Belt for housing</li> </ul>   |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
|                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include additional site in plan (for care accommodation - PRE 6011) and amend Green Belt boundary</li> <li>• Give more consideration to brownfield sites (eg. Barracks Ln, Gunco Ln, old TA site Chester Rd, site to rear of Tescos parallel to Silk Rd...)</li> <li>• Drop new road proposal in South Macc</li> <li>• Retain safeguarded land as Green Belt</li> <li>• Undertake assessment of brownfield sites</li> <li>• Do not make any changes to Green Belt</li> <li>• Less employment land around Macc</li> <li>• Strategic review of traffic movements to provide evidence of impact of proposed road changes/requirements</li> <li>• Reassess need for Green Belt land and provide full justification</li> <li>• Design a Town fit for the age – with dedicated cycle and bus ways</li> <li>• Have a policy of using empty housing stock as a first priority</li> <li>• Develop empty commercial buildings to encourage new businesses into the area</li> <li>• Revise housing figs to those given by ONS</li> <li>• Reduce growth targets</li> <li>• Encourage more housing in Town Centre to make it more attractive to live there/more sustainable</li> <li>• More parks and playing fields where development does take place</li> <li>• “Super Stores” to be within ¼ of a mile of residential properties</li> <li>• Removed proposed development sites from Green Belt</li> <li>• Consider a road to the North</li> <li>• Release more land from Green Belt to meet greater housing need</li> <li>• Allocate more dwellings to South West Macc</li> <li>• Site CS32 should not be released in its entirety</li> <li>• Leave sites CS 10, 11, 31 and 32 in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Amend site map 15.12 as titles of CS10, CS11, CS31 and CS32 have been reversed; site CS10 should be described as ‘South West Macclesfield’; in para 15.150 change words from ‘north to’ to ‘west of’; below site CS 10 ‘Land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road, Macclesfield’ should twice be corrected to ‘Land to the west of Congleton Road, South West Macclesfield’; title of fig 15.16 should be changed from ‘Land between Chelford Road and Congleton Road Site’ to ‘Land South West of Macclesfield, west of Congleton Road’, as should the title of Table 14.15; site CS 11 is described above para. 15.156 as ‘Gaw End Lane Macclesfield’ and should be changed to ‘Lyme Green Macclesfield’; below Site CS 11, ‘Gaw End Lane Macclesfield’ should be changed to ‘Lyme Green Macclesfield’; the title of Fig 15.17 should be changed from ‘Gaw End Lane Site’ to ‘Lyme Green Site’; in line 3 of para. 15.159 after ‘employment land’ delete the semicolon and add ‘and’. Delete all after ‘dwellings’.</li> <li>• The separate notations for the areas north and south of Gaw End Lane should be replaced by a single notation identifying both areas as a “housing site” on the Macclesfield map.</li> <li>• Provision needed to safeguard a new route for the A523 to the west of London Road between the Silk Road and Bonis Hall Lane</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment</b> | Many of the issues raised/listed above have been addressed within the Council’s  |

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>assessment of, and response to, comments related to each of the site specific consultation points, eg. issues such as housing figures, removing land from the Green Belt, brownfield sites first, employment land, impact on the area/wildlife/Conservation Area, etc. A few additional issues that relate specifically to sections 15.118 – 15.121 will be addressed below</p> <p>Mapping and notation – Although individuals may have preferences in respect of presentation format, the Council is satisfied that Fig 15.12 serves its purpose and that the level of detail provided is appropriate for the scale of map</p> <p>Growth targets – These have been established from assessment work undertaken and are considered to be appropriate</p> <p>Roads – Modelling work carried out has shown that a new road (SW Macc) will help address traffic congestion; the Poynton Relief Road and A523 corridor is referred to elsewhere in the document (i.e. CO 2)</p> <p>The expansion of the existing Care Facility at Lyme Green would be dealt with through the Development Management process; at present no circumstances to justify removing land from the Green Belt</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>     | <p>No material change required</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Location SL4: Central Macclesfield</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 66 (Support: 3 / Object: 20 / Comment Only: 43)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites should be developed first</li> <li>• Support for improved strategic highways links to the north subject to an off-line improvement to A523 between the Slik Road and Bonis Hall lights</li> <li>• Directing appropriate uses to the town centre is in line with NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not need more retail units in the town centre; strengthening the retail offer should focus on improving quality rather than quantity</li> <li>• Do not need more offices in the town centre</li> <li>• Design will be important in the town centre to retain Macclesfield's identity</li> <li>• No evidence that 850 dwellings can be delivered in the town centre; figure is significantly higher than that proposed previously (300-400); background papers show a capacity for 527 dwellings on brownfield sites in the whole of Macclesfield; SHLAA shows 14 deliverable / developable site in this area with cumulative potential for 764 dwellings but no certainty if and when any of these sites would come forward for development; limited developer appetite for high density housing schemes and no signs this will change soon; high development costs given the need to be sensitive to the historic fabric in central Macclesfield will mean less housing is delivered than envisaged</li> <li>• Policy should acknowledge the threat from online shopping and remote working</li> <li>• Objection to any new road building</li> <li>• Developments should make use of the town centre's proximity to the Peak District and encourage the town's use as a gateway</li> <li>• Should include the old TA Barracks site on Chester Road within the Strategic Location</li> <li>• Objections to the approved town centre redevelopment scheme</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the Tesco Hibel Road site be classed as Central Macclesfield?</li> <li>• Policy should include provision for hotel development including conferencing facilities</li> <li>• Policy should require improved links between the town centre and station</li> <li>• Policy should require improved seating in the town centre</li> <li>• Should include provision for demolition of derelict buildings</li> <li>• More efforts needed to reduce congestion</li> <li>• Should prioritise the provision of housing on brownfield sites; new housing will help to revitalise the town centre; maximise the numbers of new dwellings on brownfield sites in central areas</li> <li>• Provision of greenspaces within the town centre is vital</li> <li>• The site's contribution to housing numbers should be clearly stated</li> <li>• Major regeneration sites within the area should be identified and prioritised for regeneration e.g. Barracks Mill, Park Green</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run-down and unused sites detract from the town centre. Consider owner owners and developers can be incentivised to improve these areas</li> <li>• Views of the surrounding hills are a unique asset of Macclesfield town centre and should be referenced in policy to maintain / enhance views</li> <li>• There are large numbers of designated heritage assets in this area. Any development proposals will need to demonstrate that they conserve those elements that contribute to the significance of listed buildings or their settings and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservations areas including their setting (English Heritage)</li> <li>• Consider constraints imposed by topography and highways</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 4: should include the words “support for” before “enhanced cultural offer”</li> <li>• Point 16: should read " on the A523 corridor" not " or the A523 corridor"</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Central Macclesfield is a sustainable urban location with excellent access to facilities, services and transport links.</p> <p>The Cheshire Retail Study Update shows that there is significant qualitative need and quantitative capacity for additional retail units in Macclesfield. The town centre regeneration scheme is now consented to deliver this additional retail capacity.</p> <p>The strategic location itself does not make an allowance for new dwellings, although a figure has been included in Appendix A to reflect the fact that it will be appropriate to allow for a certain number of units coming forwards on sites within the urban area. This figure is not limited to the central Macclesfield Strategic Location but applies across the town. Whilst the Plan would wish to maximise the amount of development on these sites, it may be appropriate to reduce the figure to ensure that the number of units envisaged can be delivered.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Strategic Location will be fully defined through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. It is agreed that the Tesco Hibel Road site is not considered to be an in-centre location. The Central Macclesfield Strategic Location refers to the inner area of Macclesfield. It is not the same as the town centre boundary, which will also be defined in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p> <p>It is the intention of the policy to facilitate regeneration and re-use of existing buildings. It may be appropriate for the policy to reference this more explicitly.</p> <p>The policy (under point 15) references a number of schemes that will reduce congestion. Further details are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The policy applies across the inner area of Macclesfield and supports the regeneration of the area. It is not considered desirable to identify specific regeneration sites within this, as the policy applies equally to the whole area.</p> <p>The policy does reference the need for landmark high quality design, but further policies related to the setting of listed buildings etc are set out elsewhere in the</p> |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | document.  |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add additional point to policy to encourage opportunities to bring disused and underused buildings back into use.</li> <li>• Minor wording to point 16 so that it reads properly (change 'or' to 'on')</li> <li>• Add sentence to paragraph 15:129 (now 15.137): 'The need to safeguard and enhance the River Bollin corridor will be an important consideration.'</li> <li>• Policy context: add paras. 109, 126, 132 and 137 to National Policy. Add Macclesfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk assessment to Local Evidence.</li> </ul> |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS8: South Macclesfield Development Area</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 60 (Support: 0 / Object: 25 / Comment Only: 35)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-Green Belt site</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question appropriateness of further retail / leisure / commercial in an out of centre location; town centre should be priority for town centre uses; impacts on town centre; no requirement for commercial premises</li> <li>• Policy should include provision for hotel development including conferencing facilities</li> <li>• Questions over deliverability of 1100 houses; Capacity of site overstated; question why the capacity has increased from 900 to 1100 dwellings (the addition of SHLAA site 455 into the boundary only accounts for an additional 60 dwellings)</li> <li>• Doubts over the viability of the site given multiple constraints including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Difficult ground conditions; waterlogged peat bog; piling needed</li> <li>○ Requirement to provide the link road (which is not included in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan) plus bridge over the railway line.</li> <li>○ Multiple ownerships</li> <li>○ Adjacent to SSSI – needs significant landscape buffer Tree Preservation Order on site</li> <li>○ Public Right of Way within the site</li> <li>○ Potential for contamination given the proximity of Danes Moss Landfill</li> <li>○ Historic landfill in south west corner of site</li> <li>○ Need for 250mm buffer between any development and the West Coat Mainline</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Anticipated rate of housing delivery overly optimistic when considering the significant site constraints</li> <li>• Suggestion that affordable housing requirement will need to be reduced given the warnings in the CIL viability study</li> <li>• Confining development to the north / western parts of the site where ground conditions would avoid the areas with worst ground conditions and allow a more viable scheme of 300 residential units plus the retail development</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion locally and within the wider town network; would seriously impact on town centre traffic congestion issues; provision of the full link road from London Road to Chelford Road is required to address this. The traffic modelling work carried out for Cheshire East Council supports the proposition that there is considerable benefit to be had from the provision of the full length of the link road.</li> <li>• Objection to the provision of the link road</li> <li>• This is not the most sustainable option; no evidence why this site is better than other greenfield sites to the west of the town</li> <li>• Land acts as a soakaway for neighbouring areas - adverse effects on adjacent areas' abilities to deal with heavy rainfall and drainage</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why relocate playing fields when they already exist in the area?</li> <li>• Question the need for pub / takeaway / restaurant when they already exist in the area</li> <li>• Question whether there is an indicated need for a health club / gym</li> <li>• Number of new homes will not support new retail and provision on additional convenience retail will adversely affect the viability of local shopping facilities in Thornton Square and Moss Lane; Do not need a new supermarket</li> <li>• Area has significant ecological and biodiversity value and supports several bird species listed and amber or red which will be affected by reduction in habitat; loss of two UK BAP Priority Habitats (Lowland Raised Bog and Lowland Wet Grassland)</li> <li>• Loss of important buffer zone between urban edge and Danes Moss SSSI</li> <li>• Potentially damaging impacts of development on SSSI and the nature reserve</li> <li>• Fragmentation of one of the more extensive lowland raised bogs in Cheshire</li> <li>• Reduce the scale of development</li> <li>• Build on brownfield sites</li> <li>• Proposals will not build a new community</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The operation of a waste management facility within the allocated land will have to be addressed and the waste management site relocated if the development aspirations of this allocation are to be realised.</li> <li>• Scheme should include at least 30% affordable housing; leisure facilities and provision of a facility for religious worship</li> <li>• New development should be well served by public transport</li> <li>• Link road may lead to more difficulties for traffic existing from Moss Lane onto Congleton Road and London Road</li> <li>• Highway benefits of the link road will be negligible and it should be extended around the south west side of Macclesfield to link with Chelford Road</li> <li>• Relocation of playing fields should be part of a co-ordinated plan for the town's leisure facilities</li> <li>• New football ground is not a priority</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 3 refers to “Up to 5,000 square meters of retail, the majority of which should be for convenience goods”. Soft market testing has revealed a market for up to 7,000 square meters of retail space and policy should be amended to accommodate this.</li> <li>• Modify policy to reduce the anticipated housing delivery over the plan period to 300 homes as 1,100 is entirely unrealistic and unproven in delivery terms</li> <li>• Policy is not strong enough on retaining trees. Points (b) and (h) refer to retaining trees ‘where appropriate’ which could allow trees to be removed on grounds of expediency rather than altering plans to accommodate them.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>This site is an existing allocated employment and retail site in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan and offers an excellent opportunity to deliver a sustainable residential-led mixed use urban extension.</p> <p>The site includes a long-standing retail allocation to address quantitative and qualitative need for new convenience retail floorspace in Macclesfield. The policy did not specify whether the maximum amount of retail floorspace provision was net or gross so it will be appropriate to clarify that the evidence shows that up to</p>  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>5,000 sqm net sales area for predominantly convenience retail will be appropriate.</p> <p>The overall capacity for development on the site is informed following a masterplanning exercise. This shows that in excess of 1,000 new dwellings can be delivered on the site. Consequently, it would be appropriate to reduce the overall number of dwellings to be provided slightly.</p> <p>Alongside the masterplanning work, detailed work on deliverability and viability shows that a scheme is viable and deliverable. The financial appraisal shows that a profitable scheme can be delivered, although there may need to be a slight reduction in the level of affordable housing provision to enable an acceptable developer profit. As with all schemes, this will be negotiated on a site-by-site basis.</p> <p>The site will also provide the benefit of a road linking Congleton Road and London Road, providing local relief from traffic congestion, particularly along Moss Lane. Within Macclesfield, a range of mitigation measures have been tested to mitigate the proposed developments in the town. These focus on improvements to the existing highway infrastructure and with the proposed mitigation strategy in place it is considered that an acceptable level of mitigation can be achieved. A number of schemes will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will be part funded through CIL. Larger, more strategic schemes will also be the subject of funding bids for central government funding. Schemes will be prioritised for incremental delivery aligned to the pace and location of development.</p> <p>The site is situated within Flood Zone 1 although the SFRA identified that there may be a risk of surface water flooding. Therefore, a site-specific flood risk assessment will be required focussed on surface water flood risks and management. It will be appropriate to reference this in the policy.</p> <p>Development proposals will be required to retain and enhance existing trees, watercourses and natural habitats wherever possible, as well as providing appropriate Green Infrastructure and additional tree planting. The policy emphasises the importance of retaining tree cover to the southern boundary of the site.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the number of dwellings to be provided from 1100 to 1050 and amend phasing information accordingly</li> <li>• Policy context: add paras. 109, 112, 117 and 120 to National Policy.</li> <li>• Add reference to requirement for site specific flood risk assessment to the Site Specific Principles of Development</li> <li>• Add clarification to the retail elements of the policy including that the floorspace figure refers to the net sales area (rather than gross internal area)</li> <li>• Add additional explanation to set out evidence and justification for the retail element of the scheme</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS9:Fence Avenue, Macclesfield</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 240 (Support: 24 / Object: 207 / Comment Only: 9)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site meets all four of the strategic priorities set out by the Pre-submission Core Strategy, especially priorities 1,2 and 4 on account of the site's proximity to the centre of Macclesfield</li> <li>• The Fence Avenue site is a sustainable location in terms of the environment and access to facilities and services</li> <li>• The site can provide an area of much needed quality housing close to the centre of Macclesfield, in an environmentally attractive setting. It is very close to the infrastructure required to support the community, providing easy access to the town centre shops and services and to rail and bus travel hubs, encouraging sustainable modes of transport</li> <li>• The development of this site will help to meet the residential development requirements needed within Macclesfield</li> <li>• The site is in single ownership and development is achievable and deliverable</li> <li>• The present status of this area is historically local green belt, but no longer provides the separation of the town from other conurbations in the way in which green belt was conceived</li> <li>• This development will enable the King's School to consolidate its operations at a single location, continuing its important role in Macclesfield as a service provider and a key contributor to both the local economy and social fabric of the town, as an important employer, and providing social, cultural and sports facilities accessible to the wider community</li> <li>• Will provide a range of housing in a quality environment close to the Town centre</li> <li>• Site includes some brownfield areas</li> <li>• Canal represents a good natural boundary to the site</li> <li>• Would greatly increase affordable housing in the area</li> <li>• A worthy development in the overall scheme of Town centre development</li> <li>• The plan address all four priorities and will provide an area close to the town centre</li> <li>• Developed in an attractive and sympathetic way, this area would become an asset to the town and would attract families to settle in the area</li> <li>• Regeneration of this area will help the Town build a sustainable future</li> <li>• This area supports the strategy and its priorities</li> <li>• Site is within a residential area ideally suited to quality housing development</li> <li>• Would provide much needed housing close to Town and local businesses</li> <li>• A sympathetic development that would maintain the character of the area</li> <li>• Will support the local economy</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site incorrectly described</li> <li>• ASCV and nature conservation not taken into account</li> <li>• Impact on SBI (Swan's Pool)</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites could be developed rather than this Green Belt site (eg. site near Tescos, Hibel Rd, Sutton Castings, Park Green); sufficient brownfield sites available</li> <li>• Conflicts with purposes of including land in Green Belt (NPPF – e.g. urban sprawl, encroachment)</li> <li>• Exceptional circumstances to justify removal of land from Green Belt not demonstrated</li> <li>• Undermines regeneration of brownfield sites</li> <li>• Serious highways constraints</li> <li>• Macc doesn't need more housing; needs to retain its open, green spaces</li> <li>• Protected species survey needed</li> <li>• Visually prominent within Peak Park Fringe</li> <li>• Northern parts of site susceptible to flood risk</li> <li>• Loss of AZ site will reduce housing need</li> <li>• Safeguarding land will cause blight</li> <li>• Stakeholder Panel rejected rolling back of Green Belt</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on character and setting of Macc Town</li> <li>• Allocation of greenfield sites does not make economic sense</li> <li>• No possibility of developing until King's School have secured a new site</li> <li>• Should emphasise the green spaces to attract visitors</li> <li>• 250 units could be accommodated on the King's School footprint without using Green Belt land</li> <li>• Area forms an important corridor for wildlife between Macc canal and BollinValley</li> <li>• Feasibility will be restricted by infrastructure and affordable housing requirements</li> <li>• Contravenes SP3 section 15.148</li> <li>• Contrary to SCS Priority 4</li> <li>• Unsustainable location</li> <li>• Fail to understand how the Council can foresee "special and exceptional circumstances" that require the set aside of Green Belt areas from 2030, but they cannot foresee near term events such consolidations necessitating evacuation from Macclesfield of both Astra Zeneca and Kings School</li> <li>• Planned road (Congleton Rd to Chelford Rd) has been rejected numerous times</li> <li>• Site not deliverable until King's School source a new location</li> <li>• Plan doesn't explain why Kings School wish to consolidate; site will only be available if this occurs; too many risks/uncertainties – unless there is evidence to counter this</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involves 2 Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Impact on Listed Buildings</li> <li>• Future development needs to preserve heritage &amp; visual value along canal edge, maintain Conservations Areas, not impact on Listed Buildings</li> <li>• Impact on Green Belt</li> <li>• Implications for King's School Cumberland Street site? Where will King's School move to – another Greenfield site?</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No certainty of site being deliverable in plan period; site could not be delivered as quickly as site NPS42</li> <li>• Need Northern access rd to ease future congestion</li> <li>• Apart from main School building on site other buildings are not suitable for residential conversion</li> <li>• Desk based archaeological study of site required and mitigation proposed as necessary</li> <li>• SHLAA refers to site as 'available' and 'developable', which it isn't</li> <li>• Site performs significant Green Belt functions</li> <li>• Poor access to local facilities/infrastructure</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make provision for Northern access road</li> <li>• Specify green corridor along canal edge (approx. 20 yards)</li> <li>• Plan needs to explain why development is acceptable given contribution site makes to the area/Green Belt</li> <li>• Amend wording to – number of units to be delivered on the site is 'around' 300</li> <li>• Apart from ref to the main School building, delete any reference to other buildings being retained on site</li> <li>• Amend to reflect development can commence between 2015-2020</li> <li>• Do not include site as an allocation (remove from Plan)</li> <li>• Farmland half of the site should be removed from the proposed site</li> <li>• Remove the proposed safeguarded land at South Macc from the Green Belt now and leave CS9 site in the GB (as proposed safeguarded land does not perform as significant a function re protection, eg. from sprawl from Manchester &amp; Stockport)</li> <li>• Redesignate site as a Non Preferred Site</li> <li>• More detailed review and analysis of brownfield and windfall sites required before removing site from Green Belt</li> <li>• Reappraisal of employment land required</li> <li>• Unsound and should be deleted</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>Impact on ASCV - Development is now to focus on the area that constitutes the School curtilage (which includes the playing fields) and therefore impact on the ASCV will be limited</p> <p>Impact on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings - An area adjacent to the canal is to be preserved as open space to limit the impact on the Conservation Areas. Impact on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings also protected by policies within the Plan and National Policy/Guidance</p> <p>Brownfield sites – Council's Assessment of brownfield sites has identified that there is not the capacity across the brownfield sites in Macclesfield to meet the need for the level of development identified/proposed</p> <p>Employment land – The aspiration within the Plan for "jobs led growth" requires the retention of existing as well as additional employment land (and therefore such land not available for residential use)</p> <p>Relocation of School - King's School considering various options re relocation. At minimum, consolidation on the Cumberland Street site is an option and therefore</p>   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>development of the site is considered to be feasible within the Plan period</p> <p>Green Belt – Removal of the site from the GB has been informed by the Council’s GB Assessment and the need for some land to be removed from the GB to meet development needs across CE</p> <p>Infrastructure &amp; affordable housing - Provision for infrastructure requirements – eg. road improvements - and affordable housing are dealt with by policy (which allow flexibility)</p> <p>Highways - Transport Assessment would be required with any application, which would include consideration of the access requirements and implications for surrounding highway network where appropriate</p> <p>Sites Assessment - Consideration has been given to a range of sites in reaching decision about proposed sites (noting that the Non Preferred Sites have been discounted for sound reasons)</p> <p>Sustainability - Site is within walking distance of the train station, some local shops, a Primary School, etc. Hence, site is considered to be sustainable and policy requires improvements to and/or provision of links to residential areas, shops, schools, etc.</p> <p>Policies within Plan - Policy is consistent with other policies within the Plan<br/>Ecological impact – Any application would require an Ecological Impact Assessment and mitigation measures if required</p> <p>Housing need – Level of housing proposed is derived from assessment of need (SHMA)</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development will focus on the School curtilage (which includes the sports fields)</li> <li>• An area adjacent to canal will be retained as open space (which will limit any impact of development on the Conservation Areas and ASCV)</li> <li>• Remove reference in the ‘Site Specific Principles of Development’ section of the plan re retaining “other existing school buildings”. The only building to be retained will be the main School building</li> <li>• Bullet point ‘1’ amended to refer to “around 250 new homes”</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paras. 74, 109, 126, 132 and 137 to National Policy, add: Cheshire East: Local Landscape Designation Study (2013), Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area: Appraisal and Management Proposals (2009), Buxton Road Macclesfield Conservation Area appraisal to Local Evidence.</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS10: Land Between Congleton Road and Chelford Road</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 593 (Support: 2 / Object: 562 / Comment Only: 29)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South West Macclesfield is the most sustainable location for development on greenfield land with the least environmental damage and should be allocated for more than 150 homes</li> <li>• Within an area that has the least environmental constraints of any part of the existing Green Belt around Macclesfield</li> <li>• Development at this site would help to meet the overall housing requirements</li> <li>• Was previously proposed as part of a development site in 1990s and approved as such by a planning inspector but subsequently dropped as an allocation following reduction of housing figures</li> <li>• Site is suitable, available and deliverable but a more realistic figure would be for circa 1,000 dwellings during this plan period.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was previously proposed as part of a development site in 1990s but following an inquiry the inspector recommended that the proposal should not be taken forward</li> <li>• This is at the entrance to the safeguarded land meaning that development there is a fait accompli; this is the first step to developing the whole South West Macclesfield area</li> <li>• Loss of prime agricultural land grades 2 and 3a; loss of grazing land would make several small farms unviable</li> <li>• Too distant from Macclesfield town centre; development here would represent urban sprawl; unsustainable location distant from the train and bus stations.</li> <li>• This land is important in acting as a buffer between Macclesfield and the towns and villages to the south</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be developed instead; adhere to the Government's policy of building on brownfield land first; there are plenty of available brownfield sites in Macclesfield; existing brownfield sites will not be redeveloped if this site goes ahead; an allowance should be made for future windfall sites.</li> <li>• Exceptional circumstances required to remove this land from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. Local Government Minister Brandon Lewis issued a written statement to Parliament on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013 to clarify that the Secretary of State considers that the single issue of unmet demand is unlikely to outweigh the harm to Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt; Green Belt land should not be built on; weak boundaries would not be sufficient to prevent further future encroachment into the Green Belt; Green Belt Assessment does not consider the site on its own and its contribution to Green Belt understated; Green Belt assessment is flawed</li> <li>• The policy references a South West Link Road – but no consideration has</li> </ul> |

been given to the effect on traffic on the A537 as a result of this road; the Council leader has stated in writing that there will be no South West Macclesfield Link Road; there has been no public consultation on a potential South West Macclesfield Link Road; para 11.217 of the Local transport Plan states there will be a transport assessment of strategic site proposals to assess the impact of proposed developments on the highways and transport network; there is no need for a link road

- No transport assessment of the impact of 150 houses has been carried out; additional traffic congestion on Congleton Road
- No analysis of flood risk has been carried out; Council's own evidence shows that this site has areas susceptible to ground water flooding; fails NPPF sequential test on flooding
- Sterilisation of potential minerals deposits
- Residents' views have been ignored including a petition signed by 3000 people in February 2013.
- There is an oversupply of employment land and further employment land is not required;
- Housing requirement has been overstated
- Popular walking area; important amenity use
- Important area for wildlife including protected species; biodiversity includes thirteen Red list species, twenty three Amber list species, six schedule 1 species, fifteen species listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and seven identified in RSPB Conservation Targeting Projects; Site of Biological Importance within the site
- Area is valuable in landscape terms; part of the historic Cheshire landscape of Higher Farms and Woods; not included in Cheshire East Local Landscape Designation (22) which should be corrected as it has been identified as being important by Natural England.
- Would adversely affect the setting and special character of the historic towns of Macclesfield and Gawsworth
- Should help existing communities to grown organically rather than imposing large unwanted developments
- Development of this site would mean Macclesfield merging with Gawsworth
- Other sites have been ruled out on ground that apply equally, or more so to this site
- Large number of mature trees on site along with woodlands
- Important hedgerows on site as well as ponds and ditches
- Overhead high voltage power lines
- This is not a logical development site in isolation without the land that is proposed to be safeguarded
- Development unlikely to be viable – requirement to provide access road of a standard to form part of any future link road would require scale of infrastructure greatly in excess of that which would normally be required for a development of this size. Scale of development proposed will not support these additional costs therefore the wider site should be allocated for significantly more development and land at both ends of the link road (Congleton Road and Chelford Road ends) should be allocated for development now to enable link road to be progressively provided from both

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>ends ultimately joining in the middle. The wider site is deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without link road, development at South Macclesfield will have a harmful impact on town's road system</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not clear why this section of the south-west Macclesfield site remains as an allocation when the remainder is proposed to be safeguarded, particularly when there are other sites that have been assessed as having less of a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt</li> <li>Every reduction in Green Belt should be compensated by an increase of twice the size</li> <li>The employment element would be better located at South Macclesfield</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain land as Green Belt</li> <li>Remove site from plan</li> <li>Re-word policy to read:<br/>         "The development of land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road over the Core Strategy period will be achieved through:         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delivery of between 1,500 and 2,000 dwellings;</li> <li>The delivery of 10 hectares of employment land;</li> <li>Incorporation of green infrastructure;</li> <li>Pedestrian and cycle links to new and existing residential areas, shops, schools and health facilities;</li> <li>Onsite provision, or where appropriate, relevant contributions towards highways and transport, education, health, open space and community facilities;</li> <li>Provision of the South West Link Road;</li> <li>Provision of [ x ] hectares of safeguarded land;</li> <li>A new mixed use local centre comprising: -             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 1,500 sq m of retail;</li> <li>new primary school;</li> <li>Community facilities;</li> <li>Public house/takeaway/restaurant; and</li> <li>Healthclub/gym.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>Site Specific Principles of Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will be expected to contribute towards appropriate road infrastructure improvements in the area, including the provision of the South West Link Road from Congleton Road to Chelford Road. To assist the timely delivery of this new strategic route, development of the Strategic Site will commence from both the north (Chelford Road) and south (Congleton Road) ends of the site;</li> <li>Any development must not prejudice the future comprehensive development of safeguarded land within the overall allocation;</li> <li>The development will be expected to provide improvements to existing and include the provision of new pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to existing and proposed residential employment areas, shops, schools and health facilities;</li> <li>The Core Strategy Site is expected to provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in policy SC5 (Affordable Homes);</li> <li>The development should deliver compensatory habitats on site as required;</li> </ol> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>and</p> <p>f) A desk based Archaeological Assessment is required for the site, with targeted evaluation and appropriate mitigation being carried out if required. Special measures will be taken to ensure the protection of the Cock Wood Site of Biological Importance.</p> <p>g) A Masterplan/Development Framework will be required in advance of any planning application, to guide the future comprehensive development of the Strategic Site, including the appropriate provision and phased implementation of necessary infrastructure.”</p>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>This site represents an opportunity for a well-connected sustainable urban extension to help meet the housing needs arising in Macclesfield.</p> <p>The adjacent Safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time and can only be allocated in the future through a review of the Local Plan if there is a need for further development.</p> <p>A whole range of factors need to be borne in mind re appraisal of the site’s sustainability, such as access to public transport, public rights of way, leisure opportunities, local shops and facilities and employment opportunities</p> <p>Infrastructure - Provision for infrastructure requirements – eg. road improvements, school places, etc. - are dealt with by policy, which allows flexibility</p> <p>Brownfield sites – Council’s Assessment of brownfield sites has identified that there is not the capacity across the brownfield sites in Macclesfield to meet the need for the level of development identified/proposed</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances to justify releasing land from the Green Belt are dealt with under the Green Belt policy.</p> <p>The site makes no provision for a south-west Macclesfield link road but it will be important that the development does not prevent provision of the link road, should it be included in policy in any future Local Plan.</p> <p>Housing levels – The proposed level of housing has been informed by the CE Housing Needs Assessment (SHMA)</p> <p>Employment Land – the proposed level of employment land provision has been informed by the Cheshire East Employment Land Review.</p> <p>Ecological impact – It is noted that the ‘Site Specific Principles of Development’ requires the delivery of compensatory habitats if required</p> <p>Development of the site would not lead to Macclesfield and Gawsorth merging.</p> <p>Given the reduction in the amount of housing considered realistic as part of the Central Macclesfield Strategic Location, and the reduction in the area of the adjacent safeguarded land, it may be appropriate to increase the number of houses on this site to aid its viability and to make a sufficient contribution to the</p> |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | overall need for new housing in the town/   |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increase the site area to accommodate 300 new dwellings</li><li>• Addition of requirement for a landscaped buffer between any development and the rear of properties on Hillcrest Road.</li><li>• Policy Context: add paras. 109, 112, 117 and 120 to National Policy</li></ul> |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS11: Gaw End Lane, Macclesfield</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 290 (Support: 3 / Object: 271 / Comment Only: 16)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the potential for development proposals to incorporate the existing Council depot into a future scheme</li> <li>• The nature of the site is such that it would require little adaptation given its layout and existing features</li> <li>• Site could lend itself to a range of commercial uses</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not easy to commute to other Towns from South Macc (eg. Stockport, Manchester)</li> <li>• Area of natural beauty</li> <li>• Lack of facilities for people in Lyme Green</li> <li>• Would prevent regeneration of brownfield sites</li> <li>• Would increase traffic problems</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence provided to justify exceptional circumstances required for change of Green Belt status</li> <li>• Sufficient land identified in SW Macc for housing, therefore not necessary to remove this site from GB</li> <li>• In survey 97% of local residents rejected any change to Green Belt boundaries</li> <li>• Serves a number of purposes – preventing merging of Macc/Lyme Green/Sutton, prevents encroachment into countryside and ASCV</li> <li>• Contains Canal Conservation Area</li> <li>• Contains SBI</li> <li>• Impact on Lyme Green infrastructure</li> <li>• Little public transport</li> <li>• Impact on ASCV</li> <li>• Increased traffic, congestion, restricted narrow (protected) canal bridge</li> <li>• Ample brownfield sites available in Macc</li> <li>• Not sustainable development</li> <li>• Site forms well defined Green Belt boundary</li> <li>• Potentially contaminated land</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife (inc. protected species such as great crested newts)</li> <li>• Need Noise impact assessment</li> <li>• Need Travel Plan</li> <li>• Contrary to purposes of including land in Green Belt (NPPF)</li> <li>• Encroaches into countryside</li> <li>• Land performs significant Green Belt function/makes significant contribution to GB (see GB Assessment Report)</li> <li>• No justification or need for amount of safeguarded land at Lyme Green</li> <li>• Local School could not accommodate more pupils</li> <li>• Decreased demand for houses given closure of Alderley Park (AZ)</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt boundary between Macc &amp; Sutton</li> <li>• Would result in unrestricted sprawl</li> <li>• Will destroy setting and character of Lyme Green</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop brownfield sites before Greenfield</li> <li>• Site affects a number of heritage assets – Canal Conservation Area, Listed Buildings – these need to be preserved if site developed</li> <li>• Heritage assessment required</li> <li>• Desk-based archaeological assessment required, inc. mitigation if required</li> <li>• Better to have employment more central, so should swap this aspect with CS10 site</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swap employment land proposal in CS9 with CS10 site</li> <li>• Retain site as Green Belt</li> <li>• Reconsider use of part of NPS40</li> <li>• Focus development on SW Macc</li> <li>• Suggest a comprehensive approach to include the proposed safeguarded land to the south to be considered for inclusion</li> <li>• See PRE 4886 – proposed larger site concept plan</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability/local facilities – A whole range of factors need to be borne in mind re appraisal of the site’s sustainability. At present, for example, there is a bus stop across the road from the site, a Public Right Of Way along the adjacent canal, a Playing Field approx. 250m from the site, a convenience store within 1K of the site, a Primary School approx. 1.2K from the site, a post box within 50m of the site and the Lyme Green Business and Retail Park is located on the northern side of the canal. Within the context of the proposed Plan, the South West Macclesfield Development Area, for example, includes residential, playing fields &amp; leisure facilities, retail and employment uses. There is also a link road proposed between London Rd and Congleton Rd and the proposed development sites include requirements for improved infrastructure/vehicle/cycle and pedestrian links. Hence, the development of the site is considered to be sustainable.</li> <li>• Infrastructure - Provision for infrastructure requirements – eg. road improvements, school places, etc. - are dealt with by policy, which allows flexibility</li> <li>• Brownfield sites – Council’s Assessment of brownfield sites has identified that there is not the capacity across the brownfield sites in Macclesfield to meet the need for the level of development identified/proposed</li> <li>• Housing levels – The proposed level of housing has been informed by the CE Housing Needs Assessment (SHMA)</li> <li>• Ecological impact – It is noted that the ‘Site Specific Principles of Development’ require a buffer zone of semi-natural habitats to be provided adjacent to the Canal SBI; any application would require an ecological impact assessment to include mitigation measures if required</li> <li>• Impact on Conservation Area and neighbouring Listed Buildings/Structures - Conservation Area and Listed Buildings are protected by policies within the Plan and national Policy/Guidance; the Site Specific Principles of Development require development to be sensitive to the CA and any neighbouring Listed Buildings/Structures</li> </ul> |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on ASCV - The proposed site is to included in the Plan to provide an additional and/or alternative site to the other proposed development sites in the south Macclesfield area, thereby providing some flexibility in terms of securing delivery of development</li> <li>• Highways – A Transport Assessment would be required with any application, which would include consideration of the access requirements and implications for surrounding highway network where appropriate</li> <li>• Assessment of Sites - Consideration has been given to a range of sites in reaching the decision regarding the proposed sites (noting that the Non Preferred Sites have been discounted for sound reasons)</li> <li>• Ecological impact – Any application would require an Ecological Impact Assessment, to include mitigation measures where/if required</li> <li>• Green Belt – Removal of the site from the GB has been informed by the Council’s GB Assessment and the need for some land to be removed from the GB to meet development needs across CE generally, including the Macclesfield area</li> <li>• Contaminated land &amp; archaeology – Any application would include consideration of contaminated land issues and any archaeological assessment requirements.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council Depot is to be removed from the site (though this will still be taken out of the Green Belt to be used as Employment Land). Hence, the site plan will be amended accordingly</li> <li>• The site is to be used solely for housing, around 150 dwellings (i.e. no employment land within the amended site area). Therefore, any references to Employment removed from this section, i.e.: i) sentence “potential exists for development proposals to incorporate the existing Cheshire East Council depot into a future scheme...” removed; ii) Local Evidence ref to ‘Employment Land Review’ deleted; iii) ref to “promoting economic prosperity by creating conditions for business growth” deleted from ‘strategic priorities’ refs; iv) ref to SCS priority 2 – ‘create conditions for business growth’ – deleted.</li> <li>• Ref to National Policy (‘Policy Context’) add paras.: 109, 112, 117, 126, 132 and 137.</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Alsager</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 30 (Support: 0 / Object: 21 / Comment Only: 9)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No support expressed during consultation</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new employment opportunities but significant increase in housing. Significant increase in traffic without the infrastructure to cope effecting existing and future residence.</li> <li>• Level of development appears unsustainable. Existing schools (particularly primary), medical facilities etc would not be able to cope with increase in local population.</li> <li>• Alsager cannot support the level of development planned for it under these proposals without significant investment in infrastructure, services and employment.</li> <li>• The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides evidence that there is no coherent investment plan for Alsager to provide the 'right new infrastructure' to support the Core Strategy proposals.</li> <li>• Commuting will increase as no local job opportunities. Will change nature of the community from market town to dormitory town. Much development is a significant distance from railway station removing the option of commuting via train.</li> <li>• Housing numbers contradict those in the democratically agreed Town Strategy. Previous consultation which took place between March and April 2012 arising from which the new housing limit for Alsager was established at 1000. This figure is increased to 1,700 houses with an additional 350 without any real consultation and against the expressed wishes of the Alsager community.</li> <li>• The plan does not reflect public opinion, neither does it reflect the originally published data which indicates the housing requirement for Alsager as a whole.</li> <li>• Strategy has ignored the facts and historical data on house development in Alsager.</li> <li>• Plans are ill thought through. Infrastructure by way of roads, drainage and essential services cannot be effectively provided as an afterthought.</li> <li>• There are sufficient brownfield sites in the area which should be used before greenfield sites are.</li> <li>• White Moss is a completely inappropriate strategic location for housing and could even have health hazards related to the proximity of the M6 motorway. The proposals are far in excess of the infrastructure, in all aspects, of the Town of Alsager to cope with.</li> <li>• White Moss Quarry is subject to a legal restoration agreement which will return it to greenfield status. The effects of draining it for house-building could have serious effects on the Oakhanger Moss RAMSAR site to the west, as well as Alsager Mere. Hydrological surveys have not covered a wide enough</li> </ul> |

area.

