

Responses to the consultation on the Pre Submission Core Strategy Non Preferred sites and key changes

Summary and Assessment of Issues Raised During Consultation

Consultation of the Local Plan Pre-Submission Core Strategy took place between 5th November and 16th 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 5th November and 16th 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 The Pre Submission Joint Core Strategy was made available for public consultation between 5th of November and 16th December 2013, accompanied by the Sustainability Appraisal, the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Non-Preferred Sites.

- 1.1 The Non Preferred Sites Document contained sites **not** proposed to be allocated in the Pre Submission Core Strategy but that had been consulted upon at a previous stage in the development of the Cheshire East Local Plan including the Development Strategy and Possible Additional Sites Proposed by Developer and Land Interests.

2 The reason for consultation

- 2.1 The Local Plan must be produced in a way that complies with the National Planning Policy Framework. It must reflect the vision and aspirations of local communities, including the consideration of potential alternatives policies and sites.
 - 2.2 *150. Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities. Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise*
 - 2.3 *155. Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as*

possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made.(NPPF)

3 The number of comments received

- 3.1 During the Pre-Submission consultation 8,585 comments were received from 2,777 different people and organisations. 38% of comments were submitted online using the Council's consultation portal, 36% were submitted by email and 26% were submitted on paper.

4 Method of assessing comments

4.1 Analysis

- 4.2 As well as questionnaires, the Council also 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 a method used by South Cambridge during their plan preparations.

5 Consultation Points-, support, objections, comments and suggested changes

- 5.1 There were 67 Non Preferred Sites considered as part of the Pre Submission Core Strategy. All comments received about the sites through the consultation were recorded against the appropriate non preferred site as either an objection, a vote of support, a comment or a suggested change to an individual site.

6 Logging comments

- 6.1 Every comment received was logged against the appropriate non preferred site and all comments and issues raised have been made available on the Cheshire East Council web site along with the names of individuals or agents that submitted them for complete transparency.

7 Proformas

- 7.1 A proforma was produced for each non preferred site. All objections, support, comments and suggested changes received for each non preferred site were quantified (giving a total number of times the point was made) and summarised.

8 Issues raised

- 8.1 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;-

- 8.2 *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*

- 8.3 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.

9 Peer Review

- 9.1 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.

10 Council Recommendations

- 10.1 A Council response was added to each proforma setting out the reasons for accepting or rejecting suggested changes. Issue relating to “soundness” of policy wording where 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.
- 10.2 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.
- 10.3 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.

11 Recording the changes

- 11.1 All minor and major changes taken forward in the PSCS are recorded at the end of each individual Consultation Proforma in the shaded “Council Response” box.

Contents

Summary and Assessment of Issues Raised During Consultation	1
Methodology adopted for assessing responses to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy	1
Contents.....	4
NPS 1 Coppenhall East Extension	7
NPS 2: Sydney Road (South).....	8
NPS 3 Poole Meadows Road	10
NPS 4: Land Off University Way	12
NPS 5 Gorsty Hill Golf Course.....	13
NPS 6 land South of Weston	16
NPS7 Land on Crewe Road Along A500 Linking to Park Estate Shavington.....	17
NPS 8 Land south of Gresty Lane	19
NPS 9 Newcastle Road Willaston.....	21
NPS 10 Land South West Crewe	22
NPS 11 Wistaston Green Road, Crewe	24
NPS 12: West street/ Dunwoody Way	25
NPS 38 land between Chelford Road and Whirley Road	26
NPS 39 Land to the North of Birtles Road.....	28
NPS 40 Land to the West of Priory Lane	30
NPS 41 Land North of Prestbury Road	32
NPS42: Land adjoining Lark Hall, Macclesfield	34
NPS43: Land to the East of London Road	37
NPS17: MMU Extension.....	39
NPS18: Sandbach Road North.....	40
NPS19: Fanny's Croft.....	41
NPS20: Congleton West.....	43
NPS21: Land North of Lamberts Lane	45

NPS61: Land Between Clay Lane and the proposed A555 Airport Link Road.....	46
NPS46: Land to the south and west of Beggarmans Lane	47
NPS47: Land to the west of Blackhill Lane	48
NPS48: Land to the south west of Knutsford High School.....	49
NPS49: Land to the west of Parkgate Lane.....	51
NPS50: Land South of Longridge.....	53
NPS51: Booths Hall Estate.....	55
NPS52 - Land between Gough's Lane and Chelford Road	57
NPS34 Glebe Farm (Extended Site).....	58
NPS35 Land to the North West of Booth Lane	59
NPS14 Land South of Queens Drive	60
NPS15 Land Bounded by the railway to the west and the River Weaver to the east	61
NPS16 Land to the South of Nantwich.....	62
NPS 63 Land to the West of Poynton.....	64
NPS 64: Land at Lower Park	66
NPS 65: Land North of Middlewood Road and East of Towers Road	67
NPS 66: Land to the West of Poynton Coppice.....	68
NPS 67: Land East of Poynton Industrial Estate.....	69
NPS 23: Land West of Cookesmere Lane	70
NPS 24: Land at Marsh Green Road.....	71
NPS25: Land East of Cookesmere Lane.....	72
NPS 26 Land at Congleton Road Sandbach.....	73
NPS27: Land South West of A533	74
NPS28: Land off Houndings Lane	75
NPS29: Land to the west of Wheelock Bypass.....	76
NPS30: Land to the rear of Park Lane and Crewe Road.....	77
NPS 31 land at Hind Heath.....	78