- Building on White Moss Quarry would make the fields to the east very vulnerable to "infill" development applications.
- The former MMU site should be creatively developed to preserve its existing sports facilities for community use and these should not be 'transferred' to Crewe.
- The limit from the Town Plan for the Former Manchester Metropolitan University Campus is 300 not 350. The Inspector determined that 150 was the maximum level because of the inadequate infrastructure.  
Alsager is an area of restraint because of its proximity to Stoke-On-Trent and Newcastle Councils, this is demonstrating no restraint and is an abdication of Cheshire East's duty to consult and co-operate with its neighbouring Local Authorities.
- Land to the west of Close Lane, Alsager is available, achievable and deliverable within the next five years; as such it should be considered preferable to the residential allocation suggested in Alsager. The site will provide a mix of tenures of housing and local jobs. (*Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group*).

**Comment Only**

- Proposals will result in the creation of an unsustainable commuting dormitory town and lead to increased in traffic problems.
- Insufficient evidence has been presented to support new proposals, consultation period has been limited.
- The "creation of sustainable urban and rural communities that locate developments in places close to jobs" is clearly at odds with what is proposed for Alsager in this document.
- Recent employment has been lost (MMU and most of the arms factory at Radway Green and Twyfords).
- No foreseeable improvement in this condition outlined in this document.
- Alsager needs much more employment, including manufacturing, not only new housing. Already insufficient employment for its population.
- Housing has been added without any employment increase and far from the railway station. No thought to upgrading road links.
- Existing infrastructure is inadequate. The extent of proposed provision will create social problems given the low level of investment in facilities and infrastructure.
- Highways improvements are essential to protect existing residents of Oakhanger, particularly those close to the B5077. An improved link to Crewe must be provided that reduces the traffic speeding past existing housing.
- Proposals are contrary to core strategies objectives concerning such as carbon footprint and reduction of emissions.
- Health, well being and recreational issues cannot be achieved by planning large development next to overstretched motorways, building on greenfields, increasing journeys to go to work, loss of countryside.
- Land off Crewe Road, Alsager should be included in the plan as a strategic development location. Site is very well related to Alsager town centre, existing and proposed employment areas, the urban area and new housing

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>development. The site can meet the shortfall in deliverable housing land. (<i>Sedgwick Associates on behalf of Hollins Strategic Land LLP</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development on land south of Hall Drive, Alsager. The site should therefore be included within the existing commitments for Alsager. (<i>Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Renew Land Developments Limited</i>)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove White Moss as a Strategic Location for housing.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of houses proposed around Alsager.</li> <li>• Give recognition and commitment to infrastructure improvements particularly roads.</li> <li>• A complete rethink and production of a joined up plan for Alsager drawn up by working group made up of representatives from the Town and Cheshire East Councils, ARAG, Sports Clubs, Chamber of Trade and local resident with assistance to seek appropriate funding for infrastructure.</li> <li>• Infrastructure challenges to be properly addressed. Could include new bypass and car/pedestrian friendly environment similar to Poynton.</li> <li>• Development to be restricted to the available brownfield sites.</li> <li>• MMU site should retain an educational function, include preservation of sports facilities and pitches as well as an independent living environment for the elderly.</li> <li>• Any viability assessment for affordable housing undertaken by the Council MUST be Independent and open to public scrutiny;</li> <li>• Land off Crewe Road, Alsager should be included in the plan as a strategic development location.</li> <li>• Include land to the west Close Lane.</li> <li>• Land south of Hall Drive, Alsager should be included within the existing commitments for Alsager.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the issues raised/listed above have been addressed within the Council's assessment of, and response to, comments related to each of the site specific consultation points, eg. issues such as housing figures, infrastructure improvements, brownfield sites first, employment land, impact on the area/wildlife/RAMSAR sites.</li> <li>• Alsager is a Key Service centre which lies in close proximity to Crewe and is close to the Potteries conurbation, and is well connected by the M6 motorway, Bus routes and a train line. Infrastructure improvements are included within the site specific policies.</li> <li>• The committed sites have been updated and include Hall Drive and Land of Crewe Road, Alsager. All other sites have been considered within the document and no additional sites are required to be allocated for Alsager over and above those which have been allocated.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | No material alterations proposed.   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Location SL5: White Moss Quarry</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 52 (Support: 1 / Object: 45 / Comment Only: 6)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPRE can support the principle of development</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Unacceptable existing site constraints and inadequate infrastructure</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Site lies between a high pressure gas pipeline and a munitions factory with part of site falling within the blast zone area of the BAE Systems at Radway Green.</li> <li>○ Noise from the M6 motorway across this site is acknowledged to be in excess of WHO, National and EU limits. (Levels well in excess of 72 dB have been registered)</li> <li>○ Air pollution levels from the M6 motorway is above WHO, EU and national limits exacerbated by prevailing westerly wind.</li> <li>○ Serious danger of flooding when the original levels are restored. Site was classed as a low lying peat marsh with high water table. Now huge areas of water and water logged areas, 7m deep in parts</li> <li>○ The circle on the map also appears to include the RAMSAR site by going to the west of the motorway.</li> <li>○ The area supports a wide range of protected amphibians and reptiles.</li> <li>○ Proposed creation of new Local Centre and community facility is spatially incompatible with Site Specific Principle of Development g. – ‘protection of, and enhancements to, the existing SBI in the southwest of the site’</li> <li>○ Will be an unacceptable burden on Alsager’s inadequate infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Under the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Table 4 of the document reveals that CEC has no coherent strategy nor income sources allocated for investment in the infrastructure of Alsager.</li> <li>○ The allocation has not been positively prepared and does not meeting objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.</li> <li>○ Current infrastructure is not able to cope with water, sewage, roads health care and education will already be stretched with the planned increase of housing in Alsager.</li> <li>○ The proximity of the level crossing to a development of this size is likely to cause unacceptable congestion.</li> <li>○ Core Strategy includes no suggestions or proposals for improving Alsager’s infrastructure so that the Town can cope with ANY additional development(s).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>Loss of agreed quarry restoration</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This site is very close to a RAMSAR site and when it is restored, it will contribute to the ecological viability of the surrounding area. This would</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

be damaged by developing in excess of 1,000 houses.

- Site is subject to a legally agreed restoration plan. The recreational facilities and the environmental benefits to be delivered by this plan belong to the Community of Alsager and should not be discarded
- The site is in open countryside and is part of a buffer between the M6 and Alsager. As a quarry with restoration conditions, some of which have been part implemented it will not be a derelict site in the future but a restored and landscaped area.
- Most of the remainder of the site, far from being agricultural, is one of the largest remaining virgin wetland moss sites in the south of Cheshire and an important site for wildlife.

- **Conflicts with policy**

- The site does not comply with other policies in the Strategy namely: (a) Sustainability, (b) Employment, (c) Minerals, (d) Environmental/ Ecology, (e) Open Countryside, (f) infrastructure.
- Allocation conflicts with the arguments used by Cheshire East in the recent rounds of appeals and will undermine future appeals. If accepted it will open the door to judicial review on Sandbach Road North.
- Does not comply with the Employment Site policy. EG 3. Alongside the quarrying activities there is an aggregate recycling plant, a concrete product producing plant and a couple of commercial developments including the Garden Centre. It falls into none of the exempt categories and therefore should be discounted.
- Does not comply with the minerals policy. (SE10) A Housing development including the quarry would cause unnecessary sterilisation of the ground.
- Location does not comply with Policy PG5, open countryside policy. Para 4. states that any development in the open countryside must comply with all relevant policies in the Local Plan. Greenfield sites have been included in this allocation, violating policy PG5
- Will result in loss of local employment. The employment currently provided on this site from its quarry, concrete production and aggregate recycling should be retained.
- New inhabitants will need to commute to Alsager and Crewe for work, retail and leisure facilities working against the objective of reducing the need to travel as outlined in Policy SD1

- **Question of need**

- Fundamental objection raised to the assertion that it would 'meet a significant proportion of employment and housing needs of Alsager and Crewe'. This distant site could not make any reasonable contribution to meeting Crewe's needs.
- The proposed development will not contribute to meeting unmet housing need arising from Crewe.
- The assertion that the development at the proposed Strategic Location will contribute to any shortfall of housing needs in Crewe, on this basis, is insufficiently evidenced. In common with the South East Crewe

Proposed New Settlement, and in particular the previous locations identified in closer proximity to the M6 (no longer in the Draft Local Plan), development of the White Moss Quarry site will serve a wider market area due to its proximity to Junction 16 of the M6.

- **Expansion of Alsager**
  - Site violates the settlement zone lines and will create infill. It will intrude and damage the nature of the countryside and the included greenfields.
  - Recent planning permissions and current applications around Crewe Road mean that if progressed, the site will be joined to Alsager physically by built development.
  - Location cannot be classified as a new settlement. However designed, it will be nothing more than urban sprawl on the Alsager Town boundary.
  
- **Disregard of public opinion/flaws in the planning process**
  - Site has been imposed on people of Alsager with strong objections from the Community and the Town Council being ignored.
  - By adding this location to its draft Local Plan, Cheshire East has knowingly added weight to the developer's planning application, despite objections from residents and the Town Council.
  - Site totally ignores sensible and legitimate concerns in favour of the vested interests of the council leader and cabinet members.
  - Site discriminates against the residents of Alsager who will have to live with the consequences of a badly thought out plan imposed for the convenience of Cheshire East when considered against reasonable alternatives.
  - The description of the site is confusing. In this section it is described as a sustainable village whereas elsewhere it is classed as an extension of Alsager and in Appendix A is included in the Alsager Allocation.
  - The site was not adequately consulted on. Its inclusion solely on the small number of people in favour cannot be justified and the validity of the Additional Sites consultation could be questioned.
  - Alsager's allocation of homes has increased to 1700. This is not acceptable, the town strategy said 1000 and there has already been windfall "quantities on top of that
  - It is wrong that this development has been added to the current core document when it was not previously considered in earlier documents.
  - The Village B New Settlement has effectively been replaced by Strategic Location SL 5 (White Moss Quarry, Alsager), which is proposed to deliver 750 dwellings during the plan period. This site did not appear in a SHLAA prior to it being consulted on as Site A within the 'Possible Alternative Sites' document (May 2013). It was presented in that consultation as a site which the Council had no opinion on, with nothing but a scant site description and redline provided for stakeholders to comment upon. The fact such a major site only came forward in this manner supports our earlier representations that the process of selecting Preferred Strategic Sites was seriously flawed.

- ***Objections from neighbouring LPAs/Duty to Co-operate***
  - Plan states that we should ensure to cater for our own housing needs, whilst limiting any impacts of this on the adjoining authorities' ability to regenerate their own urban housing areas. The nearest Authority in this case is Newcastle Borough Council. They have already indicated in recent planning applications that sites in this area impact on their Local Regeneration plans.
  - Alsager is defined as within the area of restraint for housing development in relation to the CEC proposals owing to the proximity to North Staffs/ Newcastle region and their plan for regeneration. Newcastle council has already objected to the proposals on greenfield sites.
  - CEC has, under the requirements of the NPPF, a duty to cooperate with neighbouring local authorities. A recent recommendation, in an Inspector's Report, has urged caution in relation to Alsager and its housing developments in this respect.
  - Adjoining Councils explicitly objected to the White Moss Quarry site; its proposed allocation raises questions about how effectively the Duty to Cooperate is being met
  - This site could render the whole of our Core Strategy unsound if the inspector found that the Duty to Cooperate has not been satisfactorily addressed.
  - Provision of housing and employment uses in this location will in reality have a stronger bearing on the development and regeneration plans of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme with the functional market relationships evidenced as strong between these areas and Alsager. The implications of this relationship, noting the comparatively fragile nature of housing markets in Stoke-on-Trent in particular, will require further consideration through the Duty-to-Cooperate than is currently suggested
  
- ***Unsustainable location***
  - There is complete lack of evidence of any jobs led growth in relation to Alsager. Development does not promote economic prosperity, it is purely a housing development with no provision for employment land and there are no associated plans for jobs growth for Alsager.
  - The core strategy pre-submission document recognises limited employment opportunities in Alsager. It is recognised the significant level of out commuting from Alsager as it already stands; adoption of this site will simply turn Alsager into a large commuter town.
  - As an out of town development that is not within walking distance of local facilities in Alsager. It does not give priority to walking as it is too far from local amenities and the train station. There is no station nearby, so nearly all residents will be expected to go to work by car, mostly via the M6. Car use will simply increase from development in Alsager as there is not any real viable alternative for commuters
  - Site unlikely to encourage a reduction in car-borne commuting. As shown in GVA report, this could actually lead to increased longer-

distance commuting to employment opportunities in other larger centres to the north and south. It will encourage the existing migration of workers from the Potteries who will then commute back to there by car. Cheshire East will have the burden of the increased population whilst barely benefiting from their economic activity

- Transport critique prepared by SKTransport, identifies that: 'The White Moss Quarry site is poorly related to major trip attractors and growth areas in Crewe. These locational characteristics of the site will result in high levels of car dependency. Opportunities for trips to be made by sustainable modes of travel are extremely limited and the measures proposed as part of the development are not expected to influence this to a significant degree. These factors cannot readily be overcome and will lead to high levels of car use associated with development in this location.'
- There is no evidence that the necessary infrastructure will be provided to support this development. It has already been identified that Alsager's road network is operating above capacity with no scope for improvement
- **Alternatives have not been considered**
  - Site not justified because it does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. There are better located, more sustainable sites available for housing development.
  - The Reasoned Justification to the emerging policy admits that the site is in a rural setting. This no better sums up the unsustainable nature of the site. Building 900 - 1,000 homes in a rural area when there are better urban extension sites available.
  - Other alternative brownfield sites should be developed first. Alsager is in the unique position of having two brownfield sites that are capable of delivering Alsager's actual housing needs.
  - Proposals for Alsager should concentrate on the brownfield sites of former Twyford, a smaller proposal for the MMU and other, known brownfield sites available now or in the future in Alsager, Crewe and Arclid.
  - Saying it will "Meet a significant proportion of the employment and housing needs of Alsager and Crewe" may be the case for Alsager but a strategy of meeting a "significant" proportion of Crewe's needs on a site some 4 miles from its outskirts is quite frankly ridiculous, unsound and not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.
  - White Moss Quarry only meets 3 of the Council's maximum standards. Site at Close Lane, Alsager, is located near the White Moss Quarry, but is better related to the settlement and is nearer to Alsager town centre and local services and facilities (*made by Muller Property Group*).
  - White Moss Quarry should not be considered in preference to Fanny's Croft which is far more sustainable than any of the other sites shown on the map at Figure 15.18 of the Core Strategy (*made by Raleigh Hall*

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Properties Ltd).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Other issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Maladministration by Cheshire East on 11 counts in relation to the unauthorised use of 'The Triangle Field' has been referred to the Ombudsman and needs to be resolved and the field returned back to its Greenfield status</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has a legally agreed restoration plan, which Cheshire East is obliged to enforce.</li> <li>• Benefits delivered by this restoration plan belong to the Community of Alsager and should not be discarded.</li> <li>• Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent have specifically objected to development.</li> <li>• Noise and air pollution limits from the M6 motorway across this site is acknowledged to be in excess of WHO, National and EU limits</li> <li>• Site is very close to a RAMSAR site and when it is restored, it will contribute to the ecological viability of the surrounding area</li> <li>• Principles of the development of White Moss Quarry to include a contribution or provision of a bridge to replace the existing Radway Green Level Crossing. This is a critical piece of infrastructure that needs to be delivered to accommodate the increased traffic if the development of White Moss Quarry goes ahead.</li> <li>• Any surviving peat needs to be assessed for further analysis and/or preservation on palaeoecological grounds.</li> <li>• A high pressure gas pipeline FM04 Audley – Plumley runs to the west of the proposed allocation</li> <li>• Strategic Location supported but objection to the exclusion land to the north of the site. Consultee is putting forward a new site of 7.9ha bounded by Close Lane, Nursery Road and White Moss Quarry for residential development. <i>(made by How Planning on behalf of East Cheshire Engine of the North)</i></li> <li>• Site broadly acceptable subject to the indicative phasing contained within the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, important to ensure that high levels of development in this location do not have a negative impact on the delivery of the regeneration of North Staffordshire <i>(made by Stoke-on-Trent City Council &amp; Newcastle-Under-Lyme BC).</i></li> <li>• Site close to the Radway Green blast zone, is not within walking distance of facilities in Alsager and proposals for SL5 are at odds with the policy at SP4</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site should be discounted/deleted/withdrawn from the Plan (multiple responses)</li> <li>• Commit to restore White Moss as a community recreational facility.</li> <li>• Return Alsager's allocation to 1,000 or less.</li> <li>• Reduce the size of the development to allow it to be more sustainable and other local brownfield sites to be considered first.</li> <li>• The site specific principles of development need to be more explicit and set out the requirements needed to come forward with any future planning</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any surviving peat needs to be assessed for further analysis and/or preservation on palaeoecological grounds.</li> <li>• Remove any assertion that such a proposal would serve to meet Crewe's housing needs.</li> <li>• Include the new site of 7.9 ha at Nursery Road and Close lane within the SL5 policy designation and therefore amend Figures 15.18 and 15.19.</li> <li>• Request the following changes to part 1 of the text to policy SL5: The delivery of a sustainable village comprising in the region of 1200 new homes in the plan period (at a density of between 25 and 35 dwellings per hectare); the sustainable village can be brought forward in phases, including infrastructure requests sought by this policy. The provision of any infrastructure requirements detailed within this policy will be shared by all promoters of the Strategic Location, the amount provided on a pro-rata basis.</li> <li>• The text to part 4 is justified or removed</li> <li>• The justification text is amended to read: The site has potential capacity for in the region of 1200 new homes delivered within the Core Strategy Plan Period.</li> <li>• The Site....<br/>The Delivery section should then be amended to read:<br/>approximately 500 homes expected during the first part of the plan period (2015-2020);<br/>approximately 350 homes expected during the middle part of the plan period (2020-2025);<br/>approximately 350 homes expected towards the end of the plan period (2025-2030).</li> <li>• Dwellings should be redirected to Alsager (and Crewe).</li> <li>• If this does go ahead, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A right turning filter lane will need creating from Crewe to Radway Green.</li> <li>2. A left filter lane for at least 1/4 mile along Crewe Road east of the lights.</li> <li>3. A filter lane will be needed southbound into the factory.</li> <li>4. The station will need to be reopened for local trains, for commuting to Stoke, Crewe and beyond.</li> <li>5. The road needs to be taken over the railway via a bridge.</li> <li>6. Footpaths and cycleways will need creating on both sides of Crewe Road (all the way into Alsager) and the Radway Green road (as far as the motorway bridge, to accommodate walkers on the rights of way, as well as workers).</li> <li>7. Much more land needs to be devoted to wetland moss habitat, with a much smaller housing allocation.</li> <li>8. The developers need to contribute towards the upgrading of Alsager's facilities such as extending the free car park, providing more schools, increasing medical and similar provision, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Remove any assertion that such a proposal would serve to meet Crewe's housing needs.</li> <li>• Propose an alternative housing allocation on land to the west of Close Lane, Alsager.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | It is considered that by reducing the proposed housing numbers on the Strategic Location to 350 and significantly reducing the area of the site to be subjected to development, this will limit potential impacts and seek to address the key  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>objections of the allocation.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that considerable constraints are present within and around the location most notably: the M6 motorway and associated air and noise pollution; known major hazardous installations (Audley – Plumley high pressure gas pipeline and BAE Systems munitions factory at Radway Green); an SBI/Local Wildlife Site (and proximity to RAMSAR), peatland/wetland and its supported ecology; and flood risk.</p> <p>Any development on the location will be expected to be sited with full regard to these constraints and any impacts properly and adequately addressed through the development management process with full regard to the relevant Core Strategy policies.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development on the location will have implications on existing infrastructure. Through a reduction in the number of houses it is sought to reduce this impact. Proposed development will be expected to make proportionate contributions towards identified highways improvements in/around Alsager.</p> <p>It is accepted that development on the existing consented quarry site could result in loss of the previously approved restoration scheme and the environmental benefits /Green Infrastructure this would provide. Siting development proposals to the south east of the location will be expected to minimise this loss of the agreed restoration of worked areas.</p> <p>Potential for the sterilisation of mineral resources by (non-mineral) development on the location. This should be fully considered by development proposals and factored into the development management process.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed quantity of housing is higher from that agreed in Alsager Town Strategy is the subject to multiple objections. It is also acknowledged that the scale of proposed development defies previous agreement with Potteries LPAs. Housing numbers on the site and expected scale of development have been reduced in response.</p> <p>Alternative sites suggested are to be considered as part of the Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>Amend Strategic Location allocation and supporting policy text to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce size of Strategic Location on maps</li> <li>• State that proposed development will be focused on the south eastern part of this location allowing for the wider existing worked areas to be effectively restored.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of dwellings that the Strategic Location would be expected to provide from 750 to 350</li> <li>• Deletion of the provision up to 1000 metres squares (including convenience) and replacement with appropriate retail provision to meet local needs</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amend to the provision of a small scale community facility</li><li>• Remove provision of new pedestrian footbridge</li><li>• Add the expectation for development proposals to fully assess and mitigate any potential adverse impacts of development in line policy requirements of Policy SE12 to the Site Specific Principles of Development</li><li>• Refer to the provision of Green Infrastructure in the Site Specific Principles of Development</li><li>• Remove requirement to provide bridge to replace existing Radway Green Level crossing</li><li>• Remove references to supporting economic growth of Crewe</li><li>• Add reference to the granting of outline planning consent at adjacent site to the east of the Strategic Location</li><li>• Remove reference to potential capacity for 900 homes</li><li>• Amend indicative site delivery from 375 homes in the middle and 375 in the end of the Plan period to 175</li><li>• Policy context: add paragraphs 100, 117, 120 and 143 to National Policy</li><li>• Site justification wording has been altered to include; - Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</li></ul> |
|--|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS12: Twyfords and Cardway, Alsager</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 39 (Support: 2 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 32)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal for small-scale retail on site</li> <li>• Principle for development</li> <li>• Agree with proposed small-scale retail of 200-300 sqm</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about traffic safety and congestion</li> <li>• Alsager unsustainable as a Key Service Centre due to lack of employment available</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-use of outmoded employment site for housing seems reasonable; density aimed for may be optimistic, given site constraints</li> <li>• Retention of rail access desirable</li> <li>• Questionable if the site is viable given requirements for infrastructure and affordable housing</li> <li>• Protection of green spaces, trees and hedgerows is essential, as is a full archaeological assessment of the site and access to any key features identified</li> <li>• Alsager needs more employment in the area and therefore employment land</li> <li>• Concern about parking and access</li> <li>• Concern about the volume of housing and impact on Alsager</li> <li>• Impact on character of Alsager – loss of “small town” feel</li> <li>• Considered not to be deliverable within 5 years</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new footbridge over the railway is likely to be required (to serve SL5)</li> <li>• Site shouldn't be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that threaten its viability</li> <li>• Site will not contribute to economic growth</li> <li>• Retail should be restricted to convenience</li> <li>• Extra play/recreation facilities should be rectified</li> <li>• Council should be minded to relax infrastructure and/or affordable housing contributions (to ensure site is deliverable)</li> <li>• At least 10 hectares should be designated for employment use</li> <li>• Various cycle and footpaths should be created and cycle/foot bridge</li> <li>• Provide separate access for Cardway site &amp; mitigate for green space and traffic movements</li> <li>• Treat the 2 areas of land north and south of the railway as separate sites</li> <li>• Reassess highways/access issues</li> <li>• Include 2 ha of employment land on Cardway site</li> <li>• Reduce housing allocation on sites to 500</li> <li>• Site should be retained for employment use only</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | Open Space - The existing open space area (Cardway site) will not be developed; open space facilities are to be retained and enhanced  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Housing - Level of housing deemed appropriate for size of site (note that there is already planning permission on the Twyfords site for 350 dwellings); no requirement to deliver within 5 years (to be delivered within the plan period)</p> <p>Rail Access - As manufacturing use isn't being retained on site there is no need to retain rail access</p> <p>Traffic safety &amp; Congestion - The site is already in use for manufacturing purposes and as such already generates a degree of traffic. Applications would require a Transport Assessment (which would include appropriate access, cycle and footpath links, parking, etc.).</p> <p>Footbridge - No need identified for link between the two sites</p> <p>Employment Land - Brownfield sites at Radway Green are being retained for employment uses and approx. 3,000 sqm of office use being retained on this site; as the open space is to be retained on the Cardway site the remaining land area is required for housing</p> <p>Retail provision – This aspect is not a requirement of the policy – bullet point 5 states “potential to include”...(care development and small scale retail)</p> <p>Infrastructure &amp; affordable housing - Provision for infrastructure requirements – eg. road improvements, pupil school places - and affordable housing are dealt with by policy (which allow flexibility)</p> <p>Assessments re arboriculture, ecology, archaeology to be submitted with applications as required.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove existing bullet point 'b' (Site Specific Principles of Development) from the Plan</li> <li>• Insert a bullet point under 'Site Specific Principles of Development' stating that the existing open space on the Cardway site will be retained (not built on) and improved.</li> <li>• Policy Context: delete paras. 7 and 19, insert paras 110, 120 and 126 from National Policy. Add priority 6: Prepare for an increasingly older population in SCS priorities.</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS13: Former MMU Campus, Alsager</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 56 (Support: 3 / Object: 23 / Comment Only: 30)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redevelopment of a brownfield site that has become an eyesore</li> <li>• Development of mixed use</li> <li>• Principle of development</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site provides an excellent opportunity for the proposed college of higher education that is currently pencilled in for Crewe</li> <li>• Elsewhere in the plan you note Alsager's lack of health club facilities and usage, so this would be an outstanding opportunity to redress the balance</li> <li>• Some of the former sports laboratory facilities could be converted into a third medical practice for Alsager, to cope with the growing population</li> <li>• Many local residents and local MP want a UTC</li> <li>• Schools won't cope with influx</li> <li>• Impact on highways system</li> <li>• Core proposals for Alsager should concentrate on brownfield sites</li> <li>• Will not lead to sustainable communities</li> <li>• Current proposals do not retain the best aspects of this site and overdevelop it</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disregards campaign for Mixed Used Development</li> <li>• Questionable whether this site is deliverable given the Council's requirements re contributions towards infrastructure and affordable housing</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redevelopment of site as mixed use site to include University Technical College, residential, exercise/leisure facilities, care community village and social club</li> <li>• Section 15.185 needs clarifying/is ambiguous (says that facilities will be provided in Crewe) – playing fields are in full use by local groups and must be retained. Changing rooms will still be needed in Alsager and sports hall and gym should be retained &amp; made available for local use</li> <li>• 15.190 talks about enhancing existing sports facilities (does this contradict 15.185?)</li> <li>• Council should relax requirements re contributions towards infrastructure and/or affordable housing</li> <li>• Other beneficial uses for the site, inc. Higher Education, Health Club, Medical Practice</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will require improvements to the junctions of Close Lane, Hassall Road and Church Road with Crewe Road, and also an improved route from there to Sandbach</li> <li>• Suggestions that there should be no more than 150, 200 or 300 dwellings on the site</li> <li>• Retain sports facilities and sports fields (for public and sports club use)</li> <li>• Include educational provision on the site</li> <li>• More robust policy to protect/retain sports buildings and pitches</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove requirement for retail, take-away, public house, etc. on site</li> <li>• Remove word 'commercial' when discussing sports facilities</li> <li>• Protected Open Space notation should not be retained</li> <li>• Principles of development are not appropriate in a Core Strategy; they should be re-worded: *Providing an appropriate balance of housing and outdoor sports facilities to meet future housing and recreational needs of the population of Alsager; *Protecting existing residential amenity through the suitable design and layout of facilities; *Mitigating the impact of development through appropriate design solutions such as SuDs and S106 contributions</li> <li>• Should include some employment use on the site</li> <li>• Should be retained for employment use only</li> <li>• Sports facilities should be made available to Alsager School</li> <li>• Retention of trees and hedgerows is essential as is connectivity to rest of the Town</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Higher Education use (inc. UTC) – Plan needs to be evidenced. No evidence submitted from appropriate bodies indicating suitability/need/viability of such a use</p> <p>Medical Practice use – As above, no evidence submitted to indicate the need for an additional practice</p> <p>Care, retail, community facilities and/or public house/take away/restaurant – Policy states (bullet point '3') that the development "could also include" such facilities, policy doesn't say that all such facilities have to be included</p> <p>Sports facilities – Sports pitches will be retained in accordance with required national standards of Sport England; some out-dated sports facilities may not be suitable to retain but the development of the site overall has to include sports/leisure facilities</p> <p>Employment land/uses– Employment land for Alsager provided elsewhere in Plan (eg. part of existing Radway Green site, Radway Green extension site, part of Twyfords &amp; Cardway site retained); any uses in addition to Housing on site would provide small levels of employment</p> <p>Arboriculture/landscape – Arboricultural &amp; Landscape Assessments/proposals would be required with any application; "strong boundaries around the site" and "Green Infrastructure" are requirements of the policy</p> <p>Highways – Transport Assessment would be required with any application, which would cover eg. access, parking and any surrounding road improvement requirements</p> <p>Brownfield land – Majority of the site is brownfield; sports facilities (inc. outdoor space/sports pitches) are included as part the policy/development of the site</p> <p>Infrastructure &amp; affordable housing (viability) - Provision for infrastructure requirements – eg. road improvements, pupil school places - and affordable housing are dealt with by policy (which allow flexibility)</p> |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy Context: delete para. 7, insert para 110 to National Policy. Insert priority 6: Prepare for an increasingly older population in SCS priorities.</li><li>• Site justification wording has been altered to include; - Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</li><li>• No other material change required</li></ul> |
|-----------------------|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS14: Radway Green Brownfield, Alsager</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 39 (Support: 35 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with site and support development of industry/commercial in this area</li> <li>• Support regeneration and redevelopment of the site on existing footprint</li> <li>• Road system needs some improvement – close level crossing and put in a new bridge on another site; improvements to the M6 junction 16</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to re-opening the Radway Green Station - sustainable form of transport – particularly useful if HS2 come through the area</li> <li>• Will create good employment opportunities for the local community</li> <li>• Support use of Brownfield first approach as opposed to use of green field sites</li> <li>• Site is within walking distance of the town/sustainable location</li> <li>• Level of contaminated land remediation will be a costly procedure therefore there is an opportunity to designate a Greenfield site adjacent for residential which will help to contribute towards this cost</li> <li>• This is a sound and logical proposition</li> <li>• Good employment site adjacent other M6</li> <li>• Improved cycle links should be proposed from site to Alsager – for example following the line of Alsagers Brook to Well Lane and connecting into the developments and to Close Lane</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None received</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question the need to use Green Belt land for employment given the reduction of level of employment proposed on the Basford Sites, Crewe</li> <li>• Whilst Alsager would benefit from additional employment opportunities there are good links with the Basford sites from Alsager</li> <li>• Desk based archaeological assessment is required for this site due to Cold War interest, to assess whether there are any original buildings and structures which require preservation or recording</li> <li>• Development site need to have due regard to the proximity of the level crossing</li> <li>• Area of land available will be reduced for bridge approaches</li> <li>• Placing of buildings may be affected by Explosives Regulations due to proximity of Ordnance factory nearby</li> <li>• No mention of the potential use of the siding on the south side of Railway</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require a desk-based archaeological assessment</li> <li>• The need for some ‘enabling development’ should be recognised in the pre-submission document as a potential solution to overcoming the constraint of contamination at this site</li> <li>• Provision of sustainable transport should include a station with local pedestrian access, parking and cycle facilities</li> <li>• Radway Green train station should be re-opened</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives should be offered to business to open there</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>It is considered that the policy as currently drafted in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is appropriate to achieve the vision and objectives of the Local Plan. The Employment Land Review identified the area adjacent to this site as well-established, attractive to the logistics sector and in a good commercial location.</p> <p>It is considered that with the incorporation of Green Infrastructure for the purposes of screening and environmental improvement to site will sit comfortably within its setting.</p> <p>With regards to the highways and infrastructure improvements issues raised it is clear within the policy that re-development of the site will include the requirement for contribution towards relevant transport and highways infrastructure improvements, including the M6 junction. The highway improvements are detailed in the Infrastructure Plan and are likely to be funded through CIL/S106 contributions.</p> <p>The land owner has proposed some 'enabling' residential development due to likely costly contaminated land issues of development the existing site. However, the plan clearly sets out a sufficient level of residential development within Alsager and therefore there is no further need to allocate additional Green Belt land in this area for housing.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include an additional requirement for a desk based archaeological assessment to assess whether there are any original buildings and structures which require preservation or recording.</li> <li>• Policy Context: delete para 7, insert para 110 to National Policy.</li> <li>• Site justification wording has been altered to include; - Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS15: Radway Green Extension, Alsager</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 48 (Support: 3 / Object: 43 / Comment Only: 2)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Developer agrees with the allocation and consider it should be extended further to include the small triangle of land between the road, motorway and railway</li> <li>• Newcastle Under Lyme Borough Council supports the delivery of the Radway Green Extension Site providing it is phased in the last 5 years of the Plan period – would object to releasing the land earlier than 2025</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to construction of industrial buildings on green field land in the Green Belt, no exceptional circumstances have been advanced to prove the need</li> <li>• Question the need for the amount of employment sites needed given the reduction proposed on the Basford sites which have been allocated for solely employment uses for many years</li> <li>• Loss of good agricultural land and associated farming jobs and local produce</li> <li>• There are sufficient industrial buildings in Stoke, Newcastle and Crewe</li> <li>• Employment site at Basford is more sustainably located, adjacent to motorway and train station and would not impact on the Green Belt</li> <li>• If there is an need for such development it should be created in Towns and Cities not in rural areas</li> <li>• The proposed development was not positively prepared</li> <li>• There is insufficient infrastructure to support this industrial development</li> <li>• Local Road networks need improvement</li> <li>• Proposal will create, noise, vibration and light pollution to the local residents</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstances demonstrated to permit the alteration of the Green Belt in this position – not in accordance with the NPPF</li> <li>• Improvements to the M6 junction area will be required – all ready very congested</li> <li>• Initiatives to regenerate Crewe, Newcastle and Stoke would be adversely effected by development this close to the M6 Junction 16</li> <li>• Employment proposal on the existing Radway Green site is sufficient</li> <li>• Unsustainable location</li> <li>• Green Belt review concludes that any changes to the boundaries would be inappropriate</li> <li>• The type of business development which will use the site will be distribution and haulage firms which will add to the existing traffic situation in the area</li> <li>• Site should not be safeguarded for future use</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> <li>• Phasing of the site is appropriate to ensure that the existing Radway Green site is developed first</li> <li>• Provision of employment land has to be accompanied by a coherent plan to achieve growth and this is not evident in the Core Strategy</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although use of green field land is unfortunate it would appear to be a sensible solution to extend the site if there is need for such employment land</li> <li>• Access to the site need improving</li> <li>• Level crossing should be closed and a bridge constructed</li> <li>• If site is approved and taken out of Green Belt, the properties of Oak Tree Barn and Rose Trees Farmhouse on Radway Green Road should also be removed from the Green Belt and left as open countryside or designated as part of the industrial estate; the land would no longer serve any strategic function associated with Green Belt; and the land may be needed for access or as part of the site</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove site from the plan</li> <li>• Remove Oak Tree Barn and Rose Trees Farmhouse from the Green Belt if the farm land that surrounds them is also removed to create an extension of the Radway Green Industrial Estate</li> <li>• Include the small triangle of land between the Road, motorway and railway.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>It is considered that the policy as currently drafted in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is appropriate to achieve the vision and objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>This proposal is a logical and sustainable extension to the existing Brownfield site, and will be brought forward as a phased development, which will continue beyond the plan period. The site is close to Junction 16 of the M6 motorway.</p> <p>There is an area of land to the rear of the existing Radway Green Brownfield site which was not previously included within the Green Belt and is now proposed to be included within the Green Belt. This will help to mitigate for some of the loss of greenfield land for the Radway Green Extension site. This will be considered further within the Site Allocations and Development Plan Document stage.</p> <p>The future development of this site is conditional upon contributions towards highway infrastructure improvements are made, notably link capacity on the A500, an upgrading of Junction 16 on the M6 and improvement to the A5020 Weston Road junction and the Crewe Green Link Road. It is also envisaged that improvements to public transport, pedestrian and cycle access to the site will be carried out. Funding for highways improvements will be sought through CIL/S106 contributions.</p> <p>With regards to the impact the employment site would have on regeneration in other Crewe, Newcastle and Stoke, it is considered that there is a need to supply employment around the Borough close to existing and future residential areas. Furthermore as it can be seen in the Newcastle Borough Council consultation response there is support to the proposed site extension, subject to the extension site being brought forward in the latter part of the plan period.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No material changes are proposed to the policy wording however the allocation of this site will require an adjustment to the Green Belt boundary. However, it is intended that the Site Allocations and Development Policies document will review the detailed Green Belt boundary to the south west of the existing Radway Green area to include this area within the Green Belt.</li> </ul>   |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy Context: delete para 7, insert paras 83, 110, 120 and 126 in National Policy.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Congleton</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 52 (Support: 4 / Object: 35 / Comment Only: 13)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The general idea of an urban extension to Congleton along with the link road seems sound.</li> <li>• Needs to be a genuine employment led initiative.</li> <li>• Development should be planned and not haphazard and we feel that the adoption of the plan, albeit with more safeguards for the green areas and some further clarification of the impacts, is the right approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections to Congleton Link Road</li> <li>• Objections to the focus of the Congleton Link Road to the north of the Town. It should instead connect to A34 and take into account north – south traffic flows through the town</li> <li>• The increase in Congleton’s housing stock by over 30% in twenty years (actually 3,500 houses over 17 years at the date of this consultation) is ambitious by any standards and would seem unrealistic for a town of Congleton’s size, infrastructure and needs – needs justification</li> <li>• The proposed sites do not have a good relationship to the existing town and without genuine employment led growth there is a risk that they will become isolated, dormitory estates with a massive increase in commuter traffic</li> <li>• Infrastructure provision is unclear and inadequate</li> <li>• Concern that Congleton Link Road will not be delivered</li> <li>• Comprehensive transport assessment required</li> <li>• It is necessary to ensure that housing development is not held back by the requirement to deliver employment sites first. Policies should support complementary growth in this area through appropriate smaller sites. This is an important consideration given that (subject to the Manchester Road sites) the delivery of the identified strategic sites is dependant on the location of the Link Road, which is still being consulted upon. As this approach is heavily reliant on timing, the Council needs to ensure it has a range and choice of sites available in case of slippage.</li> <li>• The Corridor of Interest is far too large and will result in enormously disproportionate development on the one side of town. Instead, the link road should pass through the middle of the designated development areas</li> <li>• Impacts negatively on good quality agricultural land that has capacity to support sustainable food production for the future.</li> <li>• Concerned about the effects of the loss of such a large green area on the visual and economic aspects of the town and feel that there are no adequate safeguards to preserve those amenities such as fields, hedgerows and trees which are so highly valued by the community.</li> <li>• A more proportionate and realistic growth plan for Congleton is required</li> <li>• The Non-Preferred Site at Congleton West (NPS36) should be identified as a Strategic Site to deliver housing growth in Congleton</li> </ul> |