NPS32: Land at Yeowood Farm.....	79
NPS 33 Abbeyfields	81
NPS 55: Land at Little Stanneylands.....	82
NPS56: Land at Dean Row (West).....	83
NPS 57 Land at Dean Row (eastern parcel)	85
NPS 58 land north of Beech Road	87
NPS 59 Land at Ryley’s farm	88
NPS 60: Rotherwood Road.....	89
NPS 44 Chelford	90
NPS 45 Siddington.....	91
NPS 13 Greater Wardle.....	92
NPS 20 Employment Area 3	94
NPS 21 Employment area 1	96
NPS 22 Village B Barthomley.....	98
NPS 62 Land at Audlem road, Audlem.....	100
NPS 53 Land at junction of Town and Smith Lane, Mobberley	102
NPS 54 Ilfords Mobberley	103

Consultation Point	NPS 1 Coppenhall East Extension
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 1 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land consists of managed and unmanaged areas which carry much higher environmental value than standard agricultural land with natural wildlife corridors and evidence of a number of protected species; whilst remaining high quality Grade 2 and 3 land. The road infrastructure and utilities within Wychwood (Village and Park) are already strained and the costs of delivering a sustainable development are likely to be unjustifiably high. In addition, the site should be considered for Green Belt status to protect against further development in accordance with Policy PG 3 Green Belt and Safeguarded Land. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to non inclusion of this site. Site is nearer to Crewe Town Centre and Leighton Hospital than South Cheshire Growth Village. Site is not in the Green Belt / Green Gap and therefore a more appropriate site Opportunity to put infrastructure to the north of the town through the delivery of this site by a ring road to relieve traffic congestion around the town Object to the exclusion of Broughton Road, Crewe as a housing allocation. Site is sustainable; has excellent public transport links; good highway access; is available; no flood risk; does not have the same level of constraints or sensitiveness of landscape value as other proposed Strategic Sites. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include the site as an allocation
Council assessment of relevant issues	The site is considered a Non Preferred site. The site is detached from most of the residential areas with the railway line forming a definite boundary to the west. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 2: Sydney Road (South)
Representations received	Total: 6 (Support: 4 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for non inclusion of site due to impact on Green Gap, Open Countryside, Agricultural and Recreational Land • Support non inclusion due to impact on New Green Belt Area of Search <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunters Lodge Hotel, Sydney Road; sustainable location; SHLAA (2013) suitable/achievable/developable (ref 2893); • Considered under SHLAA refs 3029, 3792, 2893 and 4098 as developable and deliverable • Preferred sites in Core Strategy are Green Gap / Green Belt Area of Search • Sustainability Appraisal considers no difference between this site and Core Strategy 4 and 5. • Inconsistent reasoning for non inclusion • Object to removal from plan • The development of this site would facilitate the wider strategic highways improvements being considered by CEC to provide a link road between the A534 and Sydney Road as well as a consequential reduction of loading on Crewe Green Roundabout. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate this site and remainder of area shown for development in the Core Strategy • Amend boundaries of sites CS4 or CS5 to include this land.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is located within a Green Gap and an area of search for potential Green Belt. Development here would significantly reduce the visual separation between Crewe and Haslington. The enlargement of allocated sites to the north and south would erode the character of those planned new developments.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 3 Poole Meadows Road
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 2 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsuitable and unsustainable for further development • Area serves a natural gap between Crewe and Haslington • Road infrastructure unable to cope • Included in the Green Belt Area of search • Site in the Green Gap • Could impact on Crewe Green Conservation Area and Listed Buildings around St Michael and All Angels Church <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is close to Crewe Town Centre and would deliver on 'All Change For Crewe' aspirations • Meet Haslington's future housing needs • Comprehensive scheme could be delivered • Site could include carbon off-setting • Logical extension to Haslington • Sustainable site with no technical or land ownership constraints • The proposed housing delivery target of 27,000 homes up until 2030 is too low when one reviews the housing evidence base and it will need to increase this if the Core Strategy is to be judged sound. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is within a Green Gap and area of search for a proposed Green Belt, and is in a location where the gap between Crewe and Haslington is already narrow. Development here would significantly erode the visual separation.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>

Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.
-----------------------	---