- The Non Preferred Site at Congleton West (NPS36) should be expanded to include land to the south west of Holmes Chapel Road and land at Sandy Lane/Sandbach Road, and allocated as part of a Strategic Site to deliver housing growth in Congleton.
  - Forecasts for housing, population & job growth are unrealistic.
  - Build on brownfield sites first.
- Comment Only**
- Site submitted for consideration, Boundary Lane, Congleton – 39 Dwellings
  - Adequate safeguards in relation to noise, air quality and environmental impact are required
  - Need cross town bus routes
  - A strategic gap between Congleton and Marton / Eaton / Astbury is required
  - Masterplan required for the whole town which considers the interrelationship between the sites and link road.
  - Retail provision in the allocations will have to be carefully considered so as to not impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.
  - Traffic congestion concerns as there may be problems in Padgbury Lane and Wall Hill Lane
  - Road and employment needs to be delivered before the housing
  - Significant numbers of permissions being granted in absence of Local Plan
  - Feasibility, viability and deliverability study needed to sit alongside allocations
  - Steps need to be taken to ensure that the employment areas are delivered no later than (and preferably prior to) the housing
  - The route for the link road is not clearly defined.
  - There needs to be a strategic plan for the internal road system of Congleton
  - A clear infrastructure plan should be included delivery timetable required
  - Congleton Bypass corridor of interest includes the Church of St Michael and Brickhouse Farmhouse, Hulme Walfield -both listed. Stables at Home Farm and Icehouse, Eaton Hall, Eaton to south of corridor of interest but setting could be impacted upon. Sites do not directly affect designated heritage assets.
  - The delivery rates for the Congleton sites are optimistic.
  - There is no phasing for the “Site Allocations”, this phasing should be provided so that the house building for the plan period can be fully understood
  - The Local Plan acknowledges that there is an aging population yet there is no mention of the provision of homes/care for the elderly.
  - Have the likely impacts of fracking in the Congleton area been considered?
  - Has Cheshire East taken into consideration what the new high speed rail network means for Congleton?
  - The development of the five new sites would appear to split the town into two distinct areas. It is not at all clear how the sites will be good for the town centre. Retail outlets already exist on Barn Road and each of the new sites will have a small retail site.
  - There are areas that are known to present a flood risk (i.e. Dane Valley). What measures and funding will Cheshire East put in place to ensure that flooding will not occur and residents are able to insure their properties at reasonable costs?
  - Dane Valley: The River cuts a deep wooded path through the town, forming

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>the primary green corridor of Congleton. Industrial development has already had a considerable impact to both north and east. Further building will only devalue an amenity. The river should be preserved as a central feature and sensitive planning could mitigate the impact on the landscape around this area. We note that a corridor along the river Dane is subject to some protection and believe that any development in the areas identified in the local plan along this route should be well back from the river banks and should be adequately screened from view from the river side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Habitat and ecological surveys are needed.</li> <li>• Feasibility and demand survey needed on employment provision on the site</li> <li>• It is not clear if the proposed number of houses is 2700 or 2922.</li> <li>• The identified sites require a higher provision of employment land and development should be genuinely employment-led.</li> <li>• Concerned over impact on Astbury and its Conservation Area</li> <li>• Loss of open countryside and impact on agricultural land - visual and economic impacts.</li> <li>• No consideration of whether sufficient primary, secondary or nursery or care for elderly is to be provided through the plan</li> <li>• Land at Waggs Road is well suited to accommodate part of this growth, being capable of accommodating over 100 dwellings.</li> <li>• Build a tram link from the Railway station to the town centre and out to the new developments.</li> <li>• Insist all new buildings have solar panels.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive transport assessment required</li> <li>• Link Road should run to the A34</li> <li>• References to Link Road removed and growth scaled back</li> <li>• Build on brownfield sites and do not destroy the countryside. Keep Congleton as a market town not a giant housing estate.</li> <li>• Section should support complementary growth in respect housing and employment</li> <li>• Change wording to remove 'employment led' growth.</li> <li>• Additional / alternative sites in Congleton identified</li> <li>• Strategic Gap required to surrounding parishes</li> <li>• Justification for high growth in Congleton needed</li> <li>• Road should be built before any housing estates.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p><u>Highways</u></p> <p>The Congleton Link Road will meet a number of objectives including the reduction of town centre congestion, supporting the regeneration of Congleton and improving access to Congleton Business Park and Radnor Park Trading Estate. It is also considered that the reduction of traffic through the town centre will improve air quality in the town. It is considered that the proposed routes to the north of the town will meet the overall objectives stated above and are therefore is the most appropriate scheme for the town at this time.</p> <p>Congleton's highway network is congested at peak times, a function of the limited number of river crossings and the convergence of several main roads in the town, this has resulted in the declaration several Air Quality Management Areas. Tests were undertaken to understand the level of existing traffic delay compared with</p>   |

the level of delay expected in the future with development. This was then used to shape the level and location of development and any necessary mitigation measures.

In order to minimise the level of delay and deliver wider benefits, a mitigation scheme has been developed to help manage the level of impact on the highway network. This involves improvements to the existing A34 corridor through the town.

As an alternative to the local mitigation strategy the council is promoting a new link road between the A536 and A534. This has wider benefits over and above the base mitigation strategy, including improving access to employment, addressing Air Quality management areas, reducing community severance on existing routes and improving strategic highway links across the Borough.

The new single carriageway Congleton Link road to link the A536 Macclesfield Road to the A534 Sandbach Road will mitigate the proposed development impact on the highway network, provide an improvement over the existing operation of the highway network and provide a range of wider benefits.

The schemes above are included in the Local Infrastructure Plan and will be part funded through the CIL. The majority of the scheme funding for the new A536 – A534 link road will be the subject of a funding bid for central government funding.

Public Consultation, scheme development and funding bid success will assess the likelihood of the link road scheme proceeding. If not, the base mitigation strategy will allow the proposed development to be delivered without severe highway impacts.

The nature of the existing observed movements in the Congleton area is such that public transport is not a viable alternative to the private car for most trips. However, targeted travel planning and investment in Local Public Transport will be investigated, to achieve a reduction in the number of new vehicle trips on the highway network.

There is a committed scheme for the M6 junction 17 improvements (new roundabout on northbound slip and signals on southbound slip).

The Corridor of Interest has been replaced by the representation of the different route options being consulted upon.

#### Scale of development

Congleton is expected to deliver in the order of 24 hectares of employment land and 3,500 new homes to deliver inward investment and employment led growth in the town. The approach for Key Service Centres has been to encourage inward investment to sustain the vitality and vibrancy of the area and deliver infrastructure and services in the town. It is important to note that the figures are intended as a guide and is neither a ceiling nor a target.

In respect the delivery of sites – a range of sites have been included in the Local Plan Strategy in Congleton to enable delivery throughout the plan period including

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>Strategic Locations to be delivered towards the end of the plan period and Local Plan Strategy Sites such as Giantswood Lane South which are intended to be delivered in the early / middle part of the plan period.</p> <p>It is considered that each site will be appropriately masterplanned and designed in order to mitigate impacts on surrounding parishes / the open countryside.</p> <p><u>Other points</u></p> <p>It is also considered that the retail provision set out on the sites is for local convenience retail and will not significantly impact on the town centre.</p> <p>It is appreciated that the River Dane should be considered a central feature of the scheme and its flooding impacts mitigated appropriately.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy accepts that there will be development of greenfield sites to meet housing targets and employment needs.</p> <p>There are no current proposals for fracking in the area. Minerals policy is outlined in policy SE10.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction to the Congleton section to be updated to reflect progress on the Congleton Link Road and the consultation on route options. The explanatory text, figures and maps to be updated as appropriate.</li> <li>• Add text to this section to note that the preferred route of the Congleton Link Road will form the northern boundary for the strategic locations at Back Lane / Radnor Park, Congleton Business Park and Giantswood Lane to Manchester Road Strategic Locations.</li> </ul>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Location SL6: Back Lane / Radnor Park, Congleton</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 19 (Support: 3 / Object: 12 / Comment Only: 4)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support principle of the Link Road and identification of site for mixed use</li> <li>• Comprehensive development of the site will facilitate the construction of the Link Road</li> <li>• Should be a Core Strategy site with defined boundaries</li> <li>• Delivery of site will meet market and affordable housing requirements</li> <li>• SHLAA 2538 is capable of delivering 500 dwellings</li> <li>• Represents a sustainable and appropriate location for growth subject to sensitive treatment of and provision of Green Links to the River Dane Site of Biological Importance</li> <li>• The area to the northwest of Congleton is: outside the floodplain of the River Dane; is not within the Green Belt; is within an area of lower-level topography and landscape character and provides an opportunity to develop a sustainable urban extension to Congleton for a mix of uses, without significant impact on designated wildlife sites.</li> <li>• A landowner of part of the Strategic Location supports this draft allocation to promote an exemplar development including the provision of areas of good quality open space, including natural and semi-natural habitat and wildlife corridors, within the strategic masterplanning of this area, to promote and enhance the biodiversity and nature conservation potential within the proposed development as a whole.</li> <li>• Leisure Hub is supported</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and traffic pollution impacts by increasing the size of the Radnor Park by 10 hectares seems unjustifiable to existing residents as well as new residents</li> <li>• Traffic congestion in the town does not justify the Link Road / allocation</li> <li>• Positioning of the Link Road will mean an increase in traffic in the town from the south (A34)</li> <li>• The new development should have an effective barrier (buffer zone) from the existing housing estate</li> <li>• The rural parishes should not be subsumed into Congleton.</li> <li>• Need to ensure employment uses are compatible with adjacent residential areas</li> <li>• SL6 is so large because of the overly ambitious growth plans for Congleton; furthermore it is sized to deal with additional housing beyond the plan horizon and it is not clear how this can be justified.</li> <li>• There will be market saturation in Congleton that impacts on delivery</li> <li>• Object to loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Unsustainable location</li> <li>• Object to 20 hectares allocated for employment / leisure use. This should be</li> </ul> |

10 hectares

- Residential capacity should be increased to approximately 1,100 – 1,255 dwellings, should be phased to bring forward allocations early and then leave later phases as a strategic location
- Fixed boundaries required for the site rather than being a strategic location
- Support for NPS36 (Padbury Lane) as a more suitable location
- Concerns over feasibility and deliverability of the sites
- Dane Valley is a designated Wildlife Corridor and a flood plain
- Does not fit with the proposals set out in the Congleton Town Strategy
- The potential of the site for a wide range of adverse impacts has not been established and therefore decisions made are not evidence based
- Impacts on Site of Biological Importance and protected Wildlife Corridor
- Site layout and viability considerations dictate capacity and therefore flexibility should be introduced into the policy. Masterplanning will dictate the final number which will be influenced by the Link Road. Suggest 750-1000 plus a minimum of 10 ha of employment land during the Plan period.
- Delivery mechanism needs to be considered in particular in relation to Leisure Hub concept. Contributions will be required from other sources and / or potentially CIL as a funding mechanism
- Delivery mechanism required for Primary School, costs of delivery should not fall to development only.
- Reference in justification for additional 500 units beyond the Plan period is an unnecessary limitation.
- Policy SE 14 needs to be mentioned in the policy context and included as a separate point within the 'site specific development principles'
- Negative impact on Town Centre
- No information provided on secondary schools, hospitals or other infrastructure
- Rural parishes should not be subsumed into Congleton

**Comment Only**

- Phasing for the delivery of the site should be removed
- Need effective buffers between edge of proposed development areas and ancient woodland / Site of Biological Importance.
- The western edge of the Back Lane and Radnor Park Site strategic Site should not cross Black Firs Lane to maintain a buffer between Somerford & Congleton.
- Boundaries are unclear in particular whether Somerford Triangle is included within the boundary of the site
- Significant care needed to protect the landscape value of land on edges of proposed site
- The Link Road needs to be provided as a whole early in the process otherwise even greater problems will exist with traffic routes through the town and deflect new employment interest from the town.
- The allocation should be limited to land within the line of the Link Road which should define the boundary of the built up area.
- External funding will be required
- Greater proportion of employment land should be allocated
- Western edge of the Back Lane and Radnor Park Site strategic Site should

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>not cross Black Firs Lane to maintain a buffer between Somerford &amp; Congleton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information required on the proposals and there implications on such matters such as infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Environment Agency - The Back Lane and Radnor Park site contains ancient woodland and is near to the River Dane Site of Special Scientific Interest, both features have been missed from the site information.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to define boundaries of the Strategic Location – should be considered a Core Strategy Site rather than Strategic Location</li> <li>• Should require an extensive archaeological field study</li> <li>• Reduce land allocated for employment / leisure use</li> <li>• Need to introduce flexibility into the policy and remove reference to additional 500 dwellings in justification</li> <li>• Need to refer to delivery mechanism for the proposals set out in the policy</li> <li>• Buffers should be referred to between uses (existing and proposed) including the River Dane and Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• The Back Lane and Radnor Park site contains ancient woodland and is near to the River Dane Site of Special Scientific Interest, both features have been missed from the site information.</li> <li>• Remove site and do not build Congleton Link Road</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Strategic Location to the north of Congleton presents the opportunity to deliver a high quality extension to Radnor Park Trading Estate alongside prominent leisure and recreational uses. Residential development will support this sustainable community.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Strategic Location are dependent on the preferred route of the Congleton Link Road and therefore its treatment as a strategic location is considered appropriate. The proportion of employment and leisure uses allocated to the site meet the sites overall objectives. The policy as currently worded is clear on the need for a comprehensive approach to the delivery of the site and the need to integrate with adjacent uses and locational assets of the area.</p> <p>The site is considered to be deliverable within the Local Plan Strategy period. A planning application has been submitted on part of the site (13/2746C relating to land between Black Firs Lane, Chelford Road and Holmes Chapel Road, for the erection of up to 180 dwellings, public open space, green infrastructure and associated works) and this will demonstrate the delivery of units early in the plan period as the detail on the remaining parts of the site are confirmed.</p> <p>The reference to a desk based archaeological study is considered appropriate and will identify where and if further more extensive work is required.</p> <p>Highways issues relating to the proposed Congleton Link Road have been responded to in the Congleton section (CP 84).</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>The following material changes are proposed to the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 3 amended as follows: ‘the delivery of 10 hectares of employment land adjacent to Radnor Park Trading Estate’</li> <li>• Point J added to ‘Future masterplanning should have reference to the River Dane Site of Biological Importance and Ancient Woodland’.</li> <li>• Point K added to ‘Future development should also have consideration to Policy SE14 (Jodrell Bank)’</li> <li>• Paragraph 15.217 has been amended to read ‘the preferred route of the</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Congleton Link Road will form the northern boundary for the site’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Paragraph 15.218 from the Pre-Submission Core Strategy – ‘Additional development land beyond the plan period will be identified in the Site Allocation and Development Policies document for 500 dwellings’ has been deleted from the policy alongside reference in the indicative site delivery section.</li><li>• Reference to Planning application 13/2746C relating to land between Black Firs Lane, Chelford Road and Holmes Chapel Road, for the erection of up to 180 dwellings, public open space, green infrastructure and associated works has been submitted on a section of the Strategic Location has been added to the site justification for this policy.</li><li>• Point B amended as follows: ‘The provision of a network of open spaces for nature conservation and recreation, including access to and enhancement of the River Dane Corridor’.</li><li>• Policy Context: add paras 109, 112 and 117 to National Policy. Add Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities. Add Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to Local Evidence.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Strategic Location SL7: Congleton Business Park Extension</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 11 (Support: 1 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to address the problems of Congleton including the satisfying locally generated housing and employment needs as well as providing the link road to resolve the severe traffic congestion in the town especially on the A34 and its junctions.</li> <li>• There is an excellent opportunity to create sustainable communities through a clearly articulated, co-ordinated and comprehensive approach, delivering the principle infrastructure elements and the quantum of development expected, which is entirely in step with the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• Strategy needs to set the scene for a well ordered stream of individual planning applications which can come forward in due course, delivering housing, employment land and infrastructure when it is required</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsustainable and the site is too large</li> <li>• Object to loss of open countryside and agricultural land</li> <li>• Object to destruction of wood to the east of Mount Pleasant Farm</li> <li>• Negative impact on Hulme Walfield</li> <li>• Object to potential for housing sprawl</li> <li>• Justification for the Link Road and therefore this site is unconvincing</li> <li>• Traffic congestion in the town does not justify the Link Road / allocation</li> <li>• Positioning of the Link Road will mean an increase in traffic in the town from the south (A34)</li> <li>• Support for NPS36 (Padbury Lane) as a more suitable location</li> <li>• Site flanks Forge and Radnor Woods, which are ancient woodland and an SBI, part of the Dane valley. Buffer zone between the proposals and these uses and existing / proposed development is inadequate</li> <li>• Site is indicative and information should be clearer on proposals</li> <li>• Proposal not included as part of the Congleton Town Strategy work and this proposal is not evidence based</li> <li>• The road and this site may not be deliverable</li> <li>• The emerging Cheshire East Local Plan anticipates that 2500 houses and 25 ha of employment land are accommodated to the south of the route of the Congleton Link Road. The reality is that this alignment will become the northern boundary to future growth and it is therefore absolutely vital that the development capacity of the encompassed land is confirmed through the Core Strategy, the underpinning evidence base and further discussion with interested parties.</li> <li>• Negative impact on Town Centre</li> <li>• No information provided on secondary schools or hospitals or other infrastructure</li> <li>• Rural parishes should not be subsumed into Congleton</li> </ul> |

**Comment Only**

- Important to conserve the best of the existing landscape and add to it to soften the impact on the surrounding countryside which is within the Dane Valley Area of Special Landscape Value and described in the supporting document "Local Landscape Designations" as having special qualities. If any reduction in requirements for development in Congleton should arise then this site designation should be reconsidered.
- Proposals need to include feasibility and environmental assessment
- The line of the Link Road should define the extent of the settlement boundary and this site. External funding would be needed whichever option for the line of the road is chosen as contributions from the proposed development could not fully fund the scheme.
- Such a by-pass needs to be extended as far as the A527 Biddulph road. However the developments are all on a single side of town, far from the centre, making the town less balanced and nuclear than if the developments had been to the south and south west of the centre.  
While it is good that some employment land is designated, this should be in greater proportion.
- The employment parts of the developments should be as central to Congleton as possible, to minimise the need for commuting by road: central locations would enable considerable travel to and from work on foot.
- The "Congleton Link Road Corridor of Interest" is far too large and will result in enormously disproportionate development on the one side of town. Instead, the link road should pass through the middle of the designated development areas, which will also vastly reduce the amount of virgin countryside / excellent farmland required.
- Full cost of Link Road cannot be funded viably by the development sites alone.
- Alignment and routing of the Congleton Link Road: to provide sufficient land footprint to deliver the housing, employment and community uses expected in the area, recognising both the physical and natural constraints of the landscape and the technical constraints that such infrastructure introduces in its own right. In some instances such an alignment may not be optimal in terms of highway design;
- Location of Access Points: as part of a flexible access strategy in order to avoid ransom positions in order for land to deliver the housing, employment and community uses expected in the area. Again in terms of junction positioning, such a strategy may not be optimal in terms of highway design;
- A mechanism to fund the new link road at an appropriate and viable time, without prejudicing any particular landowner or their ability to make planning applications within the framework of the emerging Local Plan. This may require the consideration of an incremental phasing plan depending on funding availability, coordination of infrastructure delivery and mechanisms to remove blockages to development delivery.
- The development can only be justified to help fund the Link Road which will enhance the employment prospects of the town and reduce traffic bottlenecks though at a price of severe detriment to the Dane Valley ASCV.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy needs to set the scene for a well ordered stream of individual planning applications which can come forward in due course, delivering housing, employment land and infrastructure when it is required</li> <li>• Comprehensive and co-ordinated development</li> <li>• Needs to refer to Jodrell Bank policy and any landscape designations</li> <li>• Site flanks Forge and Radnor Woods, which are ancient woodland and an SBI, part of the Dane valley. Buffer zone between the proposals and these uses and existing / proposed development is inadequate</li> <li>• Clearer boundaries of the site required</li> <li>• Need to consider landscape impacts</li> <li>• Remove site and do not build Congleton Link Road</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Strategic Location to the north of Congleton presents the opportunity to deliver a high quality extension to Congleton Business Park alongside other uses. The boundaries of the Strategic Location are dependent on the preferred route of the Congleton Link Road and therefore its treatment as a strategic location is considered appropriate. The policy as currently worded is clear on the need for a comprehensive approach to the delivery of the site and the need to integrate with adjacent uses and locational assets of the area.</p> <p>The site is considered to be deliverable within the Local Plan Strategy period alongside the preferred route of the Congleton Link Road. Further detail will be included in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.</p> <p>Highways issues relating to the proposed Congleton Link Road have been responded to in the Congleton section (CP 84).</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>The following material changes to be made to this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 3 - The delivery of 10 hectares of land for employment and commercial uses adjacent to Congleton Business Park;</li> <li>• Additional point J Future masterplanning should have reference to the River Dane Site of Biological Importance and Ancient Woodland.</li> <li>• Additional point K -Future development should also have consideration to Policy SE14 (Jodrell Bank)</li> <li>• Removal of reference to additional land being allocated beyond the plan period presented in the indicative site delivery section</li> </ul> <p>Policy Context: add paras 109, 112 and 117 to National Policy. Add Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities. Add Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to Local Evidence.</p>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS16: Giantswood Lane South, Congleton</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 13 (Support: 0 / Object: 9 / Comment Only: 4)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If required to support the link road this site seems a logical place to have new housing development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Least bad' option for Congleton future development but should be phased for later in the plan period on the basis that brownfield sites will be available by then reducing the need for development here.</li> <li>• Negative impact on Town Centre</li> <li>• No information provided on secondary schools or hospitals or other infrastructure</li> <li>• Negative impact on infrastructure and traffic congestion</li> <li>• Rural parishes should not be subsumed into Congleton</li> <li>• Conserve this site not develop it</li> <li>• Impact on open countryside and agricultural land</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of the area</li> <li>• Impact on landscape, local character and represents urban sprawl</li> <li>• Site will imbalance the pattern of development in Congleton</li> <li>• Density of site should be increased to mitigate the consumption of agricultural land on other sites in Congleton</li> <li>• NPS 36 is a more appropriate and sustainable site</li> <li>• Should be no requirement for contribution to the Link Road – S.106 contributions to the link road would not fairly and reasonably relate to the development itself and would not be compliant with CIL regulations.</li> <li>• No contribution to Link Road was requested to land on the southern part of site CS17 (approved in outline in July 2013).</li> <li>• <b>Comment Only</b></li> <li>• Access can only be achieved from Manchester Road</li> <li>• Increase the density of housing on this site.</li> <li>• Contributions from the sites along its line, whichever route is chosen cannot fully fund the scheme.</li> <li>• A desk-based archaeological assessment is required for this site, with appropriate mitigation, if required.</li> <li>• Any development would require sympathetic tree planting</li> <li>• Such a by-pass needs to be extended as far as the A527 Biddulph road. However the developments are ALL on a single side of town, far from the centre, making the town less balanced and nuclear than if the developments had been to the south and south west of the centre.<br/>While it is good that some employment land is designated, this should be in greater proportion.</li> <li>• The employment parts of the developments should be as central to Congleton as possible, to minimise the need for commuting by road: central locations would enable considerable travel to and from work on foot.</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The "Congleton Link Road Corridor of Interest" is far too large and will result in enormously disproportionate development on the one side of town. Instead, the link road should pass through the middle of the designated development areas, which will also vastly reduce the amount of virgin countryside / excellent farmland required.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase site density</li> <li>Desk based assessment required on landscape / historic character</li> <li>Sympathetic tree planting required</li> <li>Remove site from the Local Plan Strategy</li> <li>Provide more detail in terms of layout</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The site is considered deliverable within the early part of the plan period as it can be delivered without the construction of the Congleton Link Road. Information on infrastructure is provided through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The density of the proposed site is considered appropriate with wording designed to deliver an appropriate scheme in its landscape setting. This delivery of this site is considered the first element of a larger scheme and as such contributions to the Congleton Link Road are considered appropriate as the delivery of the Congleton Link Road will mitigate some of the highway impacts of the development.</p> <p>Additional details of the development will be provided in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>The following material changes to be made to this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional point 'J' added: Future masterplanning should consider the use of SuDs to manage surface run off from the site</li> <li>Additional Point 'K' added: A desk-based archaeological assessment should be undertaken, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>Additional Point I added: Future development should also have consideration to Policy SE14 (Jodrell Bank)</li> <li>Additional point m added: contributions to education and health infrastructure.</li> <li>Additional point m added: contributions to education and health infrastructure.</li> <li>Additional point m added: contributions to education and health infrastructure.</li> <li>Policy Context: add paragraphs 50, 112 and 117 to National Policy, add Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Strategic Location SL8: Giantswood Lane to Manchester Road, Congleton</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 10 (Support: 0 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 2)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If required to support the link road this site seems a logical place to have new housing development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is too large and would represent an overdevelopment of the area</li> <li>• Brownfield development should be the priority close to industry</li> <li>• Negative impact on Town Centre</li> <li>• No information provided on secondary schools or hospitals or other infrastructure</li> <li>• Negative impact on infrastructure and traffic congestion</li> <li>• Rural parishes should not be subsumed into Congleton</li> <li>• Conserve this site not develop it</li> <li>• Adverse impact on open countryside, wildlife and agricultural land</li> <li>• Impact on landscape, local character and represents urban sprawl</li> <li>• Site will imbalance the pattern of development in Congleton</li> <li>• Density of site should be increased to mitigate the consumption of agricultural land on other sites in Congleton</li> <li>• NPS 36 is a more appropriate and sustainable site</li> <li>• Ensure buffer is maintained with surrounding parishes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the density of housing on this site.</li> <li>• Contributions from the sites along its line, whichever route is chosen cannot fully fund the scheme whichever option for a route is chosen.</li> <li>• A desk-based archaeological assessment is required for this site, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>• Any development would require sympathetic tree planting</li> <li>• More detail of development is required in terms of layout and wildlife and countryside impacts.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase site density</li> <li>• Desk based assessment required on landscape / historic character</li> <li>• Sympathetic tree planting required</li> <li>• Remove site and do not build Congleton Link Road</li> <li>• More information required on Link Road and infrastructure provision</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The Strategic Location to the north of Congleton presents the opportunity to deliver a high quality sustainable community set in ample green space. The boundaries of the Strategic Location are dependent on the preferred route of the Congleton Link Road and therefore its treatment as a strategic location is considered appropriate, as is its density. The policy as currently worded is clear on the need for a comprehensive approach to the delivery of the site and the need to integrate with adjacent uses and locational assets of the area.</p>  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>The site is considered to be deliverable within the Local Plan Strategy period alongside the preferred route of the Congleton Link Road. Further detail will be included in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. Highways issues relating to the proposed Congleton Link Road have been responded to in the Congleton section (CP 84).</p>  |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <p>The following material changes to be made to this policy:<br/> Site Specific Principles of Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional point i added: requirement for affordable housing.</li> <li>• Additional point j added: Future development should also have consideration to Policy SE14 (Jodrell Bank)</li> <li>• Additional point k added: Future masterplanning should consider the use of SuDS to manage surface run off from the site</li> <li>• Additional Point l added: A desk-based archaeological assessment should be undertaken, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>• Policy context: add paragraphs 100, 109, 112 and 117 to National Policy, add priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS17: Manchester Road to Macclesfield Road, Congleton</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 9 (Support: 1 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A logical extension to the settlement boundary and can take access to Manchester Road (A34) on one of its less congested stretches</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Least bad' option for Congleton future development but should be phased for later in the plan period on the basis that brownfield sites will be available by then reducing the need for development here.</li> <li>• Negative impact on Town Centre</li> <li>• No information on associated infrastructure such as schools and hospitals</li> <li>• Allocation is too large</li> <li>• Not enough information provided on the sites</li> <li>• Traffic congestion impact</li> <li>• This development will imbalance Congleton</li> <li>• NPS 36 Padgbury Lane is a more suitable and sustainable site</li> <li>• More information required on Link Road, infrastructure provision and ensure buffer is maintained with surrounding parishes.</li> <li>• Need to ensure businesses do not have detrimental impact on local area.</li> <li>• The housing allocation for Congleton is so large in relation to the size and area of the town that development may spill over into the surrounding rural parishes. The rural parishes should not be subsumed into Congleton.</li> <li>• Proposals will completely destroy one of the most rural and agricultural parts of this area. Other brown sites could also be utilised and concentrations of new housing reduced for all areas</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A desk-based archaeological assessment is required for this site, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>• Increase density of housing on the site</li> <li>• Ensure buffer is maintained with surrounding parishes</li> <li>• The full cost of the Link Road cannot viably be met by contributions from the identified development sites, which includes this one.</li> <li>• The developments are all on a single side of town, far from the centre, making the town less balanced and nuclear than if the developments had been to the south and south west of the centre.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A desk-based archaeological assessment is required for this site, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>• Increase density of housing on the site</li> <li>• Ensure buffer is maintained with surrounding parishes</li> <li>• The link road should pass through the middle of the designated development areas, which will also vastly reduce the amount of virgin countryside / excellent farmland required.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment</b>  | The site is considered a sustainable and logical extension to Congleton. Its   |

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>phasing is considered appropriate given that it is proposed as a Local Plan Strategy site and not a strategic location and has defined boundaries. Information on infrastructure is provided within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The policy states that the site should integrate with its surroundings and therefore the site will consider its relationship to surrounding parishes and open countryside. It is considered that the delivery of the site will not have a negative impact upon Congleton Town Centre as the provision of 300 square metres of retail uses relates to convenience retail for local use.</p> <p>Highways issues relating to the proposed Congleton Link Road have been responded to in the Congleton section (CP 84).</p>                     |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>     | <p>The following material changes to be made to this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional point 'J' added: requirement for affordable housing</li> <li>• Additional point k added: Future masterplanning should consider the use of SuDS to manage surface run off from the site</li> <li>• Additional Point 'l' added: A desk-based archaeological assessment should be undertaken, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>• Additional point 'm' added: Development proposals should positively address and mitigate any impacts on the adjacent Cranberry Moss</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paragraphs 100 and 112 to National Policy, add Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Handforth</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 7 (Support: 0 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None registered</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development planned for Handforth is not sustainable or necessary</li> <li>• Creating two Handforths will affect the community identity and the area will become part of Greater Manchester</li> <li>• New community will be too far from the railway station</li> <li>• Additional traffic congestion</li> <li>• Handforth is part of Wilmslow and the Local Plan should reflect this</li> <li>• There are numerous brownfield sites available for development</li> <li>• Need to maintain the Green Belt between Wilmslow / Handforth / Dean Row and Greater Manchester</li> <li>• Handforth is a Key Service Centre but no strategic sites have been identified; this fails to recognise sites classed as developable in the SHLAA (e.g. site ref 3527) which would be a sustainable urban extension</li> <li>• Not clear why the North Cheshire Growth Village has been selected over sites in the existing settlement</li> <li>• The North Cheshire Growth Village site is on perhaps the most valuable piece of Green Belt in Cheshire East. Not clear why other, less valuable sites have not been selected for development (including the proposed safeguarded land at Wilmslow)</li> <li>• The fundamental purpose of Green Belt in North Cheshire is to prevent urban sprawl from Manchester into Cheshire. It would make sense to use other areas such as south west of Macclesfield (identified as safeguarded) rather than land at Handforth which is adjacent to the conurbation.</li> <li>• with natural meadows, ponds, grazing land, great biodiversity including protected species, landscape value with views to Pennines,</li> <li>• The amount of housing proposed at the North Cheshire Growth Village is way in excess of the identified need for Handforth. Will meet the needs of other communities but take up all of Handforth's open spaces</li> <li>• The need for housing in Handforth is primarily for social rented housing</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No indication where the 200 houses for Handforth (in addition to North Cheshire Growth Village) would be located. Suggest the sites L, K, J and G from the Handforth Town Strategy are appropriate, sustainable and would support the local community</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic sites should be included for Handforth instead of the North Cheshire Growth Village</li> <li>• Delete the North Cheshire Growth Village proposal</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | Specific issues regarding the North Cheshire Growth Village are addressed in the report for that site and specific issues regarding Green Belt are addressed in the  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>report for Green Belt policy. Sites have been selected following consideration of all the evidence available. The findings of the Green Belt Assessment are important but not determinative. The needs arising from within Handforth will be adequately met from sites within the settlement plus a proportion of the development at the North Cheshire Growth Village. Any sites required to meet the housing requirement figure for Handforth over and above the existing commitments and completions in Handforth will be identified through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | No material changes  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Knutsford</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 26 (Support: 4 / Object: 16 / Comment Only: 6)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support</li> <li>• We support CEC's local plan, and have aligned with other Knutsford Community Groups. We insist that the final Local plan includes: No commercial or Employment land in NW Knutsford (proposed in site B); and reduction of the size and scale of Safeguarded land (removal of site B from this proposal).</li> <li>• Support for the current proposals in the Local Plan with some caveats.</li> <li>• Proposals broadly supported with essential safeguards on location, design, density and landscaping to preserve the quality of life and visitor economy of the town. Safeguarded land is excessive and should be distributed more evenly. Improvements in road, public transport, educational and sports provision, health are essential requirements integral to development</li> <li>• There should be an absolute overall cap of new dwellings of 600. The number of new dwellings in the Green Belt should be limited to 300 wherever they are situated.</li> <li>• The 230 dwellings on the brown field site are supported as are 70 in the town centre with the possibility of adding other new housing units by refurbishment of existing premises or change of use to residential. the provision of affordable housing to be within striking distance of town centre and meet residency criteria</li> <li>• The 150 dwellings proposed for the north east side of A50 Manchester Rd [Site C] should be screened by judicious arborial planting and landscaping to retain the rural nature of the northern approaches to the town on the A50 and Mereheath Lane</li> <li>• The existing sports and playing field facilities should not only be retained but enhanced by relocating and enlarging</li> <li>• Egerton Primary School and its playing fields on the adjacent housing site in the process of solving the underprovision of primary places in north Knutsford. This would provide the opportunity not only to strengthen the underprovided sports and physical activity provision for the town as a whole but also to provide community accommodation for pre-school and youth organisations and replace the meeting space now lost to the Curzon Cinema. The houses provided should follow a design brief that complements the existing vernacular architecture of the rest of the town</li> <li>• The choice of site is acceptable for the other 150 houses proposed in the Green Belt for N Knutsford on the Northwich Rd [Site A]. They should receive similar screening and landscaping treatment</li> <li>• The area allocated to the 300 houses in the Green Belt is generous. It should be used to the full to create green corridors, pleasant green spaces. House should not be bunched in one area to offer developers further build opportunities</li> <li>• The recent proposal for 150 houses on Booths Park should be considered</li> </ul> |

within the overall cap of 600 houses and 150 on Green Belt land.

- Highways improvements in the town centre
- Improvements to educational provision and medical and health/medical provision before development
- Support protected open space and housing plans - oppose extent of safeguarded land and employment development

#### **Objection**

- Some indicated development areas are subject to high levels of Aircraft Noise. As such development may be contrary to the NPPF, Noise Policy Statement England, and government Policy on Aircraft Noise and in conflict with the sustainable Communities (Pollution) part of the Local Plan.
- The proposed housing numbers are too high and infrastructure will not cope.
- Safeguarded land is too focused to the north
- Justify the scale of safeguarding given the growth expectations for the plan period The northern Employment Site and Housing Site are too far north and extend Knutsford in a linear fashion northwards.
- The employment site is too far from the centre for most people to commute on foot or by bike, thereby encouraging increased car use, congestion, emissions and other pollution.
- Protect the agricultural land of North West Knutsford
- Use land swap to free up Brownfield sites for development.
- Toft Road, Knutsford. A Masterplan and Vision document (attached) has been prepared which demonstrates that a sustainable scheme of up to 50 dwellings on this site in Knutsford.
- Objection is registered to the proposed employment land development around the existing car showrooms. This constitutes ribbon development and urban sprawl on the Green Belt - the very purpose for its designation as Green Belt in the first place. In addition it would place housing closer to the relocated Egerton School.

Moreover, the re-designation of Site B as safeguarded land opens the door to retail park development in the future - the type of development that has so damaged the approach to Nantwich on the Middlewich Rd. The location and scale of 41 ha of safeguarded land is unsupported by evidence of need.

Reversion to Site B for housing and safeguarding of, say, 20 hectares on Sites A , F and east of Longridge would spread the allocation more evenly across the town and provide more flexibility of response to future needs. No further employment land should be safeguarded over and above that already available

#### **Comment Only**

- CEC should continue to investigate the distribution of any new additional housing spread evenly throughout the town taking note mainly of the impact on road infrastructure, but also utilities and health/education services. It is essential to give more detail to the plan for not just a new or replacement school/relocation of Egerton Primary School but the consideration of additional pre-school and primary school places that this plan will generate
- Drastically minimise loss of Green Belt.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support residential development at car park at Moorside, Knutsford. Detailed site information attached.</li> <li>• Site A is subject to surface water flooding [see Environment Agency Flood Risk assessments].</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More even distribution of housing on all available sites including detailed consideration of Booths Park. Dairy Farm Field and Parkgate east</li> <li>• Details of traffic infrastructure improvements that need to be approved and consulted upon and then implemented before the new houses are built.</li> <li>• Specify types of housing appropriate to the needs of Knutsford including affordable housing, houses for single people and housing for the ageing population.</li> <li>• Removal of Employment and Commercial Site B from the plans.</li> <li>• Reduction in safe guarded land for future development (Site A and B)</li> <li>• Remove Safeguarded land from North West Knutsford</li> <li>• Recognise Knutsford as an historic town-needs special protection. Impose strict design code on developers regarding housing etc. Avoid soulless mass-produced estates.</li> <li>• Preserve views on approach roads esp A50 north/south.</li> <li>• Justify amount of safeguarded land (too much).</li> <li>• Discourage cars, manage traffic better public transport.</li> <li>• More even distribution of housing on all available sites including Booths Park.</li> <li>• The best option for a nuclear town would be to build to the west and south west of the centre either side of the railway line. Such developments could also be supported by a new by-pass (within the developments, not at the edge of them, so as to minimise countryside taken up) to alleviate congestion both along the A50 and on the Northwich Road.</li> <li>• There needs to be a recognised constraint on development based on the Airports Noise Contours and the latest Government Guidance.</li> <li>• Numbers reduced,</li> <li>• Limit the number of houses to 600.</li> <li>• Parkgate Extension, Knutsford The northern section of this site is NOT "a natural extension to an existing residential and employment area", but is instead a greenfield development that distorts still further the shape of Knutsford. Better to build to the west of this industrial area, alongside the railway line</li> <li>• There is also infill land to the south of Parkgate and the main road, though at least half of it should remain as parkland. This infill development should incorporate more employment areas.</li> <li>• Cannot constitute the "exceptional circumstances" warranted to redraw the green belt boundaries around our town. This must be removed from the plan.</li> <li>• Local groups support development on the understanding that the plan is changed to remove safeguarded land from Knutsford, remove employment land from NW Knutsford Consider a strategic land swaps with infrastructure requirements i.e. schools and health using precious Greenbelt and houses backfilling into those sites in town. Rather than pushing the boundary of Knutsford out it could bring more people into the centre which is good for business and reduces car journeys.</li> <li>• Toft Road, Knutsford. A Masterplan and Vision document (attached) has</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>been prepared which demonstrates that a sustainable scheme of up to 50 dwellings on this site in Knutsford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am able to confirm that the site 4389 SHLAA 2013 is available and can be brought forward for development within the next 5 years as opposed to the timescale envisaged in the SHLAA. There is an inadequate supply of housing land as evidenced in recent appeal cases and the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Knutsford has been identified as one of the Key Service Centres for Cheshire East and as such the vitality and growth of this town is important to the prosperity of the Borough as a whole.</p> <p>A number of Local Plan Strategy sites and safeguarded land has been identified around the town to deliver appropriate sustainable economic growth up to 2030.</p> <p>The comments on individual sites relate to the Local Plan Strategy sites (CS) and Strategic Locations (SL), or to Non Preferred Sites (NPS). They are dealt with in more detail in the response to those consultation points.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy includes an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which deals with education and other infrastructure requirements required to support the delivery of the sites noted in Figure 15.31.</p> <p>Other issues raised are either covered in more detail elsewhere within the Core Strategy or are not appropriate for inclusion in the Knutsford consultation point</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>Figure 15.31 has been proposed to be amended to include Booths Hall as a Strategic Employment Area within the Green Belt and changes are proposed to be made to the boundaries, extent and use proposed at the North West Knutsford Site.</p>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Site CS 18:North West Knutsford</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 35 (Support: 1 / Object: 23 / Comment Only: 11)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept the need for housing but no more than 300 dwellings in the Green Belt. Sports facilities and protected open space are enhanced and retained. Dwellings at Parkgate to be high quality design and access improved here. Restrict further commercial development around A50. No additional safeguarded land. Development to complement Knutsford's historic nature and support its visitor economy.</li> <li>• North Knutsford Community Group support this Local plan. Cheshire East have engaged effectively with ourselves and we are pleased with changes to the Local Plan following this engagement. We welcome further discussion.<br/>We do however continue to object to two areas of detail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- location of employment land in NW Knutsford</li> <li>- scale of safeguarded land in NW Knutsford and removal of site B from this proposal</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amount of safeguarded land is excessive and unnecessary and evidence scant.( enough for 1200 plus homes)</li> <li>• Ribbon development should be avoided as in CS18 proposals should be on the western side of the town to enhance its nuclear shape and be closer to its station, and incorporate a by-pass to the current A50 to improve traffic in the town</li> <li>• With the release of employment land at Parkgate East, opportunities in the Town Centre with the Egerton school move and proposed plans for the development at Booths Park there is really no need for Manchester Road.</li> <li>• Traffic is already at saturation point, infrastructure improvements needed first</li> <li>• Oppose taking land out of Green Belt. Land is agricultural land grades 2 and 3. Sites CS19 and NPS50 are of lower agricultural quality.</li> <li>• There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an amendment to the Statutory Green Belt and consequently Policy CS18 is also not consistent with National Policy.</li> <li>• Why has there been a change from the original intention for Area A which is now scheduled for housing development along Northwich Road, behind the Red Cross/Fire Station and extending alongside the allotments behind Warren Avenue. The original plan assumed such development on Area B</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to be most acceptable site for housing but not for employment. Knutsford may require more housing development to meet local needs</li> <li>• Booths Hall houses should be included in the allocation for Knutsford</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to demonstrate impact on listed buildings and heritage assets (Tatton Park)</li> <li>• no more than 300 new dwellings are constructed in the Green Belt and that they are of a design and construction quality, positioning and landscaping that preserves the rural northern approaches to Knutsford</li> <li>• Take part in a real environmental assessment before continuing.</li> <li>• The council seems to have come up with this plan so that the developers can make maximum profit and not for the needs of the populace. and have therefore gone against the majority of there aims and principles within this document, and the wishes of the local populace, this includes ignoring the August 2012 consultation, and therefore wasting Tax payers money</li> <li>• Site is sequentially preferable to others in Green Belt review. Bolster Site Attributes and Location section. Improve Green Belt Assessment conclusions by referencing The Crowns review. Why push back 125 homes to latter plan period? Scale of development may be insufficient to support listed infrastructure - lack of list at CS19 is unreasonable. Both sites could jointly provide, if need is evidenced.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy CS18 should be deleted from the Plan. The proposed housing and employment site</li> <li>• Change the numbers of housing units to bring us in line for expected growth within Cheshire East, this would be in the region of 410 units.</li> <li>• Get rid of protected development sites to enable free markets to continue in the future</li> <li>• Set into place a timetable for infrastructure improvements that run in front of or alongside housing developments</li> <li>• Put into consideration reusing empty properties and brownfield sites, including those that may come on stream during this period</li> <li>• Take out any business development within these sites except those that may be of use to the populace, a small local shop</li> <li>• apply the documents aims and principle, and not what's cheapest for the developers to make more profit</li> <li>• Increase the number of allotments on safe and secure sites</li> <li>• Please add 'contribute to the economic sustainability of heritage and cultural assets or landscapes</li> <li>• Consider moving employment allocation to Parkgate extension</li> <li>• LP requires 30 hectares but allocates 65, why?</li> <li>• No evidence that there is a need for an additional 5ha of employment land on Manchester Road.</li> <li>• Reduction in use of Green Belt for safeguarded land as not justified</li> <li>• Site B should be taken off the Knutsford local plan for Safeguarded Land as the amount allocated land is excessive</li> <li>• Need to demonstrate impact of allocations east of A50 on heritage assets (the site boundary is adjacent to a Grade II* registered Parks and Garden Tatton Park)</li> <li>• The western housing site does support nuclear development of the town, and should incorporate a by-pass (within the development area) from the A537 Northwich road to the A50 north, to alleviate town centre congestion</li> <li>• the remainder of Site A should be allocated for development post 2030</li> </ul> |

and in addition to Site A a small extension to Site C should also be included. This would give the town enough land for future development and would just fit within the the current infrastructure limitations. Site B is not needed and is excessive and development along Manchester Road would destroy Knutsfords rural aspect as you enter the town along this major thoroughfare.

- Delete the proposed housing development adjacent to Northwich Road Knutsford from the proposals
  - Developments in Knutsford should be on the western side of the town to enhance its nuclear shape and be closer to its station, and incorporate a by-pass to the current A50 to improve traffic in the town
  - Remove Employment Site from North West Knutsford
  - The Crown Estate welcome the level of growth afforded to Knutsford. However if the Inspector was minded to increase development towards the settlement, then this equally would be supported.
    - ii) Furthermore, Policy PG1 housing requirements are a minimum. For consistency and clarity, reference to dwellings in PG18 page 258 should also be minimal.
    - iii) Core Strategy could be improved by presenting how the division of additional infrastructure related developments will be achieved through the development of two housing sites at NW Knutsford. The policy should give guidance on this.
    - iv) The phasing of land at NW Knutsford should be bought forwards to 2015-2020 and 2020-2030.
- Preferred Sites Background Paper:
- i) Add to the text within the Site Attributes and Location section:  
“The allocation of land at NW Knutsford forms an extension to an existing residential and employment area adjacent to the northern western settlement boundary of Knutsford. The site is well contained by existing landscape features (woodland and Tabley Hill are located to the west) and existing development is to the south.  
With the provision of appropriate infrastructure and services, this development can form a sustainable extension to Knutsford contributing to the Core Strategy Strategic Priorities.”
  - ii) The site is also sequentially preferable to other sites identified by the Council in their review of the Green Belt. This should be included within the recommendation section of page 49.  
Re Employment allocation - In respect of the infrastructure contributions, the Policy needs to be given further consideration and re examined alongside Policy CS19 (Parkgate).  
With regards to phasing, the text should be reworded to remove the reference to the employment being provided in tandem with the residential development. The text should allow for the employment land to be delivered independently.
- Why has there been a change from the original intention for Area A which is now scheduled for housing development along Northwich Road, behind the Red Cross/Fire Station and extending alongside the allotments behind Warren Avenue. The original plan assumed such development on Area B

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The site at North West Knutsford is considered to represent the opportunity for a high quality, sympathetic low density residential development</p> <p>The Council contends that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation of this site and adjustment to the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>The provision of safeguarded land at the site has been reviewed – please refer to comments on site CS 33 (North West Knutsford).</p> <p>The policy as worded refers to the importance of respecting nearby designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The phasing and indicative delivery of the site is considered appropriate and meets evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>Booths Hall has been identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Strategic Employment Area within the Green Belt and its boundaries identified in Figure 15.31</p> <p>Other issues raised are either covered in more detail elsewhere within the Core Strategy or are not appropriate for inclusion in the North West Knutsford consultation point</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>The policy has been proposed to be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 hectares of employment land removed and reallocated as safeguarded land</li> <li>• Reference to small scale retail changed to ‘appropriate retail provision to meet local needs’</li> <li>• Remove the 20 hectares of safeguarded land south of Tabley Road and retain its Green Belt status.</li> <li>• Reduction in the northern most extent of the protected open space (0.75 of an acre) to the south of Tabley Road to reflect the extent of the proposed housing land and the removal of the safeguarded land.</li> <li>• Paragraph 15.250 amended to read: ‘As with all new development, any ecological constraints should be considered and respected, and where necessary the proposal should provide appropriate mitigation.’</li> <li>• Policy Context box: references to paragraphs 7, 17 and 19 of the NPPF proposed to be deleted. Paragraphs 72 and 117 proposed to be added to the policy context box to reflect the NPPF. An additional Priority 3 added to the policy context box: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities</li> </ul> <p>Additional paragraph added to site justification as follows: - Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</p> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS19:Parkgate extension, Knutsford</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 25 (Support: 10 / Object: 8 / Comment Only: 7)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 ha proposed employment land at Parkgate is supported</li> <li>• Proposed residential development at Parkgate North could make a significant contribution to the requirement for new homes</li> <li>• The south eastern section of this site is good infill development.</li> <li>• Tatton Estates Land to north of Parkgate Ind Estate for phased provision of 250 new homes. Planning application has been submitted and hoped to be determined early 2014. Tatton Estates supports the principle of allocation of said land under CS19 for 250 homes but would like to comment if this changes.</li> <li>• CPRE can support the principle of development. Additional access to the Parkgate area under the railway line is required, but is not included in the draft Infrastructure Plan; enhanced retail to cater for local needs and reduce the need to travel.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The northern section of this site is NOT "a natural extension to an existing residential and employment area", but is instead a green field development that distorts still further the shape of Knutsford. Better to build to the west of this industrial area, alongside the railway line</li> <li>• Developments in Knutsford should be on the western side of the town to enhance its nuclear shape and be closer to its station, and incorporate a by-pass to the current A50 to improve traffic in the town.</li> <li>• The proposed Parkgate Housing and Employment Extension would put too much pressure on the already horrendous Brook Street traffic bottleneck.</li> <li>• It would also be too near to Tatton Park and obscure views from there towards the Peak District.</li> <li>• Dairy House Farm would no longer be a viable agricultural unit</li> <li>• Alternative sites for housing and employment land around Knutsford should be identified which do not utilise agricultural land</li> <li>• Before this site is considered there should be a second route in, and the present bridge should be strengthened</li> <li>• Why has the change from the original intention for Area A which is now scheduled for housing development along Northwich Road, behind the Red Cross/Fire Station and extending alongside the allotments behind Warren Avenue. The original plan assumed such development on Area B</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of employment land to housing in this location seems irrational. How will site be accessed? No mention of crossing the railway line as in previous plans?</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• granting of planning permission conditionally for residential development if a comparative evaluation of this and other sites, and objective evidenced need, demonstrates the site's preferred suitability</li> <li>• The site boundary is adjacent to a Grade II* registered Parks and Garden Tatton Park. The site affects a number of designated heritage assets proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that that they will conserve those elements</li> <li>• Developable area will be reduced by the area set aside for bridge and approaches over or under Altrincham-Chester railway. If railway is bridged, need sufficient headroom for electrification if not already installed at time of development.</li> <li>• Such development would interfere with the natural drainage away from the nearby flood zones.</li> <li>• Completely develop the Parkgate site (East now and West in the future) to raises the status, facilities and amenity value of the eastern side of Knutsford. Include a second access to the Site.</li> <li>• Support growth in town but Parkgate lies in the Egerton catchment area. There is no mention of moving the catchment lines so the new homes lie within Manor Park's catchment (makes more sense geographically) but, with numbers at the max,. now, Manor Park would need to expand to accommodate.</li> <li>• Do not object to growth in Knutsford as a whole. Concerned that the approach to development at Parkgate is disproportionate re required infrastructure. Support more joined up thinking regarding meeting town's infrastructure, without compromising viability.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the proposed Parkgate Extension from the Core Strategy as it impacts too much on traffic and drainage and is too near Tatton Park.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of houses proposed for the Parkgate employment site. Specifically exclude the green belt Parkgate Site F site from development or designation as safeguarded land.</li> <li>• Add Site F (Parkgate West) as a potential Housing site.</li> <li>• Consider swapping the employment allocation in NW Knutsford to this site and the housing allocation to N.W.Knutsford and secure the crossing of the railway line.</li> <li>• Before this site is considered there should be a second route in, and the present bridge should be strengthened.</li> <li>• Developments in Knutsford should be on the western side of the town to enhance its nuclear shape and be closer to its station, and incorporate a by-pass to the current A50 to improve traffic in the town.</li> <li>• It is essential to resolves and future proof the current infrastructure issues prior to any further development being permitted.</li> <li>• A more realistic appraisal of Knutsford's infrastructure requirements</li> <li>• NT ask that "Provision of a landscape buffer and appropriate security measures to the boundary of the Tatton Park Estate to the north and west of the site and between the employment site to the south."</li> <li>• A more consistent approach towards social, physical and environmental infrastructure to be achieved within Knutsford as a result of the growth of minima 650 new dwellings.</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why has the change from the original intention for Area A which is now scheduled for housing development along Northwich Road, behind the Red Cross/Fire Station and extending alongside the allotments behind Warren Avenue. The original plan assumed such development on Area B</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Site CS19 is considered to form a natural extension to the existing residential and employment uses on the edge of Knutsford, forming an appropriate location in which to meet the identified needs of the town.</p> <p>The site is allocated within the Macclesfield Local Plan as employment land. By virtue of its location, it is considered that this site presents a rare opportunity, within this part of the Borough, for a sustainable development within the existing settlement boundary of a key service centre.</p> <p>The policy as worded seeks to ensure a high quality design and the provision of an appropriate landscape buffer to the Tatton Park Estate</p> <p>The number of houses proposed at the site has been reduced in order to allow more land for acoustic mitigation from the adjacent industrial site.</p> <p>Other issues raised are either covered in more detail elsewhere within the Core Strategy or are not appropriate for inclusion in the Parkgate Extension consultation point</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <p>Proposed Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of houses proposed has been reduced from 250 to 200 due to the need to allow more land for acoustic mitigation from the adjacent industrial site. There are currently planning applications for housing and employment already being considered.</li> <li>• <i>Para 15.259</i> – last sentence amended to read ‘There is a waste water treatment plant on the eastern boundary of the proposed employment site with the Birkin Brook.’</li> <li>• <i>Para 15.264</i> – additional text added to paragraph to read ‘The floodplain of the Birkin Brook must be excluded from development’.</li> <li>• Policy context box has been amended to update references to the NPPF and an additional Priority 3 ‘Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities’</li> <li>• Additional reference to evidence base added to the policy context box – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</li> <li>• Additional paragraph added to site justification to read as follows: Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</li> </ul> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Middlewich</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 8 (Support: 0 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 3)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments made.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displacement of business at Brooks Lane will be harmful to economy</li> <li>• The bypass is a priority and should not be left until the latter stages of the plan for implementation</li> <li>• Link between Middlewich Town Strategy and Local Plan is not clear</li> <li>• A new link from Booth Lane over the canal</li> <li>• A number of strategic employment sites at Mid point 18 have not been allocated – this puts into jeopardy the growth targets of the plan.</li> <li>• Richborough estates object to the non-allocation of land a Croxton Lane</li> <li>• Housing requirement across CEC is at least 9000 dwellings too low – more housing should be allocated at Middlewich</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although no sites are now in the CWAC area, CWAC will continue to work closely and effectively with Cheshire East to plan for future sustainable development in and around Middlewich, eg. to feed into CWAC Local Plan (Part 2)</li> <li>• Middlewich Lagoons should be allocated for around 750 dwellings as it is a sustainable, suitable, brownfield site (SHLAA Ref 2318). The site is contaminated and a Site of Biological Importance, however, these factors wouldn't prevent delivery of a scheme. Site is more sustainable than Glebe Farm site</li> <li>• Middlewich already highly developed/grossly distorted in shape. Proposed will make it worse (particularly the Glebe Farm site)</li> <li>• If housing required should be on in-fill sites</li> <li>• Town needs a railway station – which would help reduce Co2 emissions. No mention of cycleways.</li> <li>• Site SL9 should be for employment</li> <li>• If SL9 given to employment then large parts of SL10 can be housing</li> <li>• Should build bridge over canal to join industrial estate east of site</li> <li>• Link between Town Strategy and Local Plan not clear</li> <li>• Housing &amp; employment sites don't contribute to Town centre investment in Local Plan</li> <li>• Brook Lane plans to move businesses are ill thought out</li> <li>• Areas discounted for housing now have permission as such</li> <li>• A number of Pochin Property's important sites, including the strategic employment land at Midpoint 18, Brooks Lane (for Residential/Mix) and Warmingham Lane (Residential), have not been allocated for development. This puts Plan in jeopardy of being found unsound</li> <li>• Object to the non-allocation of Land off Croxton Lane for housing – CE needs</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>more housing in Middlewich</p> <p>Council should identify additional deliverable development opportunities in Middlewich to achieve housing targets, without placing heavy reliance on the strategic sites coming forward in this Plan period, particularly in the north of the settlement. Site at Centurian Way provides a sustainable location for housing needed in North of settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1600 dwellings identified target for Middlewich – only 850 allocated</li> <li>• Middlewich is highly developed and new allocation create a distorted urban form</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A greater scale of strategic allocations to reflect the requirements of Policy PG6. Without this, it is considered that the target of delivering 1,600 dwellings in Middlewich by 2030 cannot be met.</li> <li>• Allocate Middlewich Lagoons (SHLAA Ref: 2381) as a strategic housing site, which is capable of delivering in the region of 750 dwellings</li> <li>• Build train station</li> <li>• Housing should be allocated to in-fill sites (not Glebe Farm)</li> <li>• Need cycleways to Town and Mid-point 18</li> <li>• Don't use SL9 for housing (use for employment and use part of SL10 for housing)</li> <li>• Middlewich eastern by-pass should pass through the site</li> <li>• Build bridge over canal</li> <li>• Mention contributions to Town Centre from proposed developments</li> <li>• Don't displace</li> <li>• Area south of Brooks Lane would make a good area fo housing, Marina and Shops</li> <li>• Create link over canal</li> <li>• Allocate former Tesco site for housing</li> <li>• Provide cycle and walking routes into Town centre</li> <li>• Protect land between Middlewich and Elworth / Sandbach to clearly define the areas</li> <li>• Pochin Property's sites in both Middlewich and Crewe to be allocated to ensure that the Core Strategy is found sound at Examination (see PRE3998 for details)</li> <li>• Warmingham Lane, Middlewich (Phase 2), this should be allocated for 165 dwellings. Please see attached Masterplan (PRE5108)</li> <li>• The emerging Core Strategy should allocate Land off Croxton Lane (A530), Middlewich for 60 dwellings</li> <li>• Need to demonstrate duty to cooperate with C West and Chester to be able to deliver on strategic issues in Middlewich</li> <li>• Identify additional development opportunities in Middlewich to achieve housing targets; site at Centurian Way should be allocated</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Local Plan Strategy establishes how and where it will meet the objectively assessed need to deliver 27000 new homes over the plan period. This is done through Chapter 8 Planning for Growth and principally through policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the Town Map. Responses to comments regarding</p>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>individual sites are made in following proformas.</p> <p>Further allocations for Middlewich will be considered during the next stage of the plan making process through the production of the Site Allocations and Detailed Policies Document</p> <p>Details of the full extent of proposed cycleway, green infrastructure and all other details of site specific development will be established through either the submission of a planning application with masterplans for sites, and/or further detail submitted to the production of a Site Allocations and Detailed Policies Document.</p> <p>Chapter 2 'Duty to Cooperate' outlines the key areas where Cheshire East Council has engaged neighbouring authorities. This is an ongoing process throughout the plan period.</p> <p>Making best use of contributions from development to improve services and facilities in the town (including investigations into canal links and rail services) will be achieved in conjunction with Middlewich Town Council through the S106 regime and in future through the establishment of a Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>Middlewich Town Strategy has significantly informed both the vision for the town and selection of sites which will contribute to delivery of that vision</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>Figure 15.34 has been amended to show the Borough boundary, route of Middlewich Eastern Bypass, existing Strategic Employment Area and Committed Strategic Sites.</p>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Site CS20: Glebe Farm, Middlewich</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 14 (Support: 2 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 5)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New investment in poor quality and under utilised land</li> <li>• High quality development creating an attractive southern gateway</li> <li>• The boundaries of this site should be drawn to match field boundaries in order to preserve priority habitat hedges and maintain the landscape 'grain'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of site is in Moston Parish Council – no mitigation for additional population within the parish</li> <li>• Contrary to Local and National Planning Policies. It is in Moston not Middlewich and will destroy a greenfield site within a Strategic Open Gap in open countryside.</li> <li>• It will place an unacceptable burden on the lanes and infrastructure of rural Moston.</li> <li>• No new local services proposed to support the development</li> <li>• Site supports flora and fauna and is greenfield</li> <li>• Allocation of site not considered most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives. Cledford Lagoons are a reasonable alternative</li> <li>• Serious concern that proposed approach will not deliver houses or economic development as per growth aspirations of the plan</li> <li>• Lack of consistency with national policy</li> <li>• Site not sustainable</li> <li>• Cledford Lane Lime Beds is a SBI, may not withstand disturbance</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage: The site boundary is adjacent to the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area. It also affects a two Grade II listed buildings. The NPPF considers that any substantial harm to or loss to a Grade II listed building should be exceptional. Therefore, any development proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that that they will conserve those elements.</li> <li>• Extending town south is broadly unsustainable in terms of access to facilities and services</li> <li>• Future development must consider impact on historic environment</li> <li>• Site is Greenfield, if housing needed, infill preferable</li> <li>• No mention of internal detail of site (cycleways etc)</li> <li>• 400 homes may be optimistic given existing site constraints</li> <li>• Full archaeological assessment needed</li> <li>• Site may not be viable given expectations in regard to contributions, infrastructure and affordable housing</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how site will not harm historic setting and include reference to Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and listed buildings.</li> <li>• Detail cycleways to both town and Mid-point 18</li> <li>• Remove site, allocate Cledford Lagoons</li> <li>• Allocate land at Warmingham Lane as an extension to Glebe Farm site</li> <li>• Remove site from plan</li> <li>• Include site NE of Booths Lane as an allocation</li> <li>• Amend policy to require provision of 10% intermediate housing and no financial contributions</li> <li>• Significantly more detailed scale of justification required to support inclusion of site</li> <li>• Include buffer zone between Cledford Lane SBI and site</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>Middlewich is identified as a Key Service Centre and the vitality and growth of the town contributes to the prosperity of the Borough as a whole. The site represents an opportunity to deliver a high quality, sustainable residential development whilst supporting delivery of key infrastructure through financial contributions to the Middlewich Eastern Link Road.</p> <p>The parish boundary is less important as a constraint than the Council Boundary and natural features such as the river corridors and floodplains.</p> <p>The development will be integrated to the existing residential areas and the town through strong pedestrian and cycle links.</p> <p>Cledford lane is some distance to the east.</p> <p>Further details of the proposals, including links and consideration of ecological issues, will be provided in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p> <p>The site is separated from the canal by Booths Lane but the setting of the conservation area will be respected in any development proposals.</p> <p>The allocation is considered to be viable.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundary of site is to be expanded to west to meet Warmingham Lane.</li> <li>• Add to end of paragraph 15.272: To the east of the site on the other side of Booth Lane lies the Trent and Mersey Canal conservation area, which also includes the listed Rumps locks.</li> <li>• Add criteria h and i to site specific principles of development:</li> <li>• h. The Local Plan Strategy Site is expected to provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in Policy SC5 (Affordable Homes).</li> <li>• The development proposals adjoining the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and associated listed buildings must reflect the location and be of a high standard.</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paragraphs 112, 117 and 126 to National Policy, add priority 3: protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation point</b>  | <b>Strategic Location SL9: Brooks Lane, Middlewich</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 37 (Support: 2 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 32)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marina can provide link into town and facilitate reopening of Middlewich train station</li> <li>• Welcome marina development</li> <li>• Total transfer from industrial to residential is difficult given issues of contamination</li> <li>• Measures should be in place to facilitate and encourage relocation of small businesses</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brooks Lane should not be developed for housing.</li> <li>• Bridge should be built to connect canal with industrial estate enabling traffic to bypass centre of town</li> <li>• Plans to move businesses are ill thought out</li> <li>• No mention of investment into the town centre</li> <li>• Draft plan only delivers 50% housing requirement of Middlewich as per PG6, to deliver housing need Brooks Lane site should be extended to include land at salt lagoons to the south</li> <li>• Allocation of site contrary to NPPF and objectives of the Plan</li> <li>• Site has barriers to deliverability including contamination and land assembly issues</li> <li>• There are other sustainable sites which have been identified which could meet housing need in Middlewich</li> <li>• If site allocated there may be serious implications for existing operators and may impact on future business expansion</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of 400 homes may be optimistic given existing site constraints</li> <li>• English Heritage: Full assessment of impact on historic environment required and impact of development on Conservation Area, Grade II listed buildings and Scheduled monuments. A framework to assess value of historic environment must be in place.</li> <li>• Full archaeological assessment required</li> <li>• Questionable whether site is viable given expectations regarding contribution to infrastructure, affordable housing etc</li> <li>• For site to be viable landowners would need to accept reduced profit</li> <li>• Of all sites included in plan this is the one that should be reserved for employment due to its easy access via sustainable means</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brooks Lane should not be developed for housing.</li> <li>• Bridge should be built to connect canal with industrial estate enabling traffic to bypass centre of town</li> <li>• Detail cycleways</li> <li>• Remove site from allocation and protect for future economic use</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify contributions to town centre and other investment</li> <li>• Do not disperse existing business at north of Brook Lane</li> <li>• South of Brook Lane would make a good area for housing</li> <li>• Improve link from Booth Lane over canal</li> <li>• Consider existing sites in town centre for housing development</li> <li>• Identify cycle and walking routes in town</li> <li>• Protect open land between Middlewich and Sandbach</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>Middlewich is identified as a Key Service Centre and the vitality and growth of the town contributes to the prosperity of the Borough as a whole.</p> <p>The site represents an opportunity to deliver a high quality, sustainable residential development with leisure and community facilities on a brownfield site, which will also support the delivery of key infrastructure through financial contributions to the A54 through Middlewich.</p> <p>The development will be integrated to the existing residential areas and the town through strong pedestrian and cycle links.</p> <p>Further details of the proposals, including links and consideration of ecological issues, will be provided in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. The impact on Cledford Lane Lime Beds has been identified as a principle of development.</p> <p>The improvement of existing and provision of new cycle and footpath links is a requirement for the development.</p> <p>The impact of the development on the Trent and Mersey Canal conservation area will be a positive one.</p> <p>There will be an impact on local businesses currently operating on the site, but this proposal is supported by the allocation of up to 70 hectares of employment land at Midpoint 18 (SL10).</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to paragraph 15.278: There is potential to expand the site into the salt lagoons in the future.</li> <li>• Add to point b of Site Specific Principles of Development: The development proposals adjoining the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and associated listed buildings must reflect the location and be of a high standard.</li> <li>• Policy Context: delete paragraphs 20 and 156, insert paragraphs 110, 117 and 127 in National Policy. Add Priority 3: Promoting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic priorities.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>  | <b>Strategic Location SL10: Midpoint 18 Extension, Middlewich</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 7 (Support: 2 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logical approach to future employment needs in Middlewich and will help to procure the Eastern By-pass</li> <li>• Will help deliver more jobs, improve local economy, improve connectivity and drive greater town centre usage</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the allocation of this site. It should not be allocated for development now or safeguarded for future development. It is in a fundamentally unsustainable location and / or located in very sensitive area of Green Belt where its contribution to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt is absolutely critical.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National grid pipelines runs to east of proposal – access must not be sterilised and pipeline should be protected from uncontrolled development in the vicinity.</li> <li>• If SL9 used for industrial, large parts of SL10 can be used for residential with eastern by-pass running through the site.</li> <li>• Middlewich is a distorted urban form and such developments exacerbate this.</li> <li>• The Middlewich Eastern by-pass should pass through the site.</li> <li>• There is no mention of cycleways, either into town or into Brooks Lane - both of which should be built, to improve non-vehicular access, benefitting both CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and local health.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include Hotel Development with conferencing facilities in future development</li> <li>• Mid point 18 including land at Cheshire FRESH, to be allocated as a strategic employment site</li> <li>• Site is unsustainable, remove site from plan</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The site will deliver a significant contribution to the Local Plan Strategy Objectives and Vision by promoting economic prosperity and contributing towards the provision of associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The site adjoins existing development and will provide good pedestrian and cycle links to the town. The delivery of the Eastern bypass is a key piece of infrastructure vital to the future prosperity of Middlewich, Cheshire East and the wider region. Therefore the proposal supports the Local Plan Strategy of providing sustainable, jobs-led growth.</p> <p>Further details of the proposals, including links, suitable uses on the site and consideration of ecological issues, will be provided in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Minor alteration to justification - insert reference to Midpoint 18 as strategic employment site</li><li>• Corrections 15.286:</li><li>• Change 'importance' to 'important', and between by pass and enhance, insert 'and'.</li><li>• Amend point d of site specific principles of development: 'Future development should safeguard the river Croco and other watercourses and deliver significant ecological mitigation areas for protected and priority species and habitats on site; and'</li><li>• Policy Context: delete paragraph 156, insert paragraphs 100 and 112 in National Policy. Add Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to Local Evidence</li></ul> |
|-----------------------|---|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Nantwich</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 5 (Support: 1 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 0)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nantwich Town Council re-iterates its support for the strategic sites (preferred sites) (site CS 21, site CS 22, site CS 23) in and around the Nantwich area. It notes that the overall supply of housing land in the plan period will be increased above the totals indicated in the core strategy by the commitments such as Queens Drive that have recently received permission.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that building houses will make traffic congestion worse and increase pressure on infrastructure e.g. doctors and schools.</li> <li>Object to the increase to 1,850 dwellings proposed in the PSCS as a matter of principle.</li> <li>Concern that the allocation for Nantwich has inexplicably risen from 1,500 to 1,850 houses.</li> <li>There has already been significant development within the area over the last 10 years and the Town cannot take this sort of increase.</li> <li>As an area we do not have the infrastructure, particularly the roads, school and hospital/GP places.</li> <li>As a historic town this increase in the number of places is not sustainable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>none</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no need for any residential sites at Nantwich.</li> <li>There has already been significant development within the historic town over the last 10 years and the town cannot take this sort of increase.</li> <li>Increased pressure on schools, transport and services.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p><u>The scale of development.</u> The scale of development allows for planned development and significant contributions to local infrastructure and amenities in the town.</p> <p><u>Impact of development on local infrastructure including roads, schools and medical provision.</u> The impacts are detailed in the policy and supporting text and will be taken into account in seeking appropriate contributions for development proposals.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>The Local Plan Strategy recognises that Nantwich is a Key Service Centre and the allocation of sites is in accordance with the Strategy. The current planning application for Kingsley Fields (CS21) includes employment areas and a site for a school and will create a balanced development enhancing local facilities.</p> <p>No material changes to Local Plan Strategy.</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS21: Kingsley Fields, Nantwich</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 17 (Support: 5 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 8)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the most suitable location for large-scale development in Nantwich. The site has ready pedestrian access to town centre, minimising pressure on parking, and bringing improved prospects for shop traders. Should provide improved walking access to River Weaver, benefiting locals and creating a tourist attraction. 56% agreed at Draft Town Strategy consultation.</li> <li>• Welcome new Green Infrastructure and extension of Riverside Park on flood plain and higher ground to the west of the Weaver. Public access should be restricted in Northern areas to avoid impact on important biodiversity site. Protected species should be accommodated and their habitats extended.</li> <li>• Bring existing bridge into use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such an enormous development is completely unwarranted and will destroy the nature of this ancient and beautiful market town. Possibly the eastern third would be acceptable.</li> <li>• Kingsley Fields is unsustainable in terms of its negative transport implications for the town and hugely damaging visual impact. More serious could be geotechnical implications which have not been assessed. If the salt-bearing marl beds on which Nantwich is built dry out, such shrinkage will cause subsidence putting many areas of the town at risk.</li> <li>• This site together with the 2 previous large sites will lead to the town's population doubling in 30 years, losing Nantwich's essential character as a small country town. All remaining growth is focused on this one location, the development will be at the expense of less favoured sites and the extent is not sustainable</li> <li>• Objects to the site delivery totals of 1100 homes. The site is not deliverable at the rate suggested in paragraph 15.299. The housing delivery rate should be calculated at a rate at or below the Council's suggested delivery rates in the 2013 SHLAA and alternative potential housing land at Nantwich South should be brought forward.</li> <li>• Consideration of the planning application has been deferred for further consideration</li> <li>• The developer claims there are 15 advantages of the proposal; but 5 are for Nantwich, 7 for Reaseheath and the remainder to CEC.</li> <li>• Not a sustainable location and not in accordance with the NPPF.</li> <li>• Will largely be a commuter village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A local food centre (shop) should be included, linked to production at Reaseheath College</li> <li>• Add more emphasis on design and biodiversity priorities.</li> </ul> |