Consultation Point	NPS 4: Land Off University Way
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only suitable for commercial development • Retained as employment land adjacent to Crewe Business Park and University Campus. Key to All Change for Crewe <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe that CEC considers this should be retained for light commercial development. If this is the case, providing it is limited to single storied/high tech/service utilisation this could be less intrusive than housing
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is allocated for employment use in the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan and has constraints in terms of listed buildings and flood risk.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the housing for the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 5 Gorsty Hill Golf Course
Representations received	Total: 260 (Support: 257 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Cheshire East designating this site as a non-preferred site. • Site needs to be returned to being a golf course in line with Policy SC2 of the Core Strategy • There is a lack of infrastructure, facilities and the site would impact negatively on the local highway network • The site borders another Council area and its development would reduce the gap between the two areas • Impact on utility provision in the area • Development of this site would violate Section 106 agreement which limits development on the site • Site provides a great natural habitat for wildlife and protected species • Negative impact on trees in the area • Unsuitable and unsustainable location • Site should be considered appropriate for Green Belt status under the Green Belt Area of Search • High Grade Agricultural Land that should be retained • Should refer to original site design brief designed around open space village theme surrounded by Country Park and Golf Course • The Basford Sites have already been allocated and are more suitable and sustainable • Should maintain green infrastructure in the area • The wildlife mitigation (planting, habitat and shelter) put in place to compensate for the existing development is on the Gorsty Hill site, which is unacceptable for further development. • The costs of delivering a sustainable development are likely to be unjustifiably high. • Not in keeping with character of surrounding area • Golf course should be reopened • Contrary to the original design plan 7/16321 for an outline application for golf courses and associated buildings, hotel, shops, leisure facilities which was approved subject to S106 agreement, 21st November 1990. • The site is not currently included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment with the area currently classified as non deliverable due to the current permitted development 7/16321 and limitations under 106 agreement • Building is still not complete after a decade • Lack of Broadband and other infrastructure <p>Objection</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site seems a logical extension and site needs to be included in the plan • Site capable of appropriate redevelopment and should be included in the Core Strategy • Concern that the process has been predetermined and prejudiced by a letter from the Council Leader sent out in April 2013 • Disagree with reasons set out in Non Preferred Documents • Site would not be contrary to Vision and Objectives of the Plan • Unlawful consultation process as criteria for site assessment not published • Relates well to strategic properties set out in the Core Strategy • CEC not adequately assessed the demand / supply position regarding Golf Courses • Gorstyhill represents a suitable growth village south east of Crewe and is sustainable in its own terms, is achievable and is available now as in a single ownership • Site can improve sustainability of Wychwood Park • Golf course is redundant for planning purposes • This site represents a more suitable site than the South Cheshire Growth Village as it is not constrained by a heritage asset • Site would represent no loss of agricultural land • Site is not constrained in highways terms • Site is deliverable and would represent appropriate design and would meet housing requirements • Would provide local employment • Good access to local facilities • Would fund public transport subsidy for 10 plus years • Development would improve Country Park at Gorstyhill • Represents an efficient reuse of a redundant recreational facility • Core Strategy has not considered 'reasonable alternatives' • Previously developed and unconstrained site • Treatment of the site through the SA process is not considered sound. • Council recognises need for a growth village south east of Crewe – Gorstyhill represents a more appropriate location for this than South Cheshire Growth Village • Represents opportunity for garden city concept in line with paragraph 52 of the NPPF <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site
Council	The site is within the area of search for a potential Green belt and is a

assessment of relevant issues	former recreational area, in the form of a golf course. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 6 land South of Weston
Representations received	Total: 27 (Support: 26 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome non inclusion of site • Reason for rejection should be made robust and refer to Grade II* Listed Building at Weston Hall • Local infrastructure cannot cope with development • Not a sustainable location • Concerned over traffic impact • Concerned over loss of open countryside and agricultural land. • Farmland provides a natural buffer • Support inclusion of this area in Green Belt Area of Search • Concerned over landscape impact • Concerned over impact on neighbouring North Staffordshire <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site does not relate well to the achievement of the Vision and Strategic Priorities. It is outside the recommended distance to open space and key services and facilities. The site is within the area of search for a potential Green belt and is a former recreational area. It is accepted that there is no longer a listed building at Weston Hall, but the site is close to Weston Conservation Area and listed buildings.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS7 Land on Crewe Road Along A500 Linking to Park Estate Shavington
Representations received	Total: 7 (Support: 3 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shavington does not require a housing development of this size • Shavington could not sustain the extra traffic • Shavington facilities could not cope with the additional development • These are strategically important to the rural character of South Cheshire and to provide a buffer against unplanned urban sprawl of Crewe • Open Countryside • Site is not sustainable in terms of economic activity or social infrastructure • Loss of agricultural land is a concern • Support designation of area as part of the New Green Belt Area of Search <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is suitable for housing • Can provide an enhanced settlement boundary buffer to the north of Shavington • Capable of 150 houses plus public open space and landscaping belt. Capacity of site has been overestimated. • Can get direct access onto Crewe Road and Highway Network • It is on existing bus routes and cycleway • Shavington has existing infrastructure and facilities to cope with this development • SHLAA sites 2905,2909,2911 and 3381 – sites are deliverable and developable. Sites are well defined and suitable • Precedent of using A500 as a boundary has been established by Basford East and West <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be allocated for development, with the potential for 150-250 homes.
Council assessment of relevant issues	The site is located within a Green Gap and an area of search for proposed Green Belt designation. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been

	selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 8 Land south of Gresty Lane
Representations received	Total: 12 (Support: 12 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I fully support this designation of site NPS 8 as a non-preferred site, as I feel development on this site would be unsustainable, erode the existing Green Gap and destroy the vital local environment for wildlife, agricultural and recreational use. No change to the Local Plan as it stands • I agree that this should not be developed. I would support it becoming part of the new Green Belt. I hope that the outline planning application for 880 homes will be refused. • The application site is unjustifiable, would be in direct conflict with the Green Gap/Belt proposals. The railway and A500 create boundary between Crewe and Shavington. • I support the non-inclusion of these sites. I support the proposal to develop a Green Belt to protect South Cheshire from urban sprawl • Fully support the non inclusion of this site as development would lead to the erosion of the local green gap and destroy the habitat for the local wildlife. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following withdrawal of appeal for residential use, we seek to promote the site for mixed use / employment / retail which would complement the proposals at the adjoining site at Basford West. Detailed site information is attached • Until the identified borough-wide housing requirement, and also (in part related) the housing requirement assigned to Crewe are resolved, the precise level of new housing required to be accommodated within sites identified to meet Crewe's needs is not accurately established. Land bounded by Gresty Lane, Rope Lane, Crewe Road and the A500 (see attached Plan at Appendix 7) represents a more suitable and sustainable alternative to sites and locations identified in the Plan, and its exclusion on that basis alone is inappropriate. • This site for 880 units is a more suitable & sustainable alternative to sites & locations identified in the Plan & we object to its non-inclusion. Site is suitable, available & deliverable; it has few constraints which can be mitigated; it is well related to facilities & to Crewe & is separate from Shavington; loss of Green Gap & open countryside is necessary; Green Belt & SOG study is flawed. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I agree that this should be a NPS but I note that the land from Rope Lane to Wistaston along Eastern Road is not included? Why is the land off Eastern Road not protected when dead and in parts

	derelict Crewe Town Centre is not considered for housing development?
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site for mixed use / employment / retail development
Council assessment of relevant issues	Development of this site would lead to the loss of a large area of open countryside designated as Green Gap and within an area of search for a proposed Green Belt. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 9 Newcastle Road Willaston
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 1 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the Council on this site <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site currently has no use, due to the isolated nature and small size, the site is incapable of any productive use, including agriculture. It is bound by the A500 and Newcastle Road and is enclosed by two roads. The site is of no amenity or visual value. If the site is classed as Green Belt the only option is for the land to remain as vacant / derelict scrubland in the future. • Proposed development: employment / commercial / roadside service use We have undertaken a desk based assessment of roadside service areas on the A500. There are no service stations located along this strategic link or indeed the A51. The nearest fuel stations are in south Crewe, Nantwich Town Centre or Shavington. We therefore consider that there is a need for the proposed development, which would result in an active economic use for an otherwise landlocked parcel of land that could fall into a state of neglect, The proposal would also contribute to the Government's growth agenda and the prosperity of the local area. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be promoted for employment / commercial / roadside service use.
Council assessment of relevant issues	The site has limited access to services and facilities. The site is situated within the Green Gap and within an area of search for a proposed Green Belt. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 10 Land South West Crewe
Representations received	Total: 29 (Support: 30 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I fully support Cheshire East designating this site as a non-preferred site. Development on this site would erode the green gap and greatly impact on local amenities. Development on this site is not sustainable and is not needed. This area should rightly be designated green belt. • There is no way the present infrastructure could support a development on this scale, it adds nothing to the village whatsoever, other than a number of problems. It is totally unnecessary, unsustainable and unwanted • I support the designation of land at Witters Field, Wistaston as a non preferred site. Development here would erode the Green Gap and facilities are not available (education, health, transport). The whole character of Wistaston would be changed forever, for the worse. • I would like to raise my objection to the proposed Gladman homes application to build houses on this piece of land. There is very little green belt land left in this area. There are no jobs to sustain families to buy these houses, not unless they are being earmarked for the mass migration of Eastern Europeans due over shortly. This is ludicrous and Cheshire council need to step up to the plate, and keep Wistaston green • This is the last remaining open countryside between Crewe and the village of Wistaston. It is used by adults and children from the whole area and building on it would destroy the very thing which makes people want to live in the area. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed Masterplan & Vision Document was submitted by Gladman in February 2013 during the previous stage of consultation. This concluded that a sustainable scheme of up to 320 dwellings was deliverable. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is submitted this site should be allocated for 300 dwellings in the submission Core Strategy
Council assessment of	The site is situated within the Green Gap and within an area of search for a proposed Green Belt. When assessed against reasonable