- Even though outline permission is likely to have been given, these matters should be the subject of conditions and ongoing dialogue with the development management planners and the community
- If this site is allocated, wish to see good quality design, retail facilities that do not compete with Nantwich town centre, highway improvements and contributions to our village environmental improvements as this scheme will increase the traffic through the village.
- Not convinced that the Kingsley Fields expansion in Henhull Parish, north west of Nantwich, is necessary. If it is needed and its development is preferred to other areas near Nantwich, then its development should be used to secure:
  - (a) greater sustainability in Acton Village ( school, church, hall, pub and possible shop,
  - (b) alleviation of traffic problems in the village and the implementation of environmental improvements,
  - (c) reconfiguring Burford cross roads to reduce through traffic on Chester Road, Acton,
  - (d) reconfiguring the junction of Wrexham Road and Cuckoo Lane to reduce the use of Monks Lane,
  - (e) the provision of a new road from Waterlode to a realigned A51 near to Reaseheath.
- The comments about the benefits of the scheme place too much emphasis on the public access and creation of additional footpaths in Nantwich Riverside, to the detriment of wildlife considerations, which have been highlighted in a number of reports about the Riverside including the Nantwich Riverside Plan. Concerned about building in the flood plain, which it is stated elsewhere will be avoided where possible.
- English Heritage: The site immediately abuts a Registered Battlefield – Battle of Nantwich 1664 and appears to include some land that sits within the Reaseheath Conservation Area. Historic battlefields are considered to be of the highest significance. The NPPF considers that any substantial harm or loss to a battlefield including its setting should be wholly exceptional. An assessment is required.
- English Heritage: In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its conservation areas including their setting, there will be need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to them, including views of the conservation area. If this area does make an important contribution to setting, then the plan would need to explain why its subsequent development is considered acceptable.
- Part of site in the north encroaches into Reaseheath Conservation Area.
- Part of the site should be given over to industrial use.
- Cycleways (including footpaths) would be needed, to include two new bridges over the river.
- The flood plain should be avoided, and retained as parkland.
- Acceptable but with strict provisos about S106/CIL going to Town Centre and Riverside Park.
- The site is Greenfield land.
- A balance should be struck between formal public access and wildlife.

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Increased access in most sensitive areas is inappropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design considerations should cover more than adjacent heritage assets. It should not take its contextual design from the adjacent Kingsley Fields 1.</li> <li>• The proposal requires modification. This includes non-residential floorspace; potential on-site school; inclusion of 'valley shoulder'; no sports pitches; contributions to highways proportionate and public transport contributions deleted; no reference to Great Crested Newts; reduce level of affordable housing with no viability assessment as enhanced contribution to strategic priorities.</li> <li>• Accepts that in principle, some development may be necessary. As and when further brownfield opportunities become available, the apparent current need for development here may be ameliorated or removed.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A local food centre (shop) should be included, linked to production at Reaseheath College</li> <li>• Long-term management of existing protected species mitigation areas will have to be secured in order to avoid reductions in biodiversity value.</li> <li>• The criteria (ii) and (ii) of Para 2 of the policy should be combined to set a 300m<sup>2</sup> limit on A1 small units and local B1 office development within the local centre.</li> <li>• The policy at Para 3 should provide for either primary school provision on site or an off site contribution to new or extended primary school provision within 2km of the site. There may be a need for a secondary school contribution which would be for off-site provision at Nantwich.</li> <li>• Para 6(i) of the policy should be less prescriptive over the extent and use of the riverside park. The draft policy is different from the current planning application illustrative masterplan which provides an appropriate and deliverable green infrastructure proposal.</li> <li>• Delete "sports pitches;" from para 6(iii) of Policy Site CS21</li> <li>• Amend Principle (b) to refer to crossing rather than crossings.</li> <li>• Principle (c) should state that contributions towards highway improvements, including at Burford crossroads and to the A51 Alvaston roundabout will be sought on a proportional impact basis. The A51 diversion and Waterlode to A51 links within the development will be provided as part of the development and would not be subject to separate contributions.</li> <li>• Principle (d) should be replaced with wording requiring roads within the proposal to be designed to accommodate bus services on a suitable route.</li> <li>• Principle (k) should refer to 'provide compensatory habitat measures for protected and priority species on the site adversely affected by the proposals.</li> <li>• Principle (l) should be modified to state "The development is expected to provide affordable housing in line with the requirements of Policy SC5 (Affordable Homes) as may be adjusted downwards in the context of meeting Cheshire East Council's strategic priorities for infrastructure provision in circumstances where it is agreed the development should appropriately make enhanced strategic highway improvement contributions to achieve greater overall sustainable development in the wider Nantwich area through such enhanced contributions.</li> <li>• The housing delivery rate should be calculated at a rate at or below the Council's suggested delivery rates in the 2013 SHLAA and we propose</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>alternative potential housing land at Nantwich South should be brought forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamentally reduce the scale of growth to be more sensitive to the individual circumstances of the town by abandoning this large site or retain only a small part close to the edge of the town.</li> <li>• Ensure that a full geotechnical investigation is conducted before Kingsley Fields is even considered</li> <li>• Possibly the eastern third would be acceptable. Part of this remaining third of the site should be given over to industrial use.<br/>Cycleways (including footpaths) would need to include a couple of new bridges over the river.<br/>The flood plain should be avoided, and retained as parkland.</li> <li>• State site is greenfield (not predominately greenfield).</li> <li>• Assessment of impact on Historic Battlefield and Roseheath Conservation area is required (English Heritage).</li> <li>• Add more emphasis on design and biodiversity priorities.</li> <li>• Even though outline permission is likely to have been given, important matters should be the subject of conditions and ongoing dialogue with the development management planners and the community.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>There is a current outline planning application for the majority of the site, 13/2471N, due to be considered at the Strategic Planning board on 5/2/2014.</p> <p><u>Local food centre.</u> This is a specific proposal which may be acceptable but is not appropriate for the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Ecology.</u> The criteria of the policy, including parts 6i, and criteria g, h and k safeguard ecological interests on the site.</p> <p><u>Flooding.</u> The criteria of the policy, including parts 6i, and criteria h and k safeguard flooding issues on the site. .</p> <p><u>Conservation and archaeology.</u> The site boundary does include part of Reaseheath conservation area. This area is not included in the current planning application 13/2461N and is to the north of the new road alignment. It lies between the application site and existing development and cannot reasonably be excluded from the allocated site. The impact of the development on the adjoining battle of Nantwich site to the west is not considered to be significant by English Heritage. Mitigation measures are proposed as part of the current planning application, to comply with principle f.</p> <p><u>Schools contributions.</u> This refers to part 3 of policy CS21 and refers back to policy IN2 and paragraph 10.16. The current planning application proposes a site for a primary school, and on this basis the criterion may need to be changed. Possibly a more general policy is required, to provide on-site provision or where appropriate relevant contributions towards education facilities.</p> <p><u>Highway improvements and traffic issues.</u> The development includes a new highway link to Waterlode and will take traffic out of Reaseheath Conservation Area. Important pedestrian and cycle links are an essential part of the development, to improve accessibility in this part of the town. A more detailed plan has been prepared for the Local Plan Strategy to reflect the proposed A51 improvement scheme.</p> <p>This site will have direct access on to the A51 Nantwich Bypass and also on to</p> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Waterlode in the town centre. It is expected that traffic generated by the development in this area will have its most significant impact on the following junctions on the A51 corridor:</p> <p>A51/A500 Cheerbrook Roundabout, A51/A534 Peacock Roundabout, A51/A530 Alvaston Roundabout, A51/A534 Burford Crossroads</p> <p>As a result mitigation schemes have been identified in the Infrastructure Plan at all these junctions and funding for these improvements is being sought from Local Plan development that will affect this corridor through CIL and S106 contributions. Traffic management schemes have also been identified in the villages such as Wardle and Acton likely to be affected by the traffic increases in the area to mitigate any potential adverse impacts. Improvements to sustainable travel links along the River Weaver and Shropshire Union Canal are also proposed which will ensure good linkages to the town centre and local amenities.</p> <p><u>Geotechnical Investigation</u>: The planning application is supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment which includes assessment of hydrology. The response of the Environment Agency dated 23/7/2013 raises no objection in principle.</p> <p><u>Housing delivery rate</u>: A planning application has been submitted for the site which demonstrates the availability of the site for development.</p> <p><u>Riverside park</u>. The CS21 site includes riverside meadows to the south east of the site which are not included in the current planning application site, but are in the same ownership. This land is subject to flooding and is of high ecological value and would not be suitable for development. A footbridge is proposed in the current application 13/2471N to address the requirements of 6i and principles g and h, but it is considered necessary to retain this meadow in the allocated site.</p> <p><u>Affordable housing</u>. Criteria I refers to policy SC5. The affordable housing policy refers to assessments of viability where appropriate. The criterion of policy SC21 is sound and allows for assessment of housing need as part of a planning application.</p> <p><u>Sports pitches</u>. The objection seeks deletion of this requirement to comply with the current planning application. It is considered that the provision of additional sports pitches is justified for a development of this scale.</p> <p><u>Site boundary</u>. See points above regarding Reaseheath Conservation Area and Riverside meadow, where no changes to the site boundary are proposed. There is one further area where the site boundary needs to be reviewed at Holly Farm in the north-west corner. An area of land to the south and east of Holly Farm is excluded from the site allocation but is within the current planning application and should be included in the allocation as it lies between the allocated site and existing development.</p> <p>There may be an opportunity to review the boundaries in more detail as part of the site allocations stage.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wording of the schools contributions criteria may be revised following clarification of the section 106 agreement for the current application.</li> <li>• Amend site boundary to include land south and east of Holly Farm to conform to application 13/2471N boundary.</li> <li>• Amendments relating to conservation issues:</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point f of site specific principles of development: end of sentence to read:...and upon Reaseheath Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Paragraph 15.295. Immediately to the west of the site lies the Nantwich Civil War battlefield, included on English Heritage's Register of Battlefields. The northern part of the allocated site includes part of Reaseheath Conservation Area. These heritage assets will be protected and enhanced through appropriate landscaping, design and heritage assessments. The part of the allocated site within Reaseheath Conservation Area is not affected by the current planning application (except for part of the A51 diversion scheme). Any development proposals within the Conservation Area must be of a very high standard, reflecting their location.</li> <li>• End of Point 2 changed to 'including' instead of 'comprising of'.</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paras. 109, 112, 117 and 126 to National Policy, add priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities. Add 'Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment' to Local Evidence.</li> <li>• No material change to remainder of policy for reasons given above.</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS22: Stapeley Water Gardens, Nantwich</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 33 (Support: 3 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 30)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development of brownfield site already allocated for mixed use</li> <li>• Site is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to proposed number of dwellings – capacity should be reduced by 50 dwellings to 100</li> <li>• Object to proposed number of dwellings – capacity should be increased to 200 homes</li> <li>• Part of site (CS22) should be allocated for employment use to provide local jobs.</li> <li>• Support for a mix of uses on the site. This was demonstrated in the consultation on the Nantwich Town Strategy</li> <li>• The former Water Gardens should be turned into a landscaped park with water features</li> <li>• The Viability Assessment (NCS, October 2013) concludes that this site is not viable based on the implementation of the Council’s policies and standard returns to landowners. For this site to be delivered viably, either the landowner / developer would accept some reduced profit return to stimulate the development or the Council be minded to relax affordable housing or infrastructure contributions. In terms of the latter, it is noted that the “Site Specific Principles of Development” set out in the policies include: affordable housing and highways improvements and therefore question the viability of the site.</li> <li>• Accept that the eastern part of the site is well related to the existing urban form and suitable for development. Do not accept need for site to encroach into open countryside so far to the west.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location plan should be revised to incorporate both 'Phase 1' (as a Committed Site) and 'Phase 2' (as a Core Strategy Site).</li> <li>• Policy NE10 (new woodland planting and landscaping) from Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan should be retained as subject to S.106 and is used as mitigation for Great Crested Newts. Upgrade the policy and safeguard the land as an ecological mitigation corridor by means of an appropriately worded policy specifically relating to ecology/nature conservation. Such a policy shall be worded to preclude the construction of road infrastructure on, through, under, across or over this land</li> <li>• Phase 2 (the Core Strategy allocation) will be completed as one complete phase; with between 25-30 units to be built annually, and based on the development of about 200 units, this will take between 7-8 years to build out. The above is based on the assumption of a London Road access. Access via Peter Destapleigh Way would require acquisition of third party land, which will impact significantly on the timescales and the delivery of the Site</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy should be amended to: Following the development of 'Phase 1' of the Former Stapeley Water Gardens, development over the Core Strategy period will be achieved through 'Phase 2' which seeks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The delivery of approximately 200 new homes;</li> <li>2. The incorporation of Green Infrastructure, including open space provision.</li> </ol> <p>Site Specific Principles of Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The provision of an appropriate landscape buffer (including woodland planting and landscaping);</li> <li>b) Improvements to existing and the provision of new pedestrian and cycle links to surrounding residential, employment, shops, schools and health facilities, such links to include Green Infrastructure;</li> <li>c) Provision of appropriate contribution to off-site highways works, if deemed necessary;</li> <li>d) Development must ensure that it does not have a negative impact on established Great Crested Newt mitigation areas;</li> <li>e) Financial contributions to education provision, will be assessed on a case by case basis;</li> <li>f) At least 30% of all units should be affordable housing; however, this need should be assessed on a case by case basis with exceptions given to special circumstances and viability assessment.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of Saved Policy NE10</li> <li>• Policy changed to include employment uses</li> <li>• Change the former Water Gardens into a landscaped park and water feature</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>It is considered that the policy as currently drafted in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is appropriate to achieve the vision and objectives of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The Council contends that the site is deliverable and viable. The adjacent site has planning permission and is currently under construction. The Local Plan Strategy Site is being promoted and the developer has provided information on its delivery indicating that the site could take 7-8 years to deliver.</p> <p>Junction improvements in the south of Nantwich on Peter de Stapleigh Way and Newcastle Road have been identified as a result of traffic generated by development in the Stapeley area. These improvements will be funded through CIL and S106 contributions.</p> <p>Appendix F of the Employment Land Review (2012) identified that employment land demand is relatively limited in this area. In addition, proposals at Wardle and Crewe for larger employment sites provide local and accessible employment opportunities. The site is allocated due to its ability to contribute to Cheshire East's housing requirements.</p> <p>In relation to policy NE10 (new woodland planting and landscaping), this is outside of the site boundary and is considered as part of Appendix B: Saved Policies to be Replaced.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>  | <p>The following material changes are proposed to this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of references to employment land in paragraph 15.300</li> <li>• Change to Figure 15.40 to reflect status of adjoining site as a committed</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy Context: delete paras. 7 and 19, insert paras 109, 112 and 117 in National Policy, delete priority 1 and insert Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality in Strategic Priorities, delete priority 2 in SCS Priorities.</li><li>• Site justification wording has been altered to include; - Details of Construction Environment Management Plans, landscaping, green infrastructure and open space proposals should be submitted to the Council during any future planning application process on this site as part of sustainable development proposals and their proximity to European Site (consisting of either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and / or Ramsar Sites).</li></ul> |
|--|---|