relevant issues	alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 11 Wistaston Green Road, Crewe
Representations received	Total: (Support: 12 / Object:1 / Comment Only:)
Relevant issues	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of this site would erode the green gap and severely affect the local amenities/infrastructure. Development on this site is not sustainable & unwanted. <p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the non inclusion of site NPS11 in the Core Strategy. The site is within a sustainable location and is well contained by clear and defensible boundaries. There would be no adverse impact to the current Green Gap. Existing trees and hedgerows could be retained within any Masterplan for the site. • Development would not adversely impact on any of these elements, indeed a comprehensive Masterplan for the site would provide significant areas of open space that would be publicly accessible. • Reference is also made to site constraints, however, detailed technical investigations have confirmed that there are no significant site constraints that would preclude development. Further documentation will be made available to the Council in due course to justify the deliverability credentials of this site.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be included as a potential development site in the Core Strategy
Council assessment of relevant issues	The site's outlying location means that its access to existing services and facilities is limited. It has an important Green Gap and proposed Green Belt function and its character warrants protection for recreational and ecological reasons. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 12: West street/ Dunwoody Way
Representations received	Total: (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area in question is an integral part of the wildlife corridor and any building would spoil the surroundings of the new Crewe-Nantwich Greenway. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none <p>Comment only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> none
Council assessment of relevant issues	The brownfield site does relate well to the achievement of the Vision and Strategic Priorities. During the production of the Local Plan Strategy it has not been possible to demonstrate that the site as a whole could come forward as a housing site. However, as the site is a brownfield site future development of the site would be acceptable and could come forward as a windfall site or allocated within the Site allocations and Development Policies document when deliverability is more certain.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 38 land between Chelford Road and Whirley Road
Representations received	Total: 8 (Support: 6 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report on the area seems well prepared and appropriate. The conclusion that it is not suitable is justified, in that it would merge Henbury with Macclesfield. There was a school near here, now houses contradictory. Grade 11 listed buildings would have been at risk also Green Belt. Henbury is separate area, leave alone, and leave protected trees alone. Let wildlife flourish for the benefit off all do we want a sterile area? No we do not. Glad that this site is non preferred NPS38 between Chelford Road and Whirley Road, is well used by dog walkers and maintains Henbury Village's identity Invasion of Green Belt in these locations is not justified taking into account the alternatives and the real need. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support development on this site. Detailed site information supplied. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Again this is tagged on to existing urban areas...the conurbation grows and grows and grows. Build sensible numbers of houses attached to local villages including Prestbury, this will reduce the impact. Everything just gets lumped on.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate site for development
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site has an important Green belt function and would require high levels of investment in local services and infrastructure.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 39 Land to the North of Birtles Road
Representations received	Total: 7 (Support: 5 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Green Belt, protected species. Wildlife haven. Do we not want to hear or see them? I know I do want to see them. Ensure developments are not allowed to build on this land. This is not ours to destroy. Think of forebears and future generations. • Glad that this site is non preferred. Keep the green belt between Macclesfield and Henbury • Of the four non-preferred sites, NPS 40/41 provide a valuable buffer zone between Macclesfield and Prestbury, helping both and particularly Prestbury, to retain their own identities. Also, ref 40 is the location of the rugby club and would necessitate an upheaval for them, should the grounds be redeveloped. Site references NPS38 between Chelford Road and Whirley Road, is well used by dog walkers and maintains Henbury Village's identity - as does NPS 39 which allows and open country aspect to Birtles Road. • Since 1956 all around Broken Cross, there has been much development - of horticulture nurseries and Parkside Hospital - for housing, schools and leisure centre. Broken Cross was a distinct village, but now is a suburb of Macclesfield. I would hope Prestbury and Henbury villages remain as such. • Would not be justified taking into account the alternatives and the real need. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I object partially, I accept that some parts around Macclesfield should be earmarked for development part of this could be developed, in the context of development around local villages to reduce the impact • Support development on this site. Detailed site information supplied <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate for development
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>Although it is located adjacent to the urban edge the site is at a distance from existing local services and it forms an important part of the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically</p>

	<p>policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 40 Land to the West of Priory Lane
Representations received	Total: 7 (Support: 3 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 3)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glad that this site is non preferred. Acute traffic problems in the Prestbury Road / Priory Lane area should not be allowed to worsen! • Of the four non-preferred sites, NPS 40/41 provide a valuable buffer zone between Macclesfield and Prestbury, helping both and particularly Prestbury, to retain their own identities. Also, ref 40 is the location of the rugby club and would necessitate an upheaval for them, should the grounds be redeveloped. Site references NPS38 between Chelford Road and Whirley Road, is well used by dog walkers and maintains Henbury Village's identity - as does NPS 39 which allows and open country aspect to Birtles Road. Since 1956, all around my present address in Broken Cross, there has been much development - of horticulture nurseries and Parkside Hospital - for housing, schools and leisure centre. Broken Cross was a distinct village, but now is a suburb of Macclesfield. I would hope Prestbury and Henbury villages remain as such. • Invasion of Green Belt in these locations is not justified taking into account the alternatives and the real need. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sites should be developed before green belt but if green belt has to be built on then this area or at least parts of it should be reconsidered for development . It is within easy reach of schools and amenities. is largely flat land suitable for building. The infrastructure is already there. The 'environmental protection' factor is less significant here than at other green belt sites which have been included in the Core Strategy e.g. CS9 Land to the east of Fence Avenue. If this area of greenbelt is considered worth protecting then the land at CS9 must also be protected <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site, being in close proximity to King's School's existing playing fields and conference centre facilities at Derby Fields must surely be one of the sites may be chosen by them for their intended relocation. Presumably there will be further consultation if this proves to be the case or will it be handled through Site Allocations processes? • Alternative Solutions to allow Green Belt land at Gaw End Lane (Sites CS11 & CS31) to be completely removed from the Core Strategy Framework. 2) Reconsider use of part of site NPS40 (Land to the North of Prestbury Road) which was favoured during development of the Macclesfield Town Strategy for the provision of 360 homes. By use of

	<p>only part of the site, say for 100 homes, could enable the northern section to be retained as a buffer between the development and Upton Wood. Part use of this site would not create the merging of Macclesfield with surrounding settlements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the club were to relocate, a sustainable level of development can be accommodated on site without any adverse impact on neighbouring interests. Detailed site information is attached. • Since 1956, all around Broken Cross, there has been much development - of horticulture nurseries and Parkside Hospital - for housing, schools and leisure centre. Broken Cross was a distinct village, but now is a suburb of Macclesfield. I would hope Prestbury and Henbury villages remain as such.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider use of part of site NPS40 (Land to the North of Prestbury Road) which was favoured during development of the Macclesfield Town Strategy for the provision of 360 homes. By use of only part of the site, say for 100 homes, could enable the northern section to be retained as a buffer between the development and Upton Wood. • If green belt has to be developed (and all alternatives should be exhausted first) then this site is more suitable than CS9. • Use part of NPS40 for housing allocation
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is in Green Belt and is in use for recreational purposes.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 41 Land North of Prestbury Road
Representations received	Total: 9 (Support: 6 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I whole heartedly support the council's decision not to allow building on this site and continuing to maintain it as greenbelt. This land fulfils the fundamental role of green belt land by stopping urban sprawl and enabling residents to access the countryside. This is a wildlife rich piece of agricultural land supporting and protecting the ancient Upton woods. Well done the council for recognising that any development here would not achieve the objectives of the core strategy. Fully support that this site is now non preferred. Local schools are already over subscribed and the traffic situation on Prestbury Road coming into Macclesfield should not be allowed to worsen. Maintain the green belt between Macclesfield and Prestbury! I think congratulations are in order to the council for common-sense to prevail. (No building on greenbelt area C/8) Wildlife is superb on these field's, also the land sustains sheep & cow's, so therefore is already being used. Well done & thank you. Of the four non-preferred sites, NPS 40/41 provides a valuable buffer zone between Macclesfield and Prestbury, helping both and particularly Prestbury, to retain their own identities. Also, ref 40 is the location of the rugby club and would necessitate an upheaval for them, should the grounds be redeveloped. Site references NPS38 between Chelford Road and Whirley Road, is well used by dog walkers and maintains Henbury Village's identity - as does NPS 39 which allows and open country aspect to Birtles Road. Since 1956, all around my present address in Broken Cross, there has been much development - of horticulture nurseries and Parkside Hospital - for housing, schools and leisure centre. Broken Cross was a distinct village, but now is a suburb of Macclesfield. I would hope Prestbury and Henbury villages remain as such. Invasion of Green Belt in these locations is not justified taking into account the alternatives and the real need. I fully support the council's decision not to build on this site as it performs the fundamental role of green belt land i.e. stopping urban sprawl. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would prefer this area to be developed than that of

	<p>Gawsworth, Henbury etc.</p> <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 1956, all around Broken Cross, there has been much development - of horticulture nurseries and Parkside Hospital - for housing, schools and leisure centre. Broken Cross was a distinct village, but now is a suburb of Macclesfield. I would hope Prestbury and Henbury villages remain as such.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop here to reduce impact of huge developed pockets elsewhere i.e Gawsworth Road • Object to land off Prestbury Road, Macclesfield being excluded as a housing allocation. Highways report says site is in a sustainable location & development would result in little/no adverse impact on the local network. Site is self contained; not required for Green Belt; few constraints; available.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is within a Local Landscape Designation Area and performs a strong Green Belt role in maintaining the separation of Macclesfield and Prestbury.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS42: Land adjoining Lark Hall, Macclesfield
Representations received	Total: 65 (Support: 63 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the decision to exclude this site from the allocated sites in the core strategy • No exceptional circumstances to remove the site from the Green Belt have been made • The Green Belt in this areas serve its purpose • The decision to remove the site from the Core Strategy is in accordance with the NPPF • There has been a large number objections to the inclusion of this site in previous consultations • The site allows the edge of the town to blend in with the peak national park • There are plenty of other brownfield sites which offer housing potential • It is important to retain Greenfield sites of landscape value, beauty and nature • Good for wildlife and there are many protected species on the site • Building on the site would increase the traffic in the area • Site has a covenant on it that there should be no future development • Trust this is the last time the site will be considered for development • The Council's report is well prepared and their conclusion justified • The Council should ensure they stay firm on this matter and not allow any future proposals • This site is of historic note and should be retained as is • This site forms part of the 'Green Lung' reaching from Victoria Park eastwards to Peak Park • Retention of such sites is a significant contribution to human wellbeing • NPPF requires attention to arguments in favour of preservation of green environment which it is of particular value to local people • This area is a popular area used by walkers • Brownfield sites should be brought forward first • There are mineshafts running underneath the site • This site is an Area of Special County Value for Landscape; Nature Conservation Priority Area and land within the Peak Park Fringe • The Stakeholders Panel stated in their report 'there was overwhelming consensus against using those sites to the east of Macclesfield' • Increase in traffic at this point would be a safety hazard