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS23: Snow Hill, Nantwich</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 12 (Support: 4 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept gas works redevelopment</li> <li>• Support for the proposed allocation as a sustainable brownfield development in Nantwich</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land should be accorded Village Green Status</li> <li>• The site is in a flood plain</li> <li>• Should be enhanced by parkland and by sympathetic refurbishment of buildings</li> <li>• Retail capacity and need required for Snowhill</li> <li>• Multi Storey Car Park would require high quality design to complement High Conservation Character of the Town</li> <li>• Reinstate the housing proposal status within this priority redevelopment site and return the number of homes to 'at least 60' as the reduction to 12 homes further erodes the chances of the site making a significant contribution to meeting local needs.</li> <li>• Lack of evidence on deliverability for a mixed use scheme. No identified delivery partner or firm proposal.</li> <li>• Housing units should be redistributed to Nantwich South</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the architecturally poor buildings such as B&amp;M and Home Bargains in any re-development scheme for the area.</li> <li>• Snow Hill will be one of the most difficult development sites on land built up on the wastes from salt-houses. Obvious issues regarding archaeology and geotechnical.</li> <li>• Conference Venue should be added to hotel reference</li> <li>• Specialist attention to flooding and drainage required</li> <li>• Remove reference to formal footpaths and cycleways on both sides of the river. This needs to be the subject of detail design based on flood and biodiversity assessments</li> <li>• English Heritage - The site constraints should make reference to a Listed Building (Nantwich Bridge) which appears to be within the site and there are also a large number around its boundary. It should also make reference to any locally listed buildings, as this is an important site constraint (and reference to these has been made on other sites). Adjacent to Nantwich Conservation Area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its conservation areas including their setting, there will be need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to them, including views of the conservation area. If this area does make an important contribution to setting, then the plan would need to explain why its subsequent development is considered acceptable. We welcome recognition that the site is within an area of archaeological potential and that a desk-based</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | archaeological assessment will need to be made.   |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alter wording to say that: The allocation of the Snowhill area for Redevelopment will be investigated - but not decided at this stage. Any decisions shall be based on future Need and Capacity, so as to avoid damaging independent retailers that constitute the special character and current retailing success of Nantwich.</li> <li>• Make reference to Listed Building Nantwich Bridge and locally listed buildings and the fact it is adjacent to Nantwich Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Should be accorded Village Green Status</li> <li>• The site is in a flood plain</li> <li>• English Heritage - The site constraints should make reference to a Listed Building (Nantwich Bridge) which appears to be within the site and there are also a large number around its boundary. It should also make reference to any locally listed buildings, as this is an important site constraint (and reference to these has been made on other sites). The site is adjacent to Nantwich Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Conference Venue should be added to the hotel reference</li> <li>• Remove reference to formal footpaths and cycleways on both sides of the river. This needs to be the subject of detail design based on flood and biodiversity assessments.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allocation of Snowhill as a mixed use regeneration area presents the opportunity for a high quality development in a sustainable location. Any housing proposals brought forward as part of the delivery of the site will be treated as 'windfall' to the overall housing supply.</li> <li>• It is considered that any retail proposals and their impacts will be considered through the provisions already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework with further detail provided in the Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Development Plan Document.</li> <li>• The Council considers that a number of additional points should be added to the site specific principles of development which reinforce issues relating to contamination, flooding and the historic environment.</li> <li>• The mixed use regeneration area is considered to be deliverable over the Local Plan Strategy period.</li> <li>• The proposals for Green Infrastructure including access to the river Weaver are in accordance with adopted policies and will be subject to full assessment as part of any planning applications.</li> <li>• Improvements to sustainable travel links along the River Weaver and Shropshire Union Canal are also proposed which will ensure good linkages to the town centre and local amenities.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>The following material changes have been made to this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional point 'n' added – 'Proposals should consider impacts of development on the Listed 'Nantwich Bridge' and it's setting'.</li> <li>• Additional point 'o' added – 'Proposals should include an assessment of the contribution the area makes to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area, including views of the Conservation Area'.</li> <li>• Additional point 'p' added – 'Investigate the potential of contamination on the site on the former gasworks area'</li> <li>• Additional point 'q' added – 'New development will be expected to respect any</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>flooding constraints on the site and where necessary provide appropriate mitigation'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conference Venue added to hotel reference</li><li>• Policy Context: delete para. 18, insert paras 100, 110, 120 and 126 in National Policy, insert Priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality in Strategic Priorities. Add 'Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment' to Local Evidence.</li><li>• Text has been added "Retention of the floodplain of the River Weaver; a large area of the site lies within the floodplain of the River Weaver which needs to be protected from development Retention of the floodplain of the River Weaver; a large area of the site lies within the floodplain of the River Weaver which needs to be protected from development."</li></ul> |
|--|--|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Poynton</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 13 (Support: 3 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 7)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support</b></li> <li>• The London Road Butley Town Community support the Poynton Relief Road but to avoid limiting traffic flow on the A523 caused by exacerbation of existing traffic issues between Bonis Hall Lane and Silk Road we strongly advocate concomitant construction an off-line section of road passing behind the Butley Ash pub see detailed comment under Policy CO2</li> <li>• General support for the principle of a bypass for Poynton but Improvements to the A523 London Road as descibed above must be coordinated to coincide with the opening of the Bypass.</li> <li>• We support the identification of the Corridor of Interest for the Poynton Relief Road, and welcome further clarity on the route within the Submission Plan in light of the initial evaluation, and subsequently in the Site Allocations DPD.</li> <li>• <b>Objection</b></li> <li>• Sections 15.318 to 15.321 need to be quantified. Explanation needed regarding the need to take land out of greenbelt to meet development needs post 2030 in Poynton. Impact of the Poynton Bypass alignment on future land allocations for housing in the greenbelt needs to be considered in the document.</li> <li>• Ineffective approach to Poynton. Overall housing requirement is substantially higher. Can accommodate higher growth. Object to exclusion of Dickens Lane and NPS66 as Strategic Sites.</li> <li>• <b>Comment Only</b></li> <li>• All drawings showing street / road intersections are too small not clear in particular the Poynton By Pass and its effect on Prestbury. The document is good and well presented.</li> <li>• Lack of strategic sites in Poynton welcomed. Questioning the protected route of the Poynton Bypass</li> <li>• In theory the most direct route for the By-pass should be chosen as that ought to be the cheapest option as the start and finish points seem fixed. The identification of a location of a strategic site(s) for housing and any further development would seem appropriate at this stage. The safeguarded land should be similarly identified as part of this document.</li> <li>• Build the Poynton Relief Road but at the same time, make improvement to the A523 up to the beginning of the Silk Road. The final section between Bonis Hall Lane and the Silk Road should be 'off line' to the west of the existing A523, in an area behind the Butley Ash pub</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the 'Corridor of Interest'. Concerns regarding the impact of the Poynton-Woodford relief road.</li> <li>• In Poynton, this site is the best performing site overall in terms of its contribution to Green Belt; accessibility of facilities; sustainability of site; and deliverability ( see PRE-5595 Hollins PLC)</li> <li>• The Poynton bypass and airport link have been suggested for some time, with</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>the major justification being to reduce traffic congestion in and around the Poynton area. Inevitably the blackmail of including additional housing into the deal will probably wipe out any reduction in congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the decision not to identify any strategic sites in Poynton.</li> </ul> <p>Massive development permitted by Cheshire and MBC between 1955 and 1985 caused major problems in Poynton, with traffic congestion a significant problem around the village. Large new estates were built around Poynton, but there was no attempt to improve local roads.</p> <p>The Woodford site (in Stockport MBC) will have 950 houses. This will certainly have a large impact on Poynton's traffic levels.</p>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify strategic site or sites for housing and location of safeguarded land.</li> <li>• Please recognise the above points, especially the cross border impact of the large development at the former Woodford Aerodrome.</li> <li>• As developments progress I suggest shifting the central Poynton emphasis significantly away from the car to a cycle/pedestrian bias.</li> <li>• Sections 15.318 to 15.321 need clarification.<br/>Numbers (Hectares) for the land involved need to be added compatible with those presented in other parts of the documentation.</li> <li>• Include Dickens Lane, Poynton as a Strategic Site in the Core Strategy.<br/>Include NPS66 as a Strategic Site in the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Provision be included in the Local Plan to safeguard a route for the A523 to the west of the existing A523 London Road between The Silk Road and Bonis Hall Lane</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>It is considered that further detail regarding the Poynton Relief Road would be helpful and therefore it is recommended that Figure 15.42 is amended accordingly.</p> <p>The impact of the route of the Poynton Relief Road on future housing allocations can be adequately dealt with in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document</p> <p>There is a need to take land out of the Green Belt, to meet development needs post 2030 in Poynton. This reflects the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered through the preparation or review of a Local Plan and that such boundaries should have regard to their permanence in the long term, so that they are capable of enduring beyond the plan period. As this approach reflects Government guidance, it is not considered that the text should be amended.</p> <p>It has been suggested that allocations for development in Poynton should have been made. It is proposed that Poynton will accommodate in the order of 200 new homes. It is considered that a number of different sites will provide this scale of development and that they can be identified through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document, rather than the Local Plan Strategy, as this establishes the locations of the larger sites that form the Local Plan Strategy Sites and Strategic Locations.</p> <p>Cross boundary matters are being dealt with through the Duty to Co-Operate process. A Duty to Co-Operate Statement of Compliance will be produced which</p> |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>will deal with such matters.</p> <p>Policies CO1 and CO2 require the provision of infrastructure that will improve facilities for cycling and pedestrians. It is not proposed therefore to make a particular reference to this, as this is a requirement for all developments.</p> <p>With regard to the potential to safeguard land to the west of the existing A523 London Road between The Silk Road and Bonis Hall Lane, this will be dealt with by the delivery of appropriate infrastructure in the future.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>Figure 15.42 has been amended to show more detail about the route of the Poynton Relief Road which will be reflected further at the site allocations stage.</p> <p>Amendments to the Green Belt will be quantified at the site allocations stage along with and any safeguarded land required.</p>  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Sandbach</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 20 (Support: 3 / Object: 11 / Comment Only: 6)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support exclusion of the non-preferred sites around Sandbach</li> <li>• Housing (if needed) is sensibly/sustainably sited adjacent to the M6</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision should be for Employment – Business/Science Park only and sited on the Capricorn site</li> <li>• Current infrastructure cannot cope with additional housing in this area</li> <li>• Local amenities; such doctors, schools; pharmacies; car parking in town centre etc already over subscribed</li> <li>• The road infrastructure requires significant improvement to accommodate level of development in Sandbach</li> <li>• Employers/business should be sought to ensure there are suitable jobs for the local community – particularly young people</li> <li>• Central government funding has been received for J17 improvements which are linked to the employment use not housing</li> <li>• Housing on this site will only be utilised by commuters</li> <li>• Expansion to the Park House Care Home has not been allocated/considered – sustainable location – SHLAA site 4303</li> <li>• Need for extra care/care home type development in an ageing population</li> <li>• SHLAA site 4114 has not been allocated for residential development</li> <li>• Need for housing which is bespoke/individual on smaller sites</li> <li>• Sandbach will become a commuter town</li> <li>• Level of development in the area is unsustainable and will overwhelm the market town of Sandbach</li> <li>• Junction 17 needs major improvements as it will be over burdened from all developments in the surrounding area</li> <li>• Abbeyfields, Sandbach – Phase three for further 112 dwellings should be allocated</li> <li>• Land South of Hind Heath Road, Sandbach should be allocated for development – 100 dwellings adjacent to the current Bovis site</li> <li>• Number of housing proposed in Sandbach is not sufficient to address the lack of housing supply</li> <li>• Need to increase the level of new employment land in the town to increase level of jobs in Sandbach</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sandbach will become a commuter town</li> <li>• Limited amount of employment to substantiate housing developments</li> <li>• Development in Sandbach is not inline with priority to reduce emissions in the area</li> <li>• Lack of strategic thinking with regards to the Wildlife Corridor.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local habitats and species need consideration/statement – not just those covered by European Law (Brook Wood)</li> <li>• Open Space survey includes some private areas and some public areas - inconsistent</li> <li>• Important that sufficient space to upgrade Junction 17 (possibly a roundabout is required)</li> <li>• Query why number of houses to provided in Sandbach has reduced by 200 since previous consultation</li> <li>• New sites put forward Waterworks House</li> <li>• New site put forward Dingle Farm</li> <li>• New site put forward at Marsh Green Farm</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a Master Plan for Green Spaces/Wildlife area</li> <li>• Include new sites put forward Waterworks House</li> <li>• Include new site put forward Dingle Farm</li> <li>• Include new site put forward at Marsh Green Farm</li> <li>• Include new site Park House Care Home (SHLAA site 4303)</li> <li>• Extend settlement boundary of Sandbach to include Park Home Care Home to enable the expansion proposals proposed</li> <li>• Include new site put forward SHLAA 4114 – land between Rushcroft and Park House Residential Home, Congleton Road</li> <li>• Junction 17 need major improvement</li> <li>• Include new site – Abbeyfields Phase three</li> <li>• Include new site – Land South of Hind Heath Road, Sandbach</li> <li>• Increase housing numbers allocated to Sandbach</li> <li>• Increase employment land requirement allocated to Sandbach</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>As a Key Service Centre for Cheshire East it is important and as such the vitality and growth of this town contributes to the prosperity of the Borough as a whole.</p> <p>There are a number of committed housing sites (now shown on the Sandbach Town Plan) which should the level of residential development committed to come forward in the early part of the Local Plan around Sandbach. Therefore there is no further need to allocate any additional housing sites for development within the Sandbach town area, over and above the current committed sites.</p> <p>The Strategic mixed use site adjacent to the Junction 17 of the M6 is situated in a sustainable location, adjacent to the M6 motorway and this will help to improve the economy of Sandbach, and increasing the number of job opportunities for the local population, in line with the dwelling numbers. The site is expected to be largely developed as an employment site with some small scale ancillary housing to help fund improved access and infrastructure of the site, including bridging the brook which runs across the middle of the site. It is envisaged that any development on the site will maintain and improve the existing wildlife corridor. A comprehensive masterplan is expected to be submitted for the whole of the site.</p> <p>The future improvements to the M6 motorway Junction 17 will further improve the accessibility of this site and the vitality of the employment use, and an area of safeguarded land proposed to be situated around the junction to enable future improvements to come forward.</p> |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduction of housing numbers at the Capricorn site to 200. No additional housing proposed within the Sandbach area given the level of development which has been approved 'committed sites' in the recent past.</li><li>• Area of safeguarded land to be allocated around Junction 17 of the M6 to allow for future improvements to the Junction.</li></ul> |
|-----------------------|---|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS24: Land adjacent to J17 of M6, South East of Congleton Road, Sandbach</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 109 (Support: 4 / Object: 101 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support exclusion of the non-preferred sites around Sandbach</li> <li>• Housing (if needed) is sensibly/sustainably sited adjacent to the M6</li> <li>• Mixed employment and housing has worked in other areas therefore no reason why it wouldn't here</li> <li>• Important to get the plan in place to ensure no further speculative, unplanned, proposals come forward</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site was previously split up into two site, Employment site to the north (Capricorn Site – north of the site M6, Old Mill Road and Wildlife Corridor) and residential to the south.</li> <li>• Provision should be for Employment – Business/Science Park only and sited on the Capricorn site</li> <li>• Wildlife corridor needs to be maintained and improved</li> <li>• Unsustainable location for housing</li> <li>• Current infrastructure cannot cope with additional housing in this area</li> <li>• Increase in pollution from additional cars</li> <li>• Local amenities; such as doctors, schools; pharmacies; car parking in town centre etc already over subscribed</li> <li>• The road infrastructure requires significant improvement to accommodate such development</li> <li>• More suitable sites for housing shown as available/developable within the SHLAA</li> <li>• Unnecessary loss of green field site</li> <li>• Employers/business should be sought to ensure there are suitable jobs for the local community – particularly young people</li> <li>• Local community agreed to employment only on this site in previous consultations,</li> <li>• Capricorn site is allocated as Employment only in the Sandbach Town Strategy</li> <li>• Site was allocated for Employment only in the Congleton Local Plan</li> <li>• Central government funding has been received for J17 improvements which are linked to the employment use of the site not housing</li> <li>• Site was discounted for housing in the Cheshire East Development Strategy</li> <li>• Housing on this site will only be utilised by commuters</li> <li>• Wrong site for businesses with bad access points and no pedestrian links</li> <li>• This area in a Flood Risk Zone, SBI and protected area of open space (as designated in the CBLP)</li> <li>• Housing developments by large national builders have very little impact on local economy as they bulk buy and do not employ local people</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retail/restaurant/hotel development on the site would compete with the town centre</li> <li>• There is a Air Quality Management Zone around Junction 17 which would impact on housing</li> <li>• Noise from M6 would have a detrimental impact on dwellings adjacent to the site</li> <li>• Although the planning application for the site stated there was viability issues with a commercial allocation only and there was a need for some residential to fund the employment uses, this did not take into account the revenue from the pub/restaurant, hotel, drive thru café or café</li> <li>• HIMOR have found that the redevelopment of the site solely for employment purposes would be viable</li> <li>• Site fails to meet the tests of soundness, it is not justified: as there is no robust evidence base to support it, in that the site is either not needed, or it is not the most appropriate solution bearing in mind the reasonable alternatives</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query need for housing/level of housing proposed on the site given current number of committed sites around Sandbach</li> <li>• Possibility to increase employment uses to create jobs for the town</li> <li>• Site was previously split up into two site, Employment site to the north (Capricorn Site – north of the site M6, Old Mill Road and Wildlife Corridor) and residential to the south.</li> <li>• Wildlife corridor needs to be maintained and improved</li> <li>• Important that sufficient space to upgrade Junction 17 (possibly a roundabout is required)</li> <li>• Need for a new school in the Ettiley Heath area</li> <li>• Central government funding has been received for J17 improvements which are linked to the employment use of the site not housing</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust housing/employment mix to take into account recently granted substantial housing permissions within Sandbach</li> <li>• Site should be considered as two separate sites with a buffer between.</li> <li>• North site (Capricorn Site) should be allocated for employment only</li> <li>• Whole site should be allocated for employment only</li> <li>• South site should be allocated for housing but a reduced number than that proposed in the plan</li> <li>• Wildlife corridor needs to be maintained and improved and extended</li> <li>• Remove housing requirement completely on the site completely</li> <li>• New A533 to the north of Sandbach (Stud Green) linking to a redesigned M6 Junction 17 and substantial improvements to A534 from J17 to Arclid</li> <li>• Additional junction required off the M6</li> <li>• Inclusion of a Cinema on the site</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>This site is allocated for employment in the current Congleton Local Plan and it is still considered to present an important opportunity to deliver an employment led scheme in Sandbach with a small residential element which would enable infrastructure improvements, such as a bridge over the brook.</p> <p>The change of the site designation from employment to mixed use has been</p>  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>allocated to ensure the employment site is viable and will come forward within the plan period. The residential element of the development has been reduced significantly to 200 dwellings as the Council considered that the employment designation of this site is very important and key to delivering a sustainable plan.</p> <p>The housing numbers have been reduced to a maximum of 200 to ensure that the infrastructure for access to the site is brought forward which will ensure the larger areas of the site is available for employment use. Infrastructure, such as constructing a bridge over the brook, are important to ensure the long term development potential of the site. Allowing some release of the employment site for residential will ensure that these works come forward.</p> <p>It should be clear that the infrastructure improvements which relate to this site are not those currently being considered as improvements to the Junction 17 of the M6. Any contributions are for additional improvements required in the future and the improvement of infrastructure around the development site.</p> <p>The site as a whole must be considered comprehensively and it is envisaged that a masterplan for the whole site will be produced which will include the protection and enhancement of the wildlife corridor, and site for biological Importance/local wildlife site.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An area of land around Junction 17 of the M6 motorway is to be safeguarded for future improvements to the junction.</li> <li>• Number of dwellings planned for the site should be reduced down to 200 and is to be implemented at the same time as the infrastructure improvements, such as 'constructing a bridge over the brook'.</li> <li>• Phasing of residential development removed. All development to come forward in early part of development plan.</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paragraphs 100, 112 and 117 to National Policy, add priority 1 Promote economic prosperity and Priority 3 Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities, add priority 2 Create conditions for business growth to SCS Priorities. Add: 'Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment' to local evidence.</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Wilmslow</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 64 (Support: 4 / Object: 53 / Comment Only: 7)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for overall housing target of 400 homes for Wilmslow</li> <li>• Wilmslow has housing needs and the Local Plan is obliged to provide for them by the NPPF</li> <li>• Sites will minimise impacts and provide infrastructure to support development</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of housing provision (400) not sufficient to meet needs of Wilmslow; fails to meet local needs and further sites will be required in Wilmslow</li> <li>• Technical work carried out on behalf of Royal London suggests an appropriate level of housing provision for Wilmslow would be in the range of 1,900-2,280 dwellings. Moving provision to Handforth East is not sustainable or adequate substitute for development in Wilmslow; no evidence that Handforth East is a preferable solution to meeting Wilmslow's needs when there are good, sustainably located, developable sites in Wilmslow</li> <li>• Failure to meet needs in Wilmslow will exacerbate affordability problems, reduce vibrancy of town and affect local businesses</li> <li>• There is no need for 400 new houses in Wilmslow</li> <li>• A brownfield first policy should be actively pursued which would satisfy housing needs; allocation of greenfield sites contravenes the Government's brownfield first policy</li> <li>• There are more than enough commitments and brownfield sites to meet the requirement for 400 homes without the need for greenfield sites</li> <li>• No development on any greenfield sites in Wilmslow</li> <li>• Residents objections have been ignored</li> <li>• Need to maintain the character of Wilmslow</li> <li>• Insufficient affordable housing will be provided. Affordable housing in the Wilmslow and Handforth sub-area makes up only 13.3% of the stock. Applying the policy requirement of 30% affordable housing to the provision of 400 homes equates to delivery of only 6 affordable units per year compared to a need for at least 25 according to the SHMA. Affordability is a real issue in Wilmslow and has significant impacts on the local economy</li> <li>• Property prices are too high in Wilmslow. New building should benefit the people of Wilmslow who need help to stay in the area; homes must be affordable to these people</li> <li>• New housing will not be of benefit to residents of Wilmslow as they already have a house in the town therefore new occupants will be from outside of the town.</li> <li>• Need for safeguarded land around Wilmslow not demonstrated</li> <li>• Allocation of sites ignores the current surplus of office space, industrial land and hotel room provision in Wilmslow; need policy for converting empty office and space over shops into residential use</li> <li>• Proposals for Wilmslow not in accordance with the Wilmslow Town Strategy</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals for Wilmslow not in accordance with the stated views of the Cheshire East Council Leader</li> <li>• Supply of jobs is not an issue as these are available at Waters Corporation, Alderley park, Airport City and commercial growth in Greater Manchester and the North West region; Wilmslow is a dormitory town not an employment area</li> <li>• Residents' views have not been properly considered</li> <li>• There is an oversupply of employment land in Wilmslow</li> <li>• Increased congestion and parking problems in Wilmslow</li> <li>• Infrastructure cannot cope</li> <li>• No realistic plan to upgrade the local infrastructure to cope with the increased population</li> <li>• Land at Pigginshaw Nursery, Altrincham Road (SHLAA ref 3316) lies adjacent to the built-up area, is visually enclosed and sustainably located. It is available, achievable and developable and should be included in the urban area of the Wilmslow and excluded from the Green Belt and Area of Special County Value for Landscape enabling it to contribute to the acknowledged housing shortfall.</li> <li>• Land at Beechfield Farm (SHLAA ref 4107) is a mixed use site suitable for development, available, achievable and developable with capacity for about 6 dwellings. It serves no Green Belt purpose and should be removed from the Green Belt to round off the settlement and establish a defensible boundary.</li> <li>• Land at Stockton Road should be excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development. It is a sustainable location and is capable of being developed without constraints. It has good physical boundaries and would not affect the integrity of the wider Green Belt</li> <li>• Significant development proposals at Woodford Aerodrome have not been considered</li> <li>• No evidence of liaison with neighbouring authorities</li> <li>• Given the approach of meeting Wilmslow's need on a single site in Handforth, the housing numbers for the both settlements should be considered together, not separately</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Coach House, Alderley Road (SHLAA ref 3686) is adjacent to the Royal London site. It should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated as a residential development site</li> <li>• Wilmslow needs a new High School</li> <li>• Object to development on site to the east of Stockton Road, Chesham Road and Welton Drive (not identified as a proposed Strategic Site or a non-preferred site)</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a brownfield first policy for Wilmslow</li> <li>• No development on greenfield sites in Wilmslow</li> <li>• Retain Green Belt around Wilmslow</li> <li>• No safeguarded land for Wilmslow</li> <li>• Remove paragraph 15.329 because it is a subjective statement without supporting evidence</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | Changes made to the map  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Representations regarding strategic sites have been included in appropriate  |

sections. Changes to the Wilmslow map reflect this.

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS25: Adlington Road, Wilmslow</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 96 (Support: 2 / Object: 91 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has been safeguarded for development since 1988</li> <li>• Site has never been part of the Green Belt; makes minimal contribution to the purposes of Green Belt; well related to the urban edge</li> <li>• Minor constraints can be resolved and site can be brought forwards for development</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protected Trees on site</li> <li>• Hedgerows important to wildlife on site</li> <li>• Significant wildlife present on site including bats, (badgers) and newts</li> <li>• Ponds on site</li> <li>• Adjacent to Bollin Valley which is an important wildlife corridor</li> <li>• Adjacent to Bollin Valley Area of Special County Value for landscape</li> <li>• Site is in agricultural use; sheep grazing land</li> <li>• Local opinion has been ignored</li> <li>• Develop brownfield sites first</li> <li>• Wilmslow Town Strategy states that there the site will be safeguarded until at least 2025; land not required to satisfy the housing requirements for Wilmslow in the short term</li> <li>• There are sufficient brownfield sites in Wilmslow to deliver the required 400 houses by 2030 – greenfield development not appropriate</li> <li>• Conflicts with NPPF paras 183-15; para 17 bullets 1, 4 and 7; para 47 bullet 5; para 48; para 76; para 59.</li> <li>• Proposed density of 30 dph is considerably in excess of that of the surrounding area; Wilmslow Town Strategy states that when release this land should be considered as being suitable for larger family homes</li> <li>• Local infrastructure is already strained and will be made worse by nearby development at Woodford; additional traffic congestion in North East Wilmslow.</li> <li>• Safety issues – Adlington Road is narrow with fast moving traffic and dangerous bends</li> <li>• Council Leader stated that ‘these fields will not be built on’ at the Friends of Dean Row meeting.</li> <li>• Would subsume the hamlet of Dean Row</li> <li>• No doctors surgery within reasonable distance</li> <li>• Local junior school is already over capacity</li> <li>• Lack of public transport</li> <li>• Wilmslow is becoming an extension of Greater Manchester and Stockport conurbations</li> <li>• Inadequate drainage infrastructure</li> <li>• No evidence of liaison with Stockport MBC regarding impacts of development, e.g. on the road network</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsustainable location distant from the town centre</li> <li>• No evidence that the site is deliverable</li> <li>• Although not in the Green Belt, the Green Belt Assessment concludes that the site makes a significant contribution to the checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over vehicular access and traffic pressures on Adlington Road</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designate the site as safeguarded land until at least 2025</li> <li>• Remove the site from the plan</li> <li>• Safeguard the site to prevent development unless it becomes clear that it will be needed to achieve Wilmslow's housing requirement of 400 homes by 2030</li> <li>• Designate site as Green Belt</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Adlington Road site offers an opportunity to deliver a high quality, well connected and integrated residential development to contribute to the identified housing needs of Wilmslow. There are insufficient viable and deliverable brownfield sites to meet the overall housing need. Whilst this is a greenfield site, it is not located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site specific principles of development require that proposals retain the existing mature trees and hedgerows wherever possible. They also require that new development respects any existing ecological constraints on site and provide appropriate mitigation where necessary.</p> <p>There are a mix of densities and character areas surrounding the site. It is acknowledged that there are areas of particularly low-density housing to the south and east although there are areas to the north and west that are of higher density. The site specific principles of development require a high quality design that reflects and respects the character of the area. In addition, it would be appropriate to reduce the overall number of new dwellings on this site to reduce the density and to better reflect the number proposed in the recently submitted planning application.</p> <p>As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, the site benefits from good access to some forms of public transport and good access to a range of types of open spaces and key services and amenities.</p> <p>The site affords access to a principal road, the A5102 (Adlington Road) and it is considered that a suitable access could be created to this road. Officers in the Highways department are content with the allocation of this site for residential purposes. In addition, any planning application will be required to submit a detailed Transport Assessment, looking at the impacts on the local transport network.</p> <p>There is no justification for including a policy requirement that development on this land be delayed until after 2025. When considered against policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, taken as a whole, it is considered that this site is a sustainable location for development and its allocation would be in accordance with the Framework.</p> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>The site is in the control of a regional house builder, a full planning application has recently been submitted for 203 dwellings and the site is considered to be suitable, available, achievable and deliverable in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site should be retained. To better reflect the surrounding area, the density of development should be decreased by lowering the overall number of new dwellings proposed from 225 to approximately 200. This would also be more consistent with the number proposed in the recent planning application. The indicative site delivery (phasing) should be amended so that 175 homes are expected in the early part of the plan period with 25 expected during the middle part.</li> <li>• 'Negate' changed to 'mitigate' 4<sup>th</sup> para of justification.</li> <li>• Policy Context: delete paras. 7 and 20, insert paras. 109, 112 and 117 in National Policy.</li> </ul> |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS26: Royal London, Wilmslow</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 93 (Support: 3 / Object: 83 / Comment Only: 7)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong boundaries to contain future development</li> <li>• Support designation of land west of Alderley Road as protected open space to help maintain its contribution to the southern approach to Wilmslow</li> <li>• Preferable to site at Chesham Road / Welton Drive</li> <li>• Good infill opportunity to expand existing employment area and deliver much needed housing in a sustainable location</li> <li>• Within easy walking / cycling distance of town centre with its services and transport links</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is sufficient brownfield land in Wilmslow to accommodate the required development so this site is not appropriate; development should be limited to brownfield sites only; Wilmslow is well on track to build the required 400 homes before 2030 so no justification for building on Green Belt</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstances that justify removing land from Green Belt</li> <li>• This site is key in maintaining the separation between Wilmslow and Alderley; Edge; site performs the five functions of Green Belt as listed in the NPPF</li> <li>• Need a comprehensive review of capacity of the built up area (including existing safeguarded land) before looking at Green Belt sites</li> <li>• No justification to removing the land to the west of Alderley Road from Green Belt to re-designate it as Protected Open Space – should remain as Green Belt.</li> <li>• No justification to designate land west of Alderley Road as Protected Open Space – is has no public access and is in agricultural use and should be allocated for housing to help meet the need for housing in Wilmslow (which is considerably greater than 400 homes). If there is a genuine need for additional public open space, the Council’s own land at Prestbury Road should be used to meet this. Public Open Space at Royal London would be better provided as playing pitches which could be used by the school.</li> <li>• Plan refers to the specific need for open space within south west Wilmslow but this need is overstated and not supported by the evidence. Designation as Protected Open Space is unsound and has no evidential basis.</li> <li>• Site is subject to frequent flooding, particularly in the area around Whitehall Brook; would need to establish effective soakaway drainage</li> <li>• Southern half of the site consists of made ground and there is contamination from that land that necessitated ventilation when the bypass was constructed</li> <li>• The Council is attempting to turn Wilmslow into an industrial town</li> <li>• The land to the west of Alderley Road has limited amenity value and would form a more logical place for development than Prestbury Road, so it should be safeguarded for future development</li> <li>• Site should be used for employment purposes only, not housing; housing not logical on this site given its location amongst existing employment buildings</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure is already strained</li> <li>• There is already a surplus of hotel, housing, office and industrial land</li> <li>• Significant amounts of vacant office space already exist in Wilmslow</li> <li>• AstraZeneca’s vacation of Alderley Park will leave significant amounts of commercial space vacant</li> <li>• No requirement for a hotel – the County Hotel and Harden Park Hotel are nearby and have closed, demonstrating an overcapacity of hotel space in the area; existing Wilmslow hotels operate at around 75% capacity</li> <li>• During a radio interview, the Council Leader stated that this land would remain in the Green Belt</li> <li>• This is agricultural land</li> <li>• Will add to the urbanisation of Wilmslow</li> <li>• Employment Land Review only requires 4ha of employment land in Wilmslow, which will be more than catered for by the Waters Corporation Development, Alderley Park development and Airport City</li> <li>• Wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Loss of trees</li> <li>• Planning policy needs to continue restraint in north Cheshire to aid the regeneration on Greater Manchester</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hotel development should incorporate conferencing facilities</li> <li>• Alterations will be needed to Alderley Road near to the junction with A34 – traffic turning left onto the bypass needs its own left turn only lane.</li> <li>• Land at The Coach House is immediately adjoining this site and would be an isolated parcel of Green Belt. This site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development</li> <li>• The site includes two Grade II listed buildings. Therefore, any development proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they will conserve those elements, which contribute to the significance of the listed buildings and their setting (English Heritage).</li> <li>• Grade II listed Fulshaw Hall and its setting should be specifically referenced</li> <li>• A desk-based assessment is required for this site, with appropriate mitigation, if required</li> <li>• The land required for employment uses is around 5ha – appendix A refers to 2ha.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain site within the Green Belt</li> <li>• Remove site from plan</li> <li>• No sound justification for linking delivery of housing to delivery of employment uses (site principles point a)</li> <li>• Reference the additional playing fields to be provided for the school</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The Royal London site offers an opportunity to deliver a high quality, sustainably located and integrated mixed-use development to contribute to the identified development needs of Wilmslow. There are insufficient viable and deliverable brownfield sites to meet the overall housing need. It is important to note that not all brownfield sites are available or developable and whilst the Plan is supportive of the principle of brownfield sites redevelopment, there is no policy hook within the NPPF that would allow a Local Plan policy to require that all identified brownfield sites are developed before greenfield sites.</p>   |

This is a Green Belt site and the exceptional circumstances that justify alterations to the detailed Green Belt boundary are set out in the report on the Green Belt policy. Surrounded by existing development, major roads and a railway line, this site will have strong boundaries to prevent further encroachment into the countryside in the future.

Whilst there are some vacancies in Wilmslow's office stock, this is to be expected in any property market, particularly given the economic circumstances of recent years. It is entirely appropriate to Plan to meet the needs arising over the period to 2030. The inclusion of a hotel is considered appropriate to the delivery of a successful scheme as part of the overall development mix and as a supporting facility for businesses. It is not clear where the quoted figure of existing Wilmslow Hotels operating at 75% capacity is taken from, however this is significantly greater than the average hotel occupancy rate, both regionally and nationally. The most recent VisitEngland occupancy survey (November 2013) shows that for the past 12 months, room occupancy in England has been 68%. The equivalent figure for the North West of England was 61%.

The Employment Land Review identifies that there is an overall employment land requirement of between 265 ha and 308 ha during the Plan period across Cheshire East. It does not disaggregate this requirement by town. The NPPF is clear that "*significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system*" and it is appropriate that a successful, well-located town such as Wilmslow provides a modest amount of employment land to facilitate new business investment.

Although there are existing employment buildings on site as well as proposals for new employment space, the site is located adjacent to an existing residential area and the employment space consists of B1 uses (offices, research and development and light industry) that are appropriate uses in residential area. The policy does not allow for general industry or storage and distribution uses which may not be appropriate in close proximity to residential properties.

The Agricultural Land classification shows that the majority of this area is Grade 3 agricultural land. Data is not available to disaggregate this into Grade 3a or 3b.

The Open Space Assessment for Wilmslow shows that there is a lack of provision of open spaces of a number of types in south-west Wilmslow including parks and gardens, semi natural and natural green space, green corridors, outdoor sports, children's play, allotments and country parks. In addition to the Protected Open Space to the west of Alderley Road, the scheme is intended to provide additional plating fields for Wilmslow High School and it will be appropriate to reference this in the policy.

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment does indicate the risk of flooding from Mobberley Brook and from a small field drain. As a result, a detailed site-specific Flood Risk Assessment should be prepared as part of any planning application. This should be referenced in the site specific principles of development

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>Similarly, any planning application will need to consider the potential for contamination on site and carry out site investigations if necessary.</p> <p>The Coach House is a property directly adjoining to the northern boundary of the Royal London site. This property is also currently within the Green Belt. Removal of the Royal London site from the Green Belt would leave this as a small isolated pocket of Green Belt surrounded by existing development and this development site. It will therefore be appropriate to remove the Coach House from the Green Belt. For this purpose, it should be included within the boundary of the Royal London Site although it will not be expected to form part of a comprehensive scheme at Royal London.</p> <p>Whilst the need to conserve historic environment assets is set out in Policy SE7, it will be appropriate to specifically reference the protection of the setting of listed buildings on this site.</p> <p>The employment element of the site proposals is expressed in a floorspace range (17,000 – 24,000 square metres) but for the purposes of calculating employment land supply, this is converted to a site area in Appendix A. It is accepted that the document underestimated the area allocated to employment uses and it will be appropriate to increase this to 5ha in Appendix A. The floorspace to be provided should remain the same.</p> <p>It is accepted that housing need exists in Wilmslow now and it may be unreasonable to tie the delivery of the housing to the delivery of the employment element, particularly given the current difficulties in bringing forward speculative development. Therefore it would be more appropriate to tie the delivery of housing to the delivery of a serviced site for employment.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site should be retained in the Plan. To better reflect the amount of land required to deliver the employment floorspace envisaged, increase the amount of employment land as indicated in Appendix A has been from 2 ha to 5 ha.</li> <li>• Add a specific reference to the provision of additional playing fields for Wilmslow High School</li> <li>• Add a specific reference to the preparation of a site specific flood risk assessment to support any development proposals</li> <li>• Include The Coach House within the boundary of the Royal London site to be removed from the Green Belt</li> <li>• Add reference to respecting the setting of listed buildings on site including Fulshaw Hall</li> <li>• Reword point A of Site Specific Principles of Development to tie delivery of housing to the provision of a serviced site for employment</li> <li>• Policy Context: Delete para. 7, insert paras 85, 109 and 117 in National Policy, add priority 7. Drive out the causes of poor health to SCS Priorities.</li> <li>• Add: 'Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment' to Local Evidence.</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation point</b>  | <b>Site CS27: Wilmslow Business Park</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 76 (Support: 1 / Object: 72 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of the site enables CS to deliver the Visions and Strategic Priority 1</li> <li>• The site is very well related to the site at Royal London CS26</li> <li>• The identification of Core Strategy Sites, the allocation of definitive and precise areas of land, is fully in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 157.</li> <li>• The site has been technically assessed in terms of ecology, landscape, visual impact and flood risk.</li> <li>• Enhancements can be made to access</li> <li>• No realistic alternative sites have been identified for employment use in Wilmslow</li> <li>• The site is sustainably located</li> <li>• It is considered the site has more capacity to deliver more B1 floor space</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need not established, Manchester airport, Alderley Park and Royal London Site can provide need</li> <li>• Will exacerbate traffic at A34/A538 junction and have severe traffic impact</li> <li>• Present infrastructure strained</li> <li>• Flora and fauna present on site</li> <li>• More land allocated for employment than required by ELR</li> <li>• Significant site constraints including relocation of playing fields accommodating car parking for new development and identified flood risk.</li> <li>• Rail and road noise will deter future occupiers</li> <li>• Site makes a major contribution to the Green Belt</li> <li>• Reserve the school for the expansion of Wilmslow High school</li> <li>• No special circumstances to justify removing site from the Green Belt</li> <li>• Site did not form part of earlier consultations</li> <li>• Enough brownfield sites available for development</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept need for limited development</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain as Green Belt</li> <li>• Remove site from Plan</li> <li>• The site for the expansion of Wilmslow High School</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>This Wilmslow Business Park site presents an opportunity to deliver a high quality sustainable employment led development to contribute to the provision of the Borough's knowledge-based industry.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the north of the site is currently used by Wilmslow High School as a playing field, and therefore the site allocation has been amended to take account of this. The amended allocation of the site allows for the future</p>   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>development of the site associated with an educational use. This will allow for an improved educational provision for the area in the long term.</p> <p>This site as a whole is a small area of land bounded by the West Coast Main Line to the west and the A34 Wilmslow bypass to the east. Whilst the site allocation will require the removal of the area from the Green Belt it is considered that the site has clearly defensible boundaries and is therefore an ideal opportunity to develop a sustainable employment site with an area allocated for education use.</p> <p>It is envisaged that a masterplan along with a landscape scheme will be required as part of any future development of the site to ensure the impact of the development on the surrounding area is limited. Furthermore, the landscaping of the site will help to mitigate for the visual impact of the development, and help to create a buffer with the railway and road network.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change plan to show designation of northern area of the site to be safeguarded for education use.</li> <li>• Reduction in area of business use</li> <li>• Add new paragraph after 15.358 to include the retention of the existing educational use to the north of the site.</li> <li>• Include '2. Retain and improve the educational use of the allocation'</li> <li>• Include 'where applicable' to section 'd' of the site specific principles of development.</li> <li>• Within the justification para 15.364 add 'the southern part of the site'</li> <li>• Within the justification para 15.369 add to the end 'and the educational use to the north'.</li> <li>• Policy Context: Delete paras 7 and 120, insert paras. 74, 85, 112 and 117 in National Policy.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Site CS28: Wardle Employment Opportunity Area</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 7 (Support: 2 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the landscape driven approach of masterplan of the area</li> <li>• Support intensification of existing employment uses at Wardle</li> <li>• Identification of land at former Wardle airfield for future development is supported</li> <li>• A clear evidence base for development has been established through the existing planning application</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to development dues to increased level of sustainability this brings to Alpraham and the associated development pressures to deliver new housing here. Growth should be closely proportionate to growth in surrounding areas, particularly Alpraham. A new settlement at Alpraham should not be pursued</li> <li>• Acton may be impacted by through traffic</li> <li>• The Wardle Employment allocation should be delivered in tandem with the growth of Alpraham as a Sustainable Village with the aspiration of Alpraham becoming a local service centre. Without this joint approach the proposed employment allocation will not meet the tests of Sustainable Development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jobs created should be for people from Nantwich Crewe and surrounding villages thus ousting the residential need in and around Wardle</li> <li>• Detailed travel plan needed</li> <li>• As brownfield sites become available, current need for development may be ameliorated or removed</li> <li>• The landscape-driven approach to the masterplan for the area should mitigate against visual impact of existing large shed development as well as new development.</li> <li>• The traffic impact on local communities needs monitoring against baseline.</li> <li>• More detail needed in the Green Infrastructure plan</li> <li>• Outline permission already granted for industrial uses</li> <li>• At present Figure 15.49 does not strictly accord with the approved masterplan in terms of site coverage.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promise of job creation should be formally recorded to deter residential applications.</li> <li>• Designate Shropshire Union canal as a conservation area. This is a matter to be considered as part of further work including the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</li> <li>• Update site boundary to CS28 to reflect planning application 13/2035N. The planning application site occupies a gross site area of 61.7ha which is the necessary quantum to provide low density, sensitively designed development, the council is justified in amending the CS accordingly.</li> <li>• Growth proportionate to the phased employment development should be centred on the existing communities, principally within Alpraham, aimed at</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>sensitive growth over the Plan period of housing, facilities and amenities to increase the sustainability of the village and form a future local service centre</p>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>An outline planning application including means of access for employment development comprising light industry, general industrial and storage and distribution uses (B1(C)/B2/B8 use classes) was considered at the Strategic Planning Board held on 4/12/2013. It was resolved to grant permission subject to a prior section 106 agreement relating to highway and accessibility matters and conditions. (13/2035N).</p> <p>The planning application includes a masterplan and substantial environmental improvements and is consistent with the allocation.</p> <p>The site is a well established employment area and the allocation brings much needed opportunities for environmental and highway improvements based on appropriate expansion.</p> <p>The suggested housing development at Alpraham does not relate well to the achievement of the Vision and Strategic Priorities as it would represent a major expansion of a small settlement. There are other, more appropriate sites in this part of the Borough with fewer constraints and better access to services, facilities and the transport network which are capable of meeting housing needs.</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend boundary of allocated site to correspond with the planning application site boundary.</li> <li>• Change point 2 of CS28 policy: Intensification of employment and ancillary uses within the area including B1(C Light Industry), B2 and B8 uses, of an appropriate scale, design and character and in accordance with an acceptable Masterplan.</li> <li>• Point 3. Re-number sub-headings in Roman numerals and delete 'and to separate' from point 3i (duplication).</li> <li>• Amend point 3v: Compliance with a habitat creation and management plan including mitigation for protected species.</li> <li>• Amend last sentence of 15.372 for readability.</li> <li>• Amend second sentence of para 15.374: The Masterplan will ensure that an appropriate landscape-driven employment park is achieved, in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paras. 117 and 126 to National Policy, add priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS29: Alderley Park Opportunity Site</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 74 (Support: 9 / Object: 51 / Comment Only: 14)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for attracting new business to the site</li> <li>• Encourage use of the park for high tech and health business opportunities</li> <li>• Make effective re-use of buildings on site</li> <li>• Development on the frontage of B5087 and A34 should be avoided to retain character and setting of the site</li> <li>• We are privileged to live in Nether Alderley and to have so much GB and space to enjoy but there are others who have an equal right to live in our countryside and we should therefore welcome the initiative.</li> <li>• Ensure village facilities included as part of new development</li> <li>• Housing should be targeted at first time buyers</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site must be treated as brownfield/windfall site for residential development</li> <li>• Any housing should be on PDL with no use of Green Belt</li> <li>• Consultation has gone on for so long that plan is out of touch</li> <li>• Refer clearly and directly to what is being proposed so that communities understand proposals</li> <li>• Proposals were not in the pre-submission core strategy</li> <li>• The existing employment area is close to Macclesfield where it has been pointed out that there is an excess of employment land available.</li> <li>• Against encroachment into the countryside by residential development</li> <li>• National Trust has interests at Nether Alderley Mill and the water supply originating via sources in Alderley Park. Mechanisms must be in place to secure on-going management of the whole site as part of a masterplan</li> <li>• Cannot predict what the housing requirement will be in 17 years time</li> <li>• Economics of a science park are dependent on occupancy which takes time to fill. To make the site viable, housing will be required</li> <li>• The site is suited to a village style mixed use development</li> <li>• CEC will face intense competition from SME and start up business from airport city</li> <li>• Although mixed developments can succeed this is isolated in the middle of the countryside</li> <li>• Development at the scale proposed would have detrimental affect on the rural community with pressure on local services and road network</li> <li>• Location of development will mean high car dependency of occupiers</li> <li>• No development on Green Belt</li> <li>• Kings School may move to site creating another brownfield site in Macclesfield to use before Green Belt release</li> <li>• Unclear why this site has more protection than building on Greenfield and Green Belt sites</li> <li>• Capacity at this site will reduce need for GB roll back</li> <li>• Sufficient housing capacity exists elsewhere to ensure residential development not required here</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish survey suggested 79% of respondents do not want significant new housing in the area</li> <li>• No mention of housing in the PSCS. It is now public knowledge that up to 200 houses will be sought therefore consultation process flawed as CS29 not what appears to be in the document</li> <li>• Development of 200 houses does not follow CS and does not meet policy principles underpinning the Plan</li> <li>• The heritage of the country estate should be protected</li> <li>• Significant impact on existing woodlands and natural assets</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In previous documents there has been an emphasis on big pharma. Relocation of AstraZeneca will affect this emphasis</li> <li>• Site will increase employment land stock.</li> <li>• Part of site is brownfield and should be considered for housing</li> <li>• Given failures elsewhere it is unlikely that Alderley park will achieve the level of status it currently enjoys with Astra Zeneca and new companies will not exert the same purchasing power and economic impact on the area currently provided by 3000 staff</li> <li>• There is ample space to provide mixed use housing which would relieve pressure of the Green Belt elsewhere</li> <li>• If there is a need to use GB in the north of the Borough it should be here</li> <li>• Site should be mixed use and not reserved for employment only</li> <li>• Concerned site contains a large Wildlife site</li> <li>• Technology parks are difficult to fill – technology park plus housing would be more successful.</li> <li>• The infrastructure is already there to support new employment and residential development</li> <li>• Site boundary is close to Nether Alderley Conservation Area and site contains a number of Listed Buildings – development must consider impact on historic environment. Any development proposals to demonstrate that historic character and setting can be conserved and enhanced</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A quality hotel should be included in future development</li> <li>• Use brownfield part of the site for housing</li> <li>• Allocate site as mixed use</li> <li>• Ensure no development on land which is not previously developed</li> <li>• Consideration of impact on historic environment/setting</li> <li>• Provision of quantified evidence based assessments of employment and residential need/impact</li> <li>• Re-do housing calculations and predicted need</li> <li>• Include specific reference to housing development, current wording is unclear on intended use of site</li> <li>• Refer directly to any change of use and make numbers and location clear</li> <li>• Consider allocation of site CS29 for employment rather than housing</li> <li>• Make specific reference to development of the site as a science park</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>Residential development will be an acceptable element of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site where it is located on previously developed areas and can support the delivery of a science park</p> <p>The site was included in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy as 'Alderley Park Opportunity Site'</p>   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>It is intended that a Masterplan or similar document be developed and adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document or similar to provide guidance on development and design principles to address issues of heritage, natural environment and landscape in particular.</p> <p>Any residential development at this site will contribute to the overall delivery of housing numbers across Other Settlements and Rural Areas and therefore any development of the site does not negate the need Green Belt towns to sustainably</p>   |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new footnote has been inserted to state: 'The life sciences industry is defined by the application of Biology, covering medical devices, medical diagnostics and pharmaceuticals, through to synthetic and industrial biotechnology. (Strategy for UK Life Sciences, March 2012, Department for Business Innovation and Skills).'</li> <li>• Policy re-written to clarify purpose of development on site and specify conditions under which residential development may be acceptable.</li> <li>• Text inserted into justification at 15.378 for further clarity: 'The Council and AstraZeneca have a shared aspiration that the site should evolve from a single occupier site to a 'cluster' of life science businesses with a particular focus on human health science research and development, technologies and processes.'</li> <li>• Text inserted into justification at 15.379 for further clarity: 'and not prejudicial to its longer term growth, or complimentary to the life science park and not prejudicial to its establishment or growth.'</li> <li>• For clarity and accuracy the Policy Context section has been updated: 'National Policy' now includes paragraph 126 of NPPF. Priority 3 in Strategic Priorities corrected to read priority 2; Priority 3 added to include 'Protecting and enhancing environmental quality'.</li> </ul> |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS30: North Cheshire Growth Village</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 110 (Support: 1 / Object: 104 / Comment Only: 5)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces development pressure and enables better Green Belt protection at other settlements. Serves development at Airport City.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No local need for 2300 homes</li> <li>• Parish Council are opposed</li> <li>• Only use brownfield sites in Handforth</li> <li>• Ensure a rigorous consultation process always takes place</li> <li>• Road network congested and site will impact negatively</li> <li>• Damage to habitat and species</li> <li>• Ribbon development will destroy views to Peak District</li> <li>• No unique justification for removal of GB</li> <li>• This land prevents sprawl from Greater Manchester</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be provided in exiting communities</li> <li>• In 2012 CEC estimated that Handforth would require up to 600 homes to 203. Existing permissions have been granted for come 100 homes. This need therefore stands at 100.</li> <li>• Site not considered as part of the SEMMMS scheme.</li> <li>• Whilst it is recognised that there have been meetings with representatives from Greater Manchester and Stockport MBC, it is not considered that these have been meaningful, complete, or significant. Furthermore, there has been no relevant formal liaison with or inclusion of neighbouring communities, such as Woodford, Cheadle Hulme and Bramhall, who would be significantly impacted by the CEC Local Plan. On this basis it is considered that the Cheshire East fails the duty to cooperate “test”.</li> <li>• Scale of development disproportionate to need</li> <li>• Damage to rural economy</li> <li>• Loss of leisure amenity</li> <li>• Insufficient justification to change GB boundaries. GB here fulfillsd all roels set out in NPPF</li> <li>• Predicted housing need in CEC may not be accurate</li> <li>• Few people in the Stockport, Bramhall, Cheadle Hulme areas have been notified of proposals</li> <li>• Site will not resolve locally generated need of town s in tnorht of the borough</li> <li>• The proposal would lead to substantial coalescence of Handforth with Cheadle Hulme, Bramhall and erode the gap to Woodford and Poynton</li> <li>• Proposal will not relate well to Handforth as is self contained</li> <li>• Part of the site was subject to a major restoration scheme with a derelict land grant in the 1980s/90s and was used to re-house protected species when Handforth Dean was Constructed</li> <li>• This land provides the Council with an opportunity to sell valuable land to raise funds to use elsewhere in the county.</li> </ul> |

- The land forms an essential buffer between Stockport and Cheshire, something which you claim you seek to preserve (15.383)
- Concern over impact on educational facilities in particular when considered with development at Woodford Aerodrome
- Proposal designed to provide for housing need of nearby settlements, not Handforth
- Development will reduce opportunities for participation in outdoor recreation and harm public health
- It is not clear why alternative developable sites identified in the SHLAA have been dismissed in favour of this site
- The creation of new settlements is not considered justified
- The role and contribution of sites identified as developable within the SHLAA, forming sustainable extensions of KSCs, has not been adequately considered
- Allocate housing evenly throughout the county
- Site would require considerable public and private investment to provide facilities which already exist elsewhere which could be made better use of by developing new homes and employment uses as extensions to existing settlements.
- Northern boundary is shared with Greater Manchester in conflict with core policy PG3
- Site identified as making a 'major contribution to the Green Belt' and is in conflict with Sustainable Development policies
- Other sites area available and the need for housing and development can be met elsewhere
- Amount of proposed development is far beyond the needs of Handforth
- Handforth's needs would be better served by increasing the amount of Social Rented Housing
- Through the consultation in February 2013, of 800 respondents from Handforth, 9 supported the scheme
- Views expressed during consultation are not being acted upon
- Consultation unfair as is web based
- The site is not easily deliverable, the large size of the site may mean that delivery is delayed
- CEC do not seem to be recognising their responsibility of implementing reduced carbon homes by 2016
- Core strategy does not recognise the severity of energy use in the built environment or make policies to address this
- No targets established via CS to require any specific level of renewable energy/energy efficiency etc
- CEC should focus on delivery of land adjacent to Wilmslow to meet housing need in the area
- Land performs a long term Green Belt function
- Site should not be allocated now or safeguarded for the future
- Allocation ignores councils own evidence base
- Unclear how the site achieves sustainable development in to the context of para.52 of the NPPF
- In accessibility terms the sites fails to meet the minimum acceptable standards
- To achieve a more realistic delivery it would be more appropriate to release

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>smaller sites within the GB which are immediately available</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites in existing small settlements and villages can assist in delivering a more dispersed approach to delivering need</li> <li>• Document fails to express that the site will form a new administrative unit and that none of the S106/CIL monies will be available to Handforth PC</li> <li>• Inadequate justification for changing Green Belt boundaries</li> <li>• Predictions of housing needs in Cheshire East are not likely to be sufficiently accurate to justify the negative impact of the proposed North Cheshire Growth Village. According to the pre-submission document, a need for 27,000 new homes in Cheshire East by 2030 has been predicted but this does not appear to utilise the lower revised estimates produced by the DCLG, which are 26% lower. A mere 7% variation in the numbers predicted would remove the need for 1,800 new homes, which is the number proposed for North Cheshire Growth Village. Green Belt cannot be squandered on such a tenuous prediction.</li> <li>• Required annual build rate is unachievable to deliver the site - Over the first half of 2013, the 8 largest house builders in the UK delivered an average of 33 dwellings per outlet. In order to deliver 180 dwellings in a year, five developers would need to be operating simultaneously. This is an unrealistic level of competition.</li> <li>• The anticipated build rate has increased since previous iterations of the document with no justifiable evidence to support the change.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designation could help meet requirement through phasing; it will affect fewer people and disperse traffic with less visual impact</li> <li>• New infrastructure is required</li> <li>• Protection must be given to the Grade II listed building on site</li> <li>• Projected delivery rates are optimistic in a single focused market area in proximity to development at Woodford Aerodrome</li> <li>• Recent evidence from CEC suggests that 70 dwellings per annum was the highest delivery rate achieved in the borough during the boom (Alsager planning appeal).</li> <li>• 200 dwellings per annum will require several different builders working concurrently leading to saturation of the market</li> <li>• The size, location and configuration of new health infrastructure will be determined by NHSE England. These matters are not governed by planning statements and cannot be constrained in this way</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development proposals must demonstrate that they will conserve those elements of the listed building which contribute to the significance of the listed building and its setting</li> <li>• Reconsider delivery rates</li> <li>• Statement amended to state developer contributions will be required to support health infrastructure and if required by NHS England, a site of appropriate capacity to deliver determined health infrastructure will be available for health purposes.</li> <li>• Reduce planned housing at this site to maintain GB between greater Manchester and Cheshire</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove site from plan</li> <li>• Delete the policy and address locally generated need of towns in the north of the borough in appropriate locations within those towns</li> <li>• Protect GB land west of A34 as Local Green Space</li> </ul> <p>Core Strategy to require minimum carbon targets for new development to meet</p>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p> | <p>The need to meet objectively assessed needs and remove land from the Green Belt in the north of the borough is established through Chapter 8 'Planning for Growth' and policies PG1, PG2, PG3 and supported by The Cheshire East Employment Land Review 2012, Strategic Housing Market Assessment update 2013 and the Green Belt Review 2013.</p> <p>The approach and rationale for the overall development strategy and approach to Green Belt land in the Borough is established in policy PG1</p> <p>Detailed site development principles will be established via a future planning application however the principles of development which seek to protect the natural environment and establish high quality design, connectivity links, recreation space and highways issues.</p> <p>Policy SE7 provides protection for Historic Assets in the Borough and Site CS30 similarly requires protection of those heritage assets within the site.</p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate is an ongoing process detailed in outline in Chapter 2. The engagement undertaken with neighbouring authorities in regard to this site and other issues is detailed in a supporting document available on the Cheshire East Council website</p> |
| <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alterations to point 2 within CS30 policy box: 12 hectares replaced with 'up to 12 hectares'.</li> <li>• Alterations to point 1: Housing figure reduced to 1650 new homes. Delete following reference to densities "at densities between approximately 25 dwellings per hectare and approximately 30 dwellings per hectare".</li> <li>• Alterations to point 5; insert: 'Part of the open space requirements to serve this development could, in principle, be accommodated within the adjacent Green Belt areas;</li> <li>• Point 3: change 'comprising' delete and replace with 'potentially including'.</li> <li>• Policy Context: add paragraphs 74, 85, 100, 112, 117 and 126 to National Policy, correction- Priority 3 in Strategic Priorities should read priority 2, add priority 3: Protecting and enhancing environmental quality to Strategic Priorities.</li> <li>• Site boundaries have been changed to clarify the committed site west of the A34, identify areas to be retained as Green Belt and clarify the extent of safeguarded land to be allocated.</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Committed Strategic Sites</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 4 (Support: 0 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 4)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that house numbers for towns arising on appeal are reduced in equivalent amount from those included in the relevant town plans.</li> <li>• Why has the Albion Chemicals site between Sandbach &amp; Middlewich been omitted? It has outline planning permission so should be listed</li> <li>• Support the identification of the Copenhall East Site as a committed strategic site.</li> <li>• The Council has failed to include land at Congleton Road, Sandbach which was recently allowed at appeal to deliver 160 dwellings [APP/R0660/A/13/2189733]. Whilst the Council has launched a legal challenge of the decision, if this is unsuccessful the plan should be updated accordingly.</li> <li>• Explain why a site that is a committed strategic site (Queens Drive Nantwich) is also in the list of pre-submission non-preferred sites X</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include land at Congleton Road, Sandbach which was recently allowed at appeal to deliver 160 dwellings [APP/R0660/A/13/2189733].</li> <li>• Include Albion chemicals Site between Sandbach and Middlewich.</li> <li>• Ensure that house numbers for towns arising on appeal are reduced in equivalent amount from those included in the relevant town plans.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | The list of committed sites was included up to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2013. It will be appropriate to update this in the new document.  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Update list of committed sites to 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2013.   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Safeguarded Land</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 16 (Support: 3 / Object: 12 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The identification of Safeguarded Land for residential development within the Green Belt around Wilmslow and Handforth is supported.</li> <li>• Support the identification of safeguarded land which is a well established planning tool in forward planning an area. Need to consider showing safeguarded land as part of this Core Strategy in Poynton</li> <li>• Housing need projections indicate that it is necessary, under para 85 NPPF to identify safeguarded land. There will, inevitably, be objections but CEC is obliged to do so, and seems to have identified sites which meet the region's future needs and match infrastructural capabilities. If it does not, development will be chaotic and will not support the regions development and prosperity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge the need for safeguarded sites around Wilmslow and the extent of the safeguarded sites identified in the latest version of the plan which it considers to be excessive. The consultation process in establishing this provision of safeguarded land has been inadequate to satisfy local opinion.</li> <li>• It goes beyond the Council's remit to safeguard land after the Local Plan period of 2030. The areas featured in the safeguarded zones for all areas in East Cheshire are in actual fact all within the greenbelt boundaries. Why has the council said it only needs to review and not consult on the use of this greenbelt once it loses its status is beyond what it has asked look at in the Local Plan?</li> <li>• Strongly object to the 'safeguarding' of this land (aka earmarking for development). If it is to be protected from development, leave it as greenbelt. I believe this is a ploy by the council to get around the restrictions imposed by the greenbelt status which was put in place for a reason. Furthermore, the council have continued to ignore the opinions of the people of Macclesfield.</li> <li>• The amount of safeguarded land for Knutsford is excessive and the location is unsuitable. Non-preferred sites should be revisited to provide even and more flexible spread around the town. No justification for its removal from the Green Belt is provided. If it continues to meet GB objectives leave it there. It should not be removed to make unsympathetic development easier in the future</li> <li>• Reduce the amount of safeguarded land in Knutsford, re-examine the non-preferred sites and reallocate only that which can be justified to other locations in Knutsford to spread the burden more evenly and provide greater flexibility to respond as needs arise.</li> <li>• Government guidance says no to safeguarded land. Its purpose is to give the council a certain degree of flexibility and choice of sites. This is not exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>• This is a "back door" for the council to steal our green belt and give it to developers as a done deal. Any council review regarding this land will not be subject to public consultation.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Safeguarding" will cause blight to home owners in and around the "safeguarded" area.</li> <li>• Residents of Macclesfield have already shown that they do not want this green belt land developed. 3000 people signed a petition which was presented to the council leader last February. The petition said the land should not be built on and should remain as protected green belt for future generations.</li> <li>• KCHG objects to the scale and locations proposed of safeguarded land. There are better and more sustainable locations, without the negative impacts, than at north and north west Knutsford. These other locations should be assessed before release of Green Belt land, which requires exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated.</li> <li>• Question why Poynton is singled out here and what is meant by the statement about additional 10ha land being needed from existing greenbelt. It appears that this might be taking this requirement beyond 2030. This would be outside the terms of the Local Plan.</li> <li>• The Council itself considered and rejected the idea of rolling back the Green Belt at Lyme Green prior to publishing its Draft Development Strategy in Jan/Feb 2013. The planning reasons for that decision have not changed, and no exceptional circumstances exist for the safeguarding at Lyme Green or at Macclesfield.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient safeguarded land should be allocated to ensure that the northern settlements can grow at the same rate as the rest of the borough post 2030. Not doing so will inevitably lead to a further green belt boundary review as part of the next local plan.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove all safeguarded land and maintain Green Belt status. If it is not going to be developed, it should stay as greenbelt.</li> <li>• The council should also seek to develop all brownfield sites before even considering touching the protected (and protected with good reason) greenbelt land.</li> <li>• Leave the safeguarded land out of this Local Plan (2013-2030) which is what the local plan is meant to be looking at, and, if necessary, review it at the next Local Plan in ten years.</li> <li>• Reduction of the amount of land to be safeguarded and reassessment of its location.</li> <li>• Clarify what is meant by the statement regarding the additional 10ha in Poynton and have this suitably authorised or remove the statement from this and other associated documents.</li> <li>• Identify the safeguarded land in Poynton.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The justification for safeguarded sites within green belts is set out in paragraphs 15.395-398 and in more detail in policy PG4. The proposals to safeguard land derive from the NPPF, paragraph 85. This paragraph refers to the defining of Green Belt boundaries but does not limit its advice to new areas of Green Belt. The context of paragraph 85 is that the preceding paragraph refers to the drawing up or reviewing of Green Belt boundaries, so the Council is correct in looking for safeguarded land as part of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>It is correct that the LPA should seek to safeguard sites for the longer term to meet future needs for development.</p> <p>Site specific issues are dealt with in the responses to individual safeguarded sites. Inevitably many of these sites are in the northern part of Cheshire East, but this does not mean that a disproportionate amount of new development will take place in these areas.</p> <p>The identification of safeguarded land at Poynton requires further investigation as part of the Site Allocations and Development Policies document, as explained in paragraph 8.57. This document will be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>Planning permission for development of safeguarded land will only be granted following a Local Plan review that proposes the development. Part 2 of policy PG4 confirms that policies relating to development in the open countryside will apply. The review of the Local Plan, and any planning applications received, will be subject to public consultation.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | No material change to Plan.  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS31: (Safeguarded) Gaw End Lane, Macclesfield</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 279 (Support: 1 / Object: 270 / Comment Only: 8)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would represent a logical development opportunity upon completion of CS11</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of South Macc means it isn't easy to commute to other Towns (eg. Stockport, Manchester)</li> <li>• Impact on natural beauty</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife &amp; nature</li> <li>• Impact on landscape (ASCV)</li> <li>• Would merge Macc with Lyme Green</li> <li>• Lyme Green facilities/services/infrastructure not sufficient to accommodate such increase</li> <li>• Prevents/discourages regeneration of brownfield sites</li> <li>• Would lead to congestion on surrounding highways network; serious highways constraints</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to provide justification for removal from Green Belt; no exceptional circumstances provided</li> <li>• Sufficient land identified at South Macc for housing development</li> <li>• Survey of local residents concluded 97% did not want any changes to land designated as Green Belt</li> <li>• Green Belt serves number of purposes inc. preventing merger of Macc, Lyme Green, Sutton; preventing encroachment into countryside and ASCV</li> <li>• Area contains SBI</li> <li>• Loss of valuable agricultural land</li> <li>• Land performs significant Green Belt functions</li> <li>• Would increase urban sprawl</li> <li>• Local School would not be able to cope with increases</li> <li>• Conflicts with purposes of including land in the Green Belt</li> <li>• No justification for amount of safeguarded land at Lyme Green</li> <li>• Not a sustainable location</li> <li>• No need for as many houses (given closure of AZ Alderley Park)</li> <li>• Don't need more housing South of the Town</li> <li>• Sufficient brownfield sites in built up area</li> <li>• Would destroy the setting and character of Lyme Green</li> <li>• Concern about reliability and Credibility of Statistical Analysis; inaccuracies within the Proposed Housing Growth Distribution Tables (Appendix A) which seriously brings into doubt the reliability and credibility of the content of the whole Pre-Submission Core Strategy Document</li> <li>• The Council itself considered &amp; rejected the idea of rolling back the Green Belt at Lyme Green prior to publishing its Draft Development Strategy in Jan/Feb 2013. The planning reasons for that decision have not changed</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why not leave as Green Belt until a later date?</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on heritage assets (Canal Conservation Area and Listed Buildings)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any proposal needs to demonstrate will conserve Conservation Area/Listed Buildings</li> <li>• Retain land as Green Belt</li> <li>• Reconsider use of part of site NPS40</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Safeguarded land - As noted within the plan, NPPF (para 85) requires Council, where necessary, to identify safeguarded land between urban areas and Green Belt to meet development needs beyond the plan period. The Council consider this is necessary and sites have been identified accordingly, site CS31 being one such area of land</p> <p>Impact on landscape, environment, etc. - The land is not designated for development; policies related to the Open Countryside would apply to areas of land designated as safeguarded land; development for purposes other than those allowed within the open countryside would require a review of the Plan</p> <p>The impact of any future development on the Landscape, Ecology, Conservation Area, etc. would be addressed via the Development Management process</p> <p>Brownfield sites – The Council’s Assessment of brownfield sites has identified that there is not the capacity across the brownfield sites in Macclesfield to meet the need for the level of development identified/proposed to meet the objectives of the Plan</p> <p>Housing levels – The proposed level of housing has been informed by the CE Housing Needs Assessment (SHMA)</p> <p>Assessment of Sites - Consideration has been given to a range of sites in reaching the decision regarding the proposed sites (noting that the Non Preferred Sites have been discounted for sound reasons)</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy Context: delete paragraphs 7 and 17 from National Policy</li> </ul>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS32: (Safeguarded) Land Between Congleton Road and Chelford Road, Macclesfield</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 571 (Support: 1 / Object: 567 / Comment Only: 3)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South West Macclesfield is the most sustainable location for development on greenfield land with the least environmental damage</li> <li>• SHLAA lists the site as suitable, achievable and developable</li> <li>• Provides reserve of land for development in the future to take up any slack arising from other sites if they fail to deliver and identifies land for long term development which will be required for a town the size of Macclesfield</li> <li>• Site could fund the link road and give relief to junctions and roads leading into the town</li> <li>• Site could fund all necessary ancillary development to support the new population</li> <li>• Was previously proposed as part of a development site in 1990s and approved as such by a planning inspector but subsequently dropped as an allocation following reduction of housing figures</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was previously proposed as part of a development site in 1990s but following an inquiry the inspector recommended that the proposal should not be taken forward</li> <li>• This is the most suitable location for greenfield development but the policy means it cannot be used until after 2030 which gives no flexibility should other housing sites fail to deliver</li> <li>• The extent of safeguarded land across this area is excessive and a greater proportion should be allocated for development to meet needs arising during this plan period</li> <li>• Exceptional circumstances required to remove this land from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. Local Government Minister Brandon Lewis issued a written statement to Parliament on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013 to clarify that the Secretary of State considers that the single issue of unmet demand is unlikely to outweigh the harm to Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt; Green Belt land should not be built on; weak boundaries would not be sufficient to prevent further future encroachment into the Green Belt; Green Belt Assessment does not consider the site on its own and its contribution to Green Belt understated; Green Belt assessment is flawed; loss of countryside between Macclesfield and Henbury; Macclesfield and Henbury will merge; Green Belt Assessment demonstrates the importance of this area to the purposes of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Planning Minister Nick Boles made a statement in Parliament on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2013 “there is nothing in the Localism Act 2011, in the NPPF or in any aspect of Government planning policy that requires someone to plan beyond 15 years. So, anybody who is suggesting that there is any requirement to</li> </ul> |

safeguard land or wrap it up in wrapping paper and ribbons for the future development between 2030 and 2050 is getting it wrong” therefore safeguarding this land is contradictory to that statement; the future is uncertain so we do not know whether this land will be needed; this accounts for half of the safeguarded land in the Borough which is inappropriate for a small community like Henbury

- CS10 references a South West Link Road – but no consideration has been given to the effect on traffic on the A537 as a result of this road; further congestion on A537 will lead to traffic using the back routes to the B5087; there has been no public consultation on a potential South West Macclesfield Link Road; don't need a link road; there has been no transport assessment on the potential for thousands of homes
- Increased traffic congestion around Broken Cross
- Residents' views have been ignored including a petition signed by 3000 people in February 2013.
- Safeguarding is allocation of land by the back door. This will only be subject to review by the Council and there will be no further public consultation to allocate the site for development
- Loss of prime agricultural land grades 2 and 3a; loss of grazing land would make several small farms unviable; working farm land
- Unsustainable location – too far from the centre of Macclesfield; will create a 'doughnut effect' whereby the centre of town deteriorates while the town expands at the edges; will increase car usage; distant from the bus and train stations and will not encourage the use of public transport.
- Will blight nearby properties for many years to come
- There are plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed in Macclesfield; development here will mean brownfield sites remain unused; Regional Spatial Strategy states that 80% of houses in Macclesfield should be built on brownfield sites; an allowance should be made for future windfall sites.
- No analysis of flood risk has been carried out; Council's own evidence shows that this site has areas susceptible to ground water flooding; fails NPPF sequential test on flooding
- During the Henbury Parish Plan preparation, 96% of people answered yes when asked 'do you think that the physical break of green fields between the Parish and Broken Cross should be maintained?' and 'are you in favour of the Green Belt continuing to be protected?'
- Important area for wildlife including protected species; biodiversity includes thirteen Red list species, twenty three Amber list species, six schedule 1 species, fifteen species listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and seven identified in RSPB Conservation Targeting Projects; Site of Biological Importance within the site
- Large number of mature trees on site along with woodlands including Cock Wood – ancient woodland dating back to at least before 1600 and possibly even to the post-glacial woods and High Birch Wood; Tree Preservation Orders present on site
- Ancient hedgerows on site as well as ponds and ditches
- Hedgerows, trees and ponds
- Area lack mains drainage

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area is valuable in landscape terms; part of the historic Cheshire landscape of Higher Farms and Woods; not included in Cheshire East Local Landscape Designation (22) which should be corrected as it has been identified as being important by Natural England.</li> <li>• Development here would represent urban sprawl; housing should be spread evenly around the town</li> <li>• Would erode the character of the town</li> <li>• Historic importance - contains old greenways, e.g. the old Broken Cross to Henbury Road which predates the current turnpike road built in the 1800s, various medieval and Victorian ridge and furrow fields' hedgerows that mark parish boundaries predating 1860 and protected by Hedgerow Regulations.</li> <li>• Overhead high voltage power lines cross the site</li> <li>• There is an oversupply of employment land and further employment land is not required;</li> <li>• Housing requirement has been overstated</li> <li>• Popular walking area; important amenity use</li> <li>• Would adversely affect the setting and special character of the historic towns of Macclesfield and Gawsworth</li> <li>• Should help existing communities to grown organically rather than imposing large unwanted developments</li> <li>• Development of this site would mean Macclesfield merging with Gawsworth</li> <li>• Other sites have been ruled out on ground that apply equally, or more so to this site</li> <li>• Public rights of way cross the site</li> <li>• Sterilisation of potential minerals deposits</li> <li>• The boundary is shown in the wrong position. Any development west of the line shown for the relief road in the Development Strategy would not have so much of a detrimental impact on the openness of the land</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is there no mention of the King's School's relocation to this area?</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The map is out of date and shows Henbury High School not the dwellings recently constructed on that site</li> <li>• Remove site from Plan</li> <li>• Retain as Green Belt</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (para 85) requires the Council, where necessary, to identify safeguarded land between urban areas and Green Belt to meet development needs beyond the plan period. The Council consider this is necessary and sites have been identified accordingly, site CS32 being one such area of land.</p> <p>There has been a boundary change to this allocation due to the overall reduction in safeguarded land proposed within the Local Plan Strategy. This has been justified within the assessment of Policy PG4 (Safeguarded Land).</p> <p>It should be clear that the land is not designated for development; policies related to the Open Countryside would apply to areas of land designated as safeguarded land; development for purposes other than those allowed within the open countryside would require a review of the Plan.</p>   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p>The impact of any future development on the Landscape, Ecology, Conservation Area, flood risk zones etc. would be addressed via the Development Management process.</p> <p>The Council's Assessment of brownfield sites has identified that there is not the capacity across the brownfield sites in Macclesfield to meet the need for the level of development identified/proposed to meet the objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>The proposed level of housing has been informed by the CE Housing Needs Assessment (SHMA)</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>Level of safeguarded land has been reduced from 135ha to 45.5. Pre-amble amended to reflect new site boundaries.</p> <p>Name of site changed from 'Land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road, Macclesfield' to 'South West Macclesfield'.</p> <p>Policy Context: delete paragraphs 7 and 17 from National Policy</p>   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS33: (Safeguarded) North West Knutsford</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 11 (Support: 0 / Object: 9 / Comment Only: 2)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support</li> <li>• Objection</li> <li>• Oppose taking land out of Green Belt. Land is agricultural land grades 2 and 3. Sites CS19 and NPS50 are of lower agricultural quality.</li> <li>• Remove the proposed safeguarded land in the North West of the town from the plan as there is no clear case for its re-classification from the Green Belt. If safeguarded land is required this should be spread more evenly around the town</li> <li>• The areas allocated to safeguarded land are excessive and assume twice the development rate of the plan period to 2030</li> <li>• The allocated safeguarded land could allow for up to 900 houses to be built, dependent upon density levels. The current plan period assumes 600. If any safeguarded land is included it should be an area of less than half the current allocation</li> <li>• The safeguarded land implies all development over the next 40 years will take place to the North West of the Town. This will be catastrophic to the character and heritage of the town, the jewel in the crown of Cheshire East.</li> <li>• The provision of employment land (site G) is opposed. This will be seriously detrimental to the Town Centre economic development and destroy the unique setting of the town as it will become a dominant feature on the entrance to the town. It will also increase traffic levels on an already seriously congested arterial highway.</li> <li>• Development of this site would conflict with the policy positions and priorities of CPRE,</li> <li>• The development of this site would adversely impact on the visitor route to Tatton Park from Knutsford and on views from Tatton Park. The development would have detrimental landscape consequences and would be contrary to local and national policies designed to protect heritage assets and their setting.</li> <li>• Comment Only</li> <li>• One of the site boundary is close to a Grade II* registered Parks and Garden, Tatton Park, The south-eastern site also includes a Grade II listed building. Any development proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they will conserve those elements, which contribute to the significance of the listed buildings and the designated park and their setting.(EH)</li> <li>• There is need for additional housing in Knutsford but brownfield sites must be used - and there are many such sites in the town now and more will be available in the future.</li> <li>• Food security (farm land) should be given greater consideration (Para 112 NPPF) Alternatives should be investigated first. Land should only be sacrificed when alternatives have been fully and properly investigated. This investigation</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>should demonstrate there is clear and compelling evidence that the public benefit outweighs the adverse impacts including the loss of such productive land. This loss will be permanent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very supportive of safeguarded land here ie potential for the land to meet development needs. Land is suitable, available and achievable for development within plan period, don't need to leave it beyond 2030. Commitment to safeguarding should be stronger. Could identify appropriate locations for development in Site Allocations. Mechanism to bring land forward sooner. 41ha, not 32 as in Table 8.3.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the site boundary is close to a Grade II* registered Parks and Garden, Tatton Park, The south-eastern site also includes a Grade II listed building. Any development proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they will conserve those elements, which contribute to the significance of the listed buildings and the designated park and their setting.(EH)</li> <li>• Remove safeguarded land to the North West of Knutsford from the plan</li> <li>• Remove the proposed employment land provision at site G</li> <li>• Retain parcels 1, 5 and 6 as green belt.(NT)</li> <li>• We consider that there should be a mechanism within this Core Strategy that enables Safeguarded Land to come forward in circumstances of demonstrable need and that wording to this effect should be included within Policy CS33. Within Para. 8.55-8.58, the Strategy should be clear and explain the need for flexibility and not drawing the Green Belt boundaries too tightly. We support the 41 ha of land to be Safeguarded and do not agree it should be reduced to the figures shown in Table 8.3. Table 8.3 should be amended to refer to 41ha</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (para 85) requires the Council, where necessary, to identify safeguarded land between urban areas and Green Belt to meet development needs beyond the plan period. The Council consider this is necessary and sites have been identified accordingly, site CS33 being one such area of land.</p> <p>There has been a boundary change to this allocation due to the overall reduction in safeguarded land proposed within the Local Plan Strategy. This has been justified within the assessment of Policy PG4 (Safeguarded Land).</p> <p>It should be clear that the land is not designated for development; policies related to the Open Countryside would apply to areas of land designated as safeguarded land; development for purposes other than those allowed within the open countryside would require a review of the Plan.</p> <p>The impact of any future development on the Landscape, Ecology, Conservation Area, Heritage Assets etc. would be addressed via the Development Management process.</p> <p>The Council's Assessment of brownfield sites has identified that there is not the capacity across the brownfield sites to meet the need for Wilmslow to meet the level of development identified/proposed to meet the objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>The proposed level of housing has been informed by the CE Housing Needs Assessment (SHMA)</p> |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 20 hectares of safeguarded land south of Tabley Road has been removed and retained as Green Belt.</li><li>• The five hectares of land to the north of Tabley Road has been re-designated as safeguarded land giving a total area of safeguarded land in North West Knutsford to 25.1 hectares.</li><li>• Policy Context: delete paragraphs 7 and 17 from National Policy</li></ul> |
|-----------------------|--|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site SC34: (Safeguarded) North Cheshire Growth Village, Handforth East</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 33 (Support: 0 / Object: 33 / Comment Only: 0)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient justification has been given for changes to Green Belt boundaries in this location. Safeguarded land should have full green belt status and protection.</li> <li>• The green gap between the Coleshaw Farm estate and Handforth will disappear.</li> <li>• Predictions of housing needs in Cheshire East are out of date.</li> <li>• There is no evidence for housing need in this location.</li> <li>• The Duty to Cooperate not been adequately fulfilled as development does not fit with the regeneration plans for Stockport and Manchester.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion will be worsened in Handforth and neighbouring areas.</li> <li>• The site has limited access to public transport provision.</li> <li>• The A34 bypass was built as a promise to alleviate traffic congestion and the new plans would compound existing congestion.</li> <li>• Lack of sustainability due to residential development with insufficient employment opportunities.</li> <li>• Damage to the rural economy through loss of good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Damage to the environment by development in an environmentally sensitive area.</li> <li>• Damage to wild life habitats and species due to loss of habitat including at least 20 ponds with protected species present.</li> <li>• Loss of leisure amenity for walking on several rights of way.</li> <li>• Increased air pollution and carbon emissions.</li> <li>• The creation and extension of new settlements is not considered justified. The role and contribution of sites identified as developable within the SHLAA, forming sustainable urban extensions of Key Service Centres, has not been adequately considered. In addition the Council accepts that the SHLAA needs to be reviewed and is not therefore adequate as the evidence base for the proposed strategy</li> <li>• Do not support justification for, or sustainability of, the proposal in this location. Greenbelt assessment indicates it makes a major contribution to the Green Belt in terms of the gap between Handforth /Wilmslow and the Greater Manchester conurbation and safeguarding the countryside.</li> <li>• Proposal would increase ribbon development along A34 in an area where landscape character is strong and landscape condition is good.</li> <li>• In view of the necessary increase in the housing requirement, such a proposition may ultimately be required, but it is first necessary and appropriate to reconsider the extent of growth to be accommodated in and around the northern Key Service Centres. Only once this has been fully accounted for</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>could the need for a new settlement be proven. The approach at present is severely flawed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site would undermine separation of Handforth and Wilmslow</li> <li>• Impact on Peak Park openness</li> <li>• Noise issues</li> <li>• Diverse range of wildlife, Protected Species and endangered species present on site</li> <li>• Delivery of uses on the site will not represent sustainable development</li> <li>• Contain Public Rights of Way</li> <li>• Potentially a contaminated site</li> <li>• Flooding concerns</li> <li>• Housing need is not sufficiently justified for this site</li> <li>• Damage to rural economy and loss of agricultural land</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land has contamination issues</li> <li>• Brownfield and other green belt sites should be promoted to ensure a proportionate distribution of new housing development.</li> <li>• No financial gain to Handforth from development.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The North Cheshire Growth Village, Handforth East and the adjacent safeguarded land should be completely removed from the Cheshire East Core Strategy.</li> <li>• The land should be retained as Green Belt and open countryside.</li> <li>• Clear evidence, presently absent, would be required to justify Site CS34. The evidence should demonstrate that the Handforth East site represents the most appropriate option for dealing with the (uplifted) housing requirement, specifically relative to the release of additional land on the edge of the Key Service Centres in the north of the Borough.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b></p>                                 | <p><u>General issues regarding safeguarded land</u> are set out in the section on Safeguarded Land. The justification for safeguarded sites within green belts is set out in paragraphs 15.395-398 and in more detail in policy PG4. It is correct that the LPA should seek to safeguard sites for the longer term to meet future needs for development.</p> <p><u>Contamination issues</u>: These will be addressed as part of any planning application.</p> <p><u>Remove from plan</u>. The site is safeguarded to allow for possible future expansion of the sustainable community to be created at the main allocated site for the North Cheshire Growth Village CS30. This option is preferred to alternative ways of meeting targets for delivery of housing and employment land.</p> <p><u>Retain as Green Belt and open countryside</u> to protect the gap between Handforth and Stockport. The land is not allocated for development at this stage.</p> <p><u>Additional justification is required to demonstrate that this is the best option</u>. The justification for the allocation and safeguarded land is explored in more detail in the assessment of site CS30.</p> |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p><u>Visual impact including openness of the National Park.</u> This will be assessed as part any revision to the Local Plan and/or planning application but the site is approximately 15km from the National Park.</p> <p><u>Traffic congestion and highways.</u> Currently during the peak periods the A34 suffers from congestion at a number of junctions towards Manchester. The SEMMMS scheme will provide a new east-west link between the A6 and M56 which will alleviate some of the existing congestion issues in the area, as will the proposed Poynton Relief Road, which ties in with the SEMMMS road.</p> <p>However, it expected that as part of the North Cheshire Community Village a number of improvement schemes will be required to mitigate the impact of the traffic the allocated CS30 site will generate. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new junction with the A555 serving the proposed site.</li> <li>Strategic travel plan, which may including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved walking, cycling and bus links to local stations serving Manchester.</li> <li>Improved bus services to key service centre locations, including Manchester Airport.</li> <li>Provision of essential services within the site, including shops, education and employment.</li> <li>Park and ride provision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Junction improvement contributions in the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council area, including the A34 corridor.</li> </ul> <p>These highway improvements will be developed as part of the masterplan for the Handforth site and detailed in the Infrastructure Plan and will requiring funding through CIL/S106 contributions.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | Policy Context: delete paragraphs 7 and 17 from National Policy   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS35: (Safeguarded): Prestbury Road, Wilmslow</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 77 (Support: 1 / Object: 75 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the designation of the site as removal from the GB</li> <li>• Site should be brought forward within the plan period</li> <li>• Site will have a minimal impact on the Green Belt – restricting sprawl and preventing towns from merging</li> <li>• Although the gap between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge would be reduced there would remain and the settlements would still be distinguishable</li> <li>• Will help to meet housing requirement for area</li> <li>• Site is accessed off the primary road network therefore would not increased traffic within the town centre</li> <li>• Site is sustainably located – within walking distance of the town centre</li> <li>• Better use of the amenities within the area – schools etc</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land plays a significant role in preventing the consolidation of Wilmslow and Alderley Edge</li> <li>• If the land becomes safeguarded and then developed, there will be pressure to release/approved development on rest of the land up to the roundabout</li> <li>• This site forms a gap between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge and has a strong boundary with the Green Belt with the By-pass and Prestbury Link Road</li> <li>• The site meets the criteria for Green Belt</li> <li>• Infrastructure in the area is strained at peak hours</li> <li>• The site is a green lung</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural use</li> <li>• Need to prevent urban sprawl the GB assessment states that this GB does this sufficiently and is of a significant contribution</li> <li>• No requirement to safeguard land, NPPF states ‘should where necessary..’</li> <li>• Nick Boles stated there is no need for Local Plans to go beyond 2030</li> <li>• Brownfield land should be used first</li> <li>• New house building will make little difference to commuter traffic</li> <li>• Handforth East will create a suitable level of housing for the area</li> <li>• Amenities such as the local school are at full capacity</li> <li>• Land should be used as a sports facility for the School</li> <li>• Reduced the clear demarcation between Wilmslow and Prestbury</li> <li>• Concerns over the potential single access onto Hough Lane</li> <li>• No need to change the current status of the land which is a playing field</li> <li>• Enhancements to the playing field required</li> <li>• Convert existing empty offices/retail units etc for housing</li> <li>• Sufficient development around the area to meet population growth – no need for additional land allocations</li> <li>• Land is fairly unique bog land</li> <li>• Loss of amenity space</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Trust object to land being removed from the GB</li> <li>• Site would be seen as remote from Wilmslow as it is sited on the opposite side of the by-pass to the existing town</li> <li>• Residents of Wilmslow have agreed with CEC in January 2013 170 housing developments on brown field sites can be developed</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site forms a gap between Wilmslow and Alderley Edge and has a strong boundary with the Green Belt with the By-pass and Prestbury Link Road</li> <li>• Development of this site in the future would consolidate the development along Hough Lane with the main part of Wilmslow settlement.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove site from the development plan</li> <li>• Retain the existing designation of the land as a playing field</li> <li>• Bring forward site within the plan period rather than just safeguarded for future development</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Green Belt boundaries are intended to endure over the longer term. Therefore when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, it is important to draw new boundaries having regard to potential development needs arising well beyond the plan period. Therefore, it is necessary to allocate some safeguarded land which lies between the urban area and the new green belt boundary in order to meet the potential long-term development requirements and avoid the need for another review of the Green Belt at the end of the plan period. Paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework required authorities to identify safeguarded land to meet longer-term development needs beyond the plan period.</p> <p>This site is a natural extension to the existing residential and employment uses on the edge of Wilmslow and therefore forming an appropriate location in which to meet the identified future need of the town.</p> <p>It is considered that although there is a clear need to safeguard land in the area the size/number of dwellings proposed has been reduced, as other proposed areas of safeguarded land have been identified elsewhere. The reduced size of the safeguarded land will improve the impact on the neighbouring dwellings.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>Reduce level of safeguarded land .</p> <p>Policy Context: delete paragraphs 7 and 17 from National Policy</p>   |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>       | <b>Site CS36: (Safeguarded) Upcast Lane, Wilmslow</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 84 (Support: 4 / Object: 79 / Comment Only: 1)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development over a larger area</li> <li>• Site is an obvious choice for future development</li> <li>• Access and proximity to local amenities is good</li> <li>• Development would not have adverse impact on public enjoyment of Green Belt</li> <li>• Reasonably sustainable location (buses, Chapel Ln shopping area and schools)</li> <li>• No particular agricultural use</li> <li>• Not really used by the public</li> <li>• Natural extension to existing residential and employment uses at edge of Wilmslow</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inexplicable conflict between the proposal to take site out of Green Belt and the GB Assessment, which identifies the land as making a “significant” contribution to preserving the GB</li> <li>• Do not accept the argument that developing this site will reduce the commuting to Wilmslow</li> <li>• Impact on traffic congestion; narrow roads not suitable to additional traffic</li> <li>• Result in urban sprawl</li> <li>• Encroachment into countryside</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Unnecessary loss of Green Belt – any safeguarded land should be minimal, brownfield sites, close to amenities/facilities</li> <li>• Limited consultation</li> <li>• Justification seems invalid; no evidence for demonstrable need</li> <li>• Land unsuitable for significant development – eg. liable to flooding</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife (inc. protected species)</li> <li>• Not close to facilities/services/amenities</li> <li>• Land forms important part of the Alderley Edge/Wilmslow separation</li> <li>• Loss of amenity area for local people</li> <li>• NPPF doesn’t state a compulsion to safeguard land; it says where necessary; Nick Boles stated that no need for Local Plans to go beyond 2030</li> <li>• Not well-connected to existing settlements</li> <li>• Objectively assessed housing need can be met on brownfield sites</li> <li>• Closure of AZ at Alderley Park will reduce the housing need (making current assessment not credible)</li> <li>• Would destroy character of countryside</li> <li>• Too much safeguarded land proposed; area of safeguarded land would accommodate 1,000 houses – the size of area is not necessary</li> <li>• Infrastructure cannot support development</li> <li>• Objectively assessed housing need can be accommodated on brownfield sites</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise pollution</li> <li>• Known issues accessing the site</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest development over larger area</li> </ul>   |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend to larger area (see PRE 6026) – to inc. Row of Trees, Knutsford Rd, Wilmslow</li> <li>• Remove site from plan</li> <li>• Extend safeguarded land to the North and East</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Green Belt boundaries are intended to endure over the longer term. Therefore when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, it is important to draw new boundaries having regard to potential development needs arising well beyond the plan period. Therefore, it is necessary to allocate some safeguarded land which lies between the urban area and the new green belt boundary in order to meet the potential long-term development requirements and avoid the need for another review of the Green Belt at the end of the plan period. Paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework required authorities to identify safeguarded land to meet longer-term development needs beyond the plan period.</p> <p>This site is a natural extension to the existing residential on the edge of Wilmslow and therefore forming an appropriate location in which to meet the identified future need of the town.</p> <p>It is considered that although there is a clear need to safeguard land in the area the size/number of dwellings proposed has been reduced, as other proposed areas of safeguarded land have been identified elsewhere. The reduced size of the safeguarded land will improve the impact on the neighbouring dwellings.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Reduce extent of safeguarded land by deleting area of site to the south-west.  |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation point</b>       | <b>Chapter 16 – Monitoring and Implementation</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b> | Total: 11 (Support: 1 / Object: 6 / Comment Only: 4)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>          | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England support inclusion of indicator EQ1 (protection of sports pitches). Aligns with the need to monitor and update the evidence base (emerging Playing Pitch Strategy in particular) and is in accordance with paragraph 73 of the NPPF.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly it is the responsibility of the Council to undertake the steps listed however, monitoring and commenting on the implementation of the plan should involve those living and working in Cheshire East</li> <li>• Under S3 – Five year housing land supply, the trigger of a short fall of greater than one year should be amended to ensure that at least a five year supply will be maintained otherwise the doors will be opened to developers to exploit the shortfall</li> <li>• Paragraph 16.10 does not include ‘consulting the rate payers and voters of Cheshire East.’</li> <li>• Monitoring of progress of a badly researched and overly ambitious plan will inevitably reveal shortfalls. A less ambitious plan would be more realistic and have more chance of success</li> <li>• A commitment to monitoring and implementation of the Affordable Housing Policy is required. The proposal to introduce an Economic Viability Assessment must be undertaken in complete independence from the Developers own viability assessment, and should be open to public scrutiny. The report which the proposal is based clearly showed that the level of developer profit margin is a major factor in the determining of viability of affordable housing. The report also indicates that Brownfield issues should be addressed as Land purchase stage and that payment schedules can have a significant influence on viability. One in ten sites remained viable with a 30% provision of affordable housing and the only influence was larger profit margins.</li> <li>• Cheshire Community Action consider that the Performance indicators in chapter 16 on Monitoring and Evaluation. There remains a lack of urban/rural split in the performance indicators on p.329 – 334 which will make it difficult for CEC to monitor how their policies are affecting rural communities and particularly the economy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are existing sites which have only been partly developed, eg. Millstone Lane, Nantwich. Such sites should be made to be brought forward before any development on Greenfield sites. How will sites be monitored in the future if they are not being monitored now?</li> <li>• Indicator E4 – should make clear that minerals other than aggregates have landbank requirements (set at a national level)</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of SMART monitoring is one that is effective as long as all parties are involved in its use but what is not taken into account is 'effect'. This monitoring system is used primarily to achieve a specific target i.e. the construction of new housing, commercial buildings, schools etc what it does not take into account is the erect on the local community and local infrastructure.</li> <li>• The 'contingencies' envisaged here appear to be for unavoidable causes. The section should also include at least one example (Compulsory Purchase Order) of action which might be taken if a developer reneges on his contractual obligations.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure existing sites are developed out in full</li> <li>• Minerals other than aggregates (e.g. silica sand) should be noted here E4 and monitored by appropriate Triggers and Actions to ensure national targets are met</li> <li>• Have local community groups that are involved in the monitoring – to ensure local needs are met</li> <li>• Clarify involvement of those most affected by the plan</li> <li>• Section should include an example of possible action e.g. 'Compulsory Purchase Order' if a developer reneges on his contractual obligations</li> <li>• Amend the trigger level to ensure a permanent five year housing land supply is maintained</li> <li>• The rate payers and voters of Cheshire East should be consulted before any amendments, extension or modifications are made to the plan during the plan period</li> <li>• Reduce scope of plan to ensure it does not fail</li> <li>• CCA offer Neighbourhood Planning Support Services, Parish Plan Support and Housing Needs</li> </ul> |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The purpose of this section is to highlight the monitoring and implementation which is required to assess if the Local Plan Strategy is 'effective' and assess if the plan is deliverable in the plan period. A Monitoring Report will be produced annually and published on the website which will assess the delivery and effectiveness of achieving the vision, objectives, spatial strategy, the spatial priorities and policies.</p> <p>Monitoring will include engagement with public agencies and partners which will help to inform the Monitoring Report. This therefore includes local people from within the area.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that there is a need to include minerals other than aggregates within E4 and this will be made more explicit to include reference to silica sand as well.</p>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>Change to E4 to include aggregates and silica sand into the target to be monitored.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Chapter 17: Glossary</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 5 (Support: 2 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 1)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly recommended that Places of Worship are explicitly identified within Community Infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be amended to include a definition for "Extension" to property to be included in the Community Infrastructure Levy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend to include a definition for "Extension" to property to be included in the Community Infrastructure Levy.</li> <li>The entry for the term 'community infrastructure' in Glossary (page 336) which isn't used in the document other than for the CIL which is explained in the next entry. It is confusing if a term is included in the Glossary which isn't used in the document. If the description is applied solely to the Community Infrastructure Levy, then the description should reflect para.10.16, but doesn't.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly recommended that Places of Worship are explicitly identified within Community Infrastructure.</li> <li>Glossary should be amended to include a definition for "Extension" to property to be included in the Community Infrastructure Levy.</li> <li>Include a definition for "Extension" to property to be included in the Community Infrastructure Levy.</li> <li>Remove the term 'community infrastructure' from the glossary.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The glossary is not considered to be an exhaustive list of definitions however, it is a useful succinct collections of terms used throughout the document, which may require some further explanation.</p> <p>It is considered that the inclusion of 'places of worship' within the community infrastructure definition would be too prescriptive and it is considered that 'community buildings and halls' is sufficient and inclusive of places of worship.</p> <p>It would not be reasonable to include 'extensions' within the definition for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at this time. CIL is a levy which allows Local Authorities to raise funds from owners or developers on land undertaking new building projects in the Borough. More clarification on the Borough's CIL will be produced in due course and will be subject to consultation.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Minor amendments made to clarify certain definitions.   |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix A: Housing Growth and Distribution</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 54 (Support: 1 / Object: 46 / Comment Only: 7)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is inappropriate to include the Chemical Works site as part of Sandbach housing supply as it is removed from the settlement and does not form a functional part of Sandbach</li> <li>• Insufficient employment land in the north of the Borough means more commuting from Macclesfield</li> <li>• 5ha of employment land at Knutsford will have a detrimental effect the town centre</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detailed information on which LSCs and OSaRAs are proposed for more development</li> <li>• More face to face consultation is needed</li> <li>• It would be of assistance to NHS England if a breakdown per location could be made</li> <li>• More brownfield sites should be considered in Crewe</li> <li>• Provide information to support a credible five year supply</li> <li>• We consider the Table for Housing Land Requirement and Supply in Alsager under estimates the new dwelling requirement and should rise to 2000 and overestimate the supply of new dwellings which should be reduced to 1340</li> <li>• The document states that only 3950 homes of the 27000 will be allocated through the site allocation process. The decision to allocate sites in two parts means that it is not possible to test whether housing needs can sustainable be met through smaller sites rather than a comparatively small number of larger strategic sites.</li> <li>• Completion figures are different in tables 8.2 aA.6; no evidence that all 7115 commitments will be delivered by 2030; unclear why some settlements will rely on Site Allocations and some wont; Strategic Site definition is unclear</li> <li>• Proposed employment land distribution places a disproportionate employment land distribution on Congleton</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments to be amended to read: ' Table A1 and A6' instead of A1 and A5</li> <li>• Clarify the position with regard the 5% buffer and take into account permissions and windfalls</li> <li>• Make alterations to housing figures in Table A to reduce supply in Alsager to 1340 and increased demand to 2000</li> <li>• Flexibility should be introduced into the site selection processes and identification of the overall housing requirement so that smaller sites can be promoted</li> <li>• Correct tables A.1 and A.6; provide evidence that commitments can be delivered; justify why some settlements will rely on site allocations; provide site assessment to demonstrate strategy is most appropriate against reasonable alternatives</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Albion Chemicals should contribute to supply of OSaRAs</li> <li>• More employment land to be made available in the North of the Borough</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b> | <p>The reasons and rationale underpinning the approach to delivery of objectively assessed needs is established through policies PG1, PG2 and PG6 and throughout Chapter * Planning for Growth.</p> <p>The selection of sites for each town has been undertaken over a three year period and draws significantly from the community led exercise of producing town strategies.</p> <p>The approach to brownfield sites is established in Policy SD1. It is anticipated that smaller sites, including those derived from previously developed land, will come forward at the Site Allocations and Detailed Policies stage of the Plan making process.</p> <p>The Employment land review establishes the current and projected employment land need across the Borough. Sufficient sites have been allocated to meet this projected need.</p> <p>The Council's position in regard to five year supply of housing land is established in a separate document (Five Year Supply Position Statement 2014 available via the web) and via Appendix E: Housing Trajectory</p> <p>The consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and The Town and Country Planning (Local Plans) (England) Regulations 2012</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                        | Housing figures have been revised to more accurately reflect commitments, completions and anticipated site delivery  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix A: Employment Land Growth and Distribution</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 6 (Support: 1 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5ha of employment land at Knutsford will have a detrimental effect totn eh town centre</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed employment land distribution places a disproportionate employment land distribution on Congleton</li> </ul>  |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More employment land to be made available in the North of the Borough</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The Employment Land Review 2013 establishes existing capacity and projected employment land need in the borough and the Local Plan Strategy seeks to accommodate such need in the most sustainable locations to support the growth of towns across the Borough.</p> <p>The level of employment land allocation for Congleton is commensurate with both the Vision for the town established via the Town Strategy and the needs to provide jobs led growth and new infrastructure to facilitate such development</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Employment figures have been revised to more accurately reflect supply, completions and anticipated site delivery.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix B: Saved Policies</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This section should be completed and put out to public consultation</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to any RSS saved policies required</li> </ul>   |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> |   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Regional Strategies are no longer part of the Development Plan as they have been abolished by Order using powers taken in the Localism Act.</p> <p>This section will be completed in the Submission Document once policies have been amended/ clarified. Policy wording will determine which policies are saved or deleted so this section could not be completed until all policy wording had been finalised.</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | This section will be completed in the Submission Document once policies have been amended/ clarified.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix C: Car Parking Standards</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 6 (Support: 0 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 1)   |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert car parking dimensions for car parking spaces for domestic properties</li> <li>• Larger houses should provide more parking spaces</li> <li>• All housing developments should be required to have one car parking space per bedroom.</li> <li>• Concerned over C2 car parking standards and the use of out of date guidance. Need to reconsider given the requirements of Leighton Hospital. Accept the number of disabled bays in Table C.2 and already comply with your ratio. Need to consider the staff ratio car parking requirements set out in the car parking standards for use C2</li> <li>• Applied standards do not provide sufficient parking. Increase parking for food retail, hospital, sheltered accommodation, extra care, residential and nursing homes. Standards for Principal Towns and Key Service Centres have more parking issues therefore need more provision. Add that standards here are minimum. All developments need cars, all educational establishments should have more parking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure Theatres listed as sui generis in Table C.1. Cinemas should be listed as D2. Explain why theatres noted for cycles and not cars.</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure Theatres listed as sui generis in Table C.1. Cinemas should be listed as D2. Explain why theatres noted for cycles and not cars.</li> <li>• Insert car parking dimensions for car parking spaces for domestic properties</li> <li>• Larger houses should provide more parking spaces</li> <li>• All housing developments should be required to have one car parking space per bedroom.</li> <li>• Reconsider car parking standards for use class C2 in the light of the requirements of Leighton Hospital as an example.</li> <li>• Applied standards do not provide sufficient parking. Increase parking for food retail, hospital, sheltered accommodation, extra care, residential and nursing homes. Standards for Principal Towns and Key Service Centres have more parking issues therefore need more provision. Add that standards here are minimum. All developments need cars, all educational establishments should have more parking.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework covers sustainable transport including car parking standards (paragraph 39).</p> <p>Car parking dimensions for domestic properties are already set out in Table C.4 so there is no need to repeat – however clarification can be added that this also applies to domestic properties..</p> <p>The standards require that larger houses do provide more spaces with thresholds set at which more spaces are required; different standards such as one space per bedroom would lead to overprovision.</p>  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>The concerns of Leighton Hospital are noted especially in the way the hospital's function has changed over time. Therefore the notion of a number of spaces per hospital bed may not necessarily now be the most appropriate standard given the higher levels of out-patient usage at modern hospitals. CEC are willing to work with Leighton Hospital to consider a potential reformulation of this standard. It should also be noted that the standards (in the preamble) do seek to allow some flexibility in provision on a site-by-site basis.</p> <p>The car parking standards have been researched, including against recent standards produced by other (similar) authorities. Residential standards are thresholds, or minimums, but subject to some discussion based on the sustainable (or otherwise) location of such development. Other standards are recommended ceilings.</p> <p>For clarification add theatres under sui generis as an example<br/>Amend table C.3 - cinemas are D2, theatres sui generis</p> |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | <p>Add:<br/>Table C.4 – clarify that the size and layout of standard parking bays also applies to residential developments<br/>For clarification add theatres under sui generis as an example<br/>Amend table C.3 – cinemas are D2, theatres sui generis – replace with concert halls<br/>Correct the dimensions of disabled parking bays to reflect the fact that a standard bay is 2.5m wide (not 2.4m wide)</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix D: Evidence and links</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 15 (Support: 0 / Object: 14 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The annual total housing figure used by Cheshire East (1150) in its housing supply calculations is taken from the NWRSS and it should be referenced.</li> <li>• The links attached to the evidence do not take you directly to the actual document.</li> <li>• In the Core Strategy, there are little or no direct references to particular facts in the evidence.</li> <li>• Concern with the Green Belt Assessment.</li> <li>• Concern with the SHLAA.</li> <li>• Concern with the Open Space Assessment.</li> <li>• Concern with the population figures.</li> <li>• Concern that it is unclear which documents relate to policy changes made without proper open consultation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add the NWRSS to the list.</li> <li>• Correctly reference facts to the evidence.</li> <li>• Exclude Green Belt Assessment from the list.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The annual total housing figure for the Plan is not taken from the NWRSS, but is set out in policy PG1.</p> <p>The evidence base is considered to be a sound and comprehensive suite of evidence to inform the Plan.</p>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Minor updates to the list.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix E: Housing Trajectory</b>   |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 36 (Support:0 / Object: 5 / Comment Only: 31)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Totals and proportion affordable don't meet national housing need</li> <li>The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply applying the Sedgefield method plus 20%, as required by recent appeal decisions. Hence the PSCS is unsound.</li> <li>Trajectory shows only 28,241 dwellings to 2030, rather than the 29,287 dwellings which is the combined total of completions, commitments, Strategic Sites and Site Allocations. Undermines the justification given for not adopting a higher target (ie over 27,000 homes clearly is visible); reduces confidence in Council's ability to meet total homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Liverpool method is appropriate in this economic climate</li> <li>Delivery is dependent on infrastructure, speculative development, funding</li> <li>Re-assess five year supply immediately</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update to reflect requirements arising from recent appeal decisions ie Sedgefield and 20% buffer</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | The Council has been mindful of the need to undertake an up-to-date five year land supply assessment and this was considered by the Strategic Planning Board on the 5 <sup>th</sup> February, 2014. The revised assessment demonstrates the availability of a 5-year housing land supply adopting the 'Sedgefield' method plus a 5% and 20% 'buffer' using a base date of 31 <sup>st</sup> December, 2013. The revised assessment provides a platform for preparing a new 2014 SHLAA, but a new Housing Trajectory must take full account of the increased housing targets contained in the <i>Submission Version</i> rather than adopting <i>Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)</i> targets. These should be applied using the 'Liverpool' method to redress any shortfall in delivery over the remainder of the plan period to 2030.   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | It is recommended that a revised Housing Trajectory, as set out in Appendix E of the <i>Submission Version</i> be approved pending the preparation of a new SHLAA with a base date of 31 <sup>st</sup> March, 2014.<br>For clarity, add, at the end of para E.2, 'It takes into account completions, and thereby captures the resulting shortfall, or surplus, spreading this over the remainder of the plan period.'   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix G: Evolution of the Core Strategy</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clear why Developers and Land Interests were granted opportunity, relatively late in the consultative process, to propose possible additional strategic sites...that had not previously been subject to consultation. This is presumably how the King's School land behind Fence Avenue was brought back into contention with a prospective 250 houses to be built for an institution that is showing every indication of wanting to build outside Macclesfield. What are" the special and exceptional circumstances" that can justify this in terms of NPPF criteria? It may be convenient both to Council and Developer to abbreviate/avoid the consultation process, but it gives unnecessarily the impression of deviousness</li> <li>• Why is there nothing in the document about proposals for in-fill or brownfield sites?</li> <li>• The concept of "safeguarding" for future development on present Green Belt land is a contradiction in terms</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few people commented on Issues and Options paper. All growth focused in the South/Centre of the Borough instead of an equal distribution between Crewe and Macclesfield and a sharing of growth in all towns. Therefore, flawed outcome of figures, resulting in delays and appeals that will follow</li> </ul> |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise the housing distribution plans to give increased development in Macclesfield</li> <li>• Share housing growth around the Borough to spare towns such as Sandbach, Middlewich, Alsager and Nantwich from excessive development</li> <li>• Developers/land interests should not have been given privileged position of submitting sites not previously consulted upon</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issues raised are not specific to the content of Appendix G of the PCCS, which specifically only relates to the evolution of the Core Strategy</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No material change required</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Consultation Point</b>  | <b>Appendix H: Partners and Initiatives</b>  |
| <b>Representations received</b>  | Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 2)  |
| <b>Relevant issues</b>   | <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment Only</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that CEC have consulted fully with Stoke, Newcastle or Kidsgrove on the employment and housing implications of the growth plans for Crewe, Alsager and Nantwich - towns with strong links with The Potteries. By choosing Warrington as a partner body over Manchester, the role of Macclesfield in the development of the Borough has been down-played</li> <li>• Include the Cheshire East Visitor Economy Strategy 2011</li> </ul>   |
| <b>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaningful discussions on joint development projects between South/Central CEC and The Potteries.<br/>Meaningful discussions with Manchester aimed at promoting the role of and developing the contribution of Macclesfield</li> <li>• Include the Cheshire East Visitor Economy Strategy 2011</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Council assessment of relevant issues</b>                                 | <p>The evidence that CEC is working with its neighbouring authorities will be covered by the Duty to Co-operate requirements that are being fulfilled.</p> <p>Inclusions of the Cheshire East Visitor Economy Strategy is a valid suggestion and this document will be referenced in the Core Strategy</p>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <p>The Visitor Economy Strategy is a strategically important component of the Council's economic development priorities. It is an important contributor to the economy of Cheshire East, contributing to local quality of life, and has a positive impact on decisions over business location and individual choices over where to live and work. The strategic framework outlines some of the issues and priorities that the Council must consider and resource, the opportunities to align the needs of residents and visitors and a model for partnership working to help realise the potential of Visitor Economy in Cheshire East.</p> <p>The outcome targets we seek to achieve are:<br/> Develop a Visitor Economy with a value of £818m by 2015<br/> Increase jobs directly related to the Visitor Economy by around 1271 over the same period<br/> Increase visitor numbers to Tatton to 1m by 2015<br/> Increase the number of businesses achieving quality accreditation.</p> |