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Higher Fence Road across Swan’s Pool and up the hillside are amongst the most stunning in Macclesfield <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be allocated within the Core strategy as a developable site • The site is an anomaly and does not connect to the green belt which lies beyond the houses to the rest of the site across Buxton Road on higher ground • Site would appear as a rounding off in terms of the settlement boundary • The site is deemed not to play a significant role in separating settlements which is a major purpose of the Green Belt • Development of the site will improve local recreational amenity, currently a farmer’s field with no access proposal will include half the site landscaped with access for the general public • All natural features within the site will be retained • The proposal would be for a mixed tenure – affordable and market housing • Sustainably located site with good links to bus stops, and schools • CS9 site – Land East of Fence Avenue is also a Green Belt site, but its deliverability is questionable given the need for the school to relocate • This site is available for development • Other sites to the South of Macclesfield have difficult ground conditions which may be costly and delay the developments • East Cheshire Hospice and NSPCC to benefit • Opportunity for Community Infrastructure Levy to help improve access • Any sites which do not have a house builder on board should be allocated as safeguarded for future development potential <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are doubts over the developability and capacity of some of the sites shown in the Pre-Sub Core Strategy, therefore sites such as this one may be suitable replacements • Any development would have to be low density and landscaped in keeping with the surroundings • Site would create a ‘rounding off’ of the existing development in this area • Possibility for safeguarded land for longer term development to avoid having to review the Green Belt at the end of the Plan period
<p>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider if housing numbers need increasing this site should be allocated • This site could be safeguarded for future development • Allocate site within the Core Strategy

considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove CS9 from preferred sites
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is within a Green Belt and local landscape designation. It does not have good access to local services and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS43: Land to the East of London Road
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 1 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the decision to exclude this site from the allocated sites in the core strategy • This green land connects the town to the fringes of the national park and serves to separate Sutton from Macclesfield • Marks a distinct edge between town and country • Any further development in this area would have an adverse impact on the Highway – London Road <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to release more housing land within CE • A number of sites which have been designated within the Core Strategy are constrained in association with their deliverability • Site should be allocated within the Core strategy as a developable site • Site could deliver 800-850 dwellings at 35dph and in the region of 50,000 sq.m of B1, B2 and/or B8 employment floor space – masterplan submitted • Areas of soft landscaping and green open space, including the retention of existing trees, hedgerows and watercourses within the site • Improved vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access • Green corridor network along the Macclesfield canal • Site is deliverable • The site should be released in phases • There are no insurmountable constraints on the site • Do not understand the statement... <i>'(the site) does not relate well to the achievement of the Vision and Strategic Priorities, particularly in relation to the preservation and enhancement of the environment'</i> • This site would have a lesser impact on the Green Belt than sites CS10 and CS32 • Agree the site would 'close the gap' between Sutton and Macclesfield, there are permanent defensible boundaries and land beyond the canal to prevent the long term merging of the two <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site within the Core Strategy

considered	
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site is visually prominent within the Peak Park Fringe Local Landscape Designation and contains protected natural features and adjoins the Macclesfield canal Conservation Area. Parts of the site are susceptible to flood risk. The site forms part of an important gap between Sutton and Macclesfield as part of the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS17: MMU Extension
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 1 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the decision to exclude this site from the allocated sites in the core strategy • There are better sites available. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site was put forward in the Alsager Town Strategy as being a preferred option and was fairly well supported in the public consultation, however was rejected by the Town Council • Parts of the site have previously been considered suitable for development in the Inspection of the Congleton Local Plan however the BC rejected the proposals posed • This site will form a natural, logical rounding off adjacent to the existing MMU site when that comes forward for development. • This site would be more benefit to Alsager than the White Moss Quarry site – which is in an unsustainable location • The site should be allocated for housing and ancillary development within the Core Strategy • There is approval on the site for 30 dwellings • SHLAA (2013) states the site is suitable, achievable and developable and capable of delivering 40 dwellings <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site within the Core Strategy
Council assessment of relevant issues	This site is Greenfield site, and when assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS18: Sandbach Road North
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission for 155 dwellings has been refused on the site (12/4872C) by the LPA, the appeal was dismissed however this decision is now subject to a Statutory Challenge • Potential developer submits that this site remains a suitable and sustainable location for development and should be allocated in the Submission Core Strategy • Phase II for an additional 62 dwellings should also be considered as a Preferred site as it is deliverable and sustainable (see attached plans) <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site within the Core Strategy • Allocate Phase II of the site within the Core Strategy
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>Development would have an adverse impact on the junction of Sandbach Road North and Crewe Road and contains constraints to development including areas of flood risk.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS19: Fanny's Croft
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be allocated within the Core Strategy • The Council's proposed and target figures will fail to meet the required need for the Borough • Sustainable site as evidenced in the SA • Release of the site from the Green Belt would not harm the Green Belt • If the whole site is not acceptable a smaller site in accordance with SHLAA site 2458 should be considered (to the north east of the site) • Do not considered that there are any constraints on the site which would affect deliverability of the site i.e., nature consideration issues raised by the Councils Ecologist, Contaminated Land issues, Flood Risk potential, • Most of the woodland on the site will be retained • Do not consider that development of the site would have any impact on the Local Listed Alsager Railway Station • The PROW will be retained on site and is unlikely to require any diversion • The site creates a natural extension of the existing Alsager urban area and is in walking distance to the train station, schools, health centre • In the public consultation 28% of the residence said that the site was a potential for future development, given its sustainable location • White Moss Quarry is not a sustainable development site and should be removed from the Core Strategy and replaced with Fanny's Croft <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site within the Core Strategy
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The site contains important natural features and contains constraints including a significant flood risk.</p> <p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been</p>

	considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS20: Congleton West
Representations received	Total: 11 (Support: 4 / Object: 7 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the non-allocation of this site • Leader of the Council, assured West Heath residents at a public meeting on 23rd October 2013 that the Padgbury Lane fields area would not be included in any changes to the Local Plan • Not suitable infrastructure for the level of development on the site • Roads are not capable to deal with increase in traffic • Site would not contribute to the Congleton Link Road development strategy • Non-allocation of this site would help to ensure 'urban creep' is limited • The village of Astbury is already threatened by development to the north along A34 <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be allocated for development within the Core Strategy • The Non-preferred sites in Congleton are more suitable than those that are preferred because they can be constructed without the construction of the link road • Wasting tax payers money on a link road is wrong when other solutions are available • Loachbrook Farm has planning permission therefore should be allocated within the Core Strategy • Planning application in on sites Padgbury Lane and Land east of Loach Brook also within the land designation • This site has direct access to the M6 and A34 • Although Open Countryside – its environmental value is limited • Not including the site with the reason 'it would not contribute to the provision of the Congleton Link Road' is not a reasonable argument • Sustainable site • The site should be extended to include land to the west and south of Bent Lane and allocated as a Strategic Site for housing purposes • Sites are clearly available to deliver early in the plan period with planning applications/pre-apps currently being considered • The site should be expanded to link into the proposed Northern Link Road to Newcastle Road thereby meeting other objectives of the Plan • The CEC preferred sites have no permission and therefore add uncertainty to the delivery of the plan over the plan period • Part of the site was considered within the Inspectors report for the

	<p>Congleton Local Plan he considered that the site is a suitable site for development if there is a need for housing in the area – at that time there was not a need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also considered as a mixed use site in CBLP – part of the site considered to be suitable for employment uses in the westerns corner of the site • SHLAA methodology (criteria 1) carried out on 9 sites and the two sites Padgbury Lane and Loachbrook Farm outrank all of the preferred Strategic/Locations as proposed within the PSCS • Congleton Town Strategy identified the land to the West of Congleton as a suitable location for growth • English Heritage have removed a Scheduled Monument status from the site after investigations in 2010 showed no significance of the archaeological deposits in the mound <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received
<p>List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace the Strategic Locations to the North of Congleton with this non-preferred sites • This site, Loachbrook Farm, should be allocated as permission has been granted on the site • The site should be included within the CS and extended to include sites to the north/west (Land at Sandbach Road/Land off Holmes Chapel Road)
<p>Council assessment of relevant issues</p>	<p>When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The ‘Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013’ document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The merits of other sites will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p> <p>Committed sites with planning permission have been noted on plans for relevant towns.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.</p>

Consultation Point	NPS21: Land North of Lamberts Lane
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 1 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the non-allocation of this site • This site should be considered within the Green Belt extension to afford it better protection from future development <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be allocated within the Core Strategy • SHLAA (2013) states the site is suitable, achievable, developable and capable of delivering around 372 dwellings in the medium – long term • Parts of the site have been subject to planning application • Site can be developed without significant new infrastructure • Growth in this area will deliver social, economic and environmental benefits to the town • This is a sustainable location • More housing is required than the amount proposed by CEC in the plan • No reasoned justification for removal of the site from the emerging plan <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate site within the Core Strategy • Green belt extension to protect these areas and surrounding farmland from development.
Council assessment of relevant issues	The site does not have good access to local services and existing infrastructure issues. When assessed against reasonable alternatives, it has been considered that other sites identified in the Local Plan Strategy can provide for the objectively assessed needs of the borough. The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.
Recommendation	This site has not been progressed further into the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS61: Land Between Clay Lane and the proposed A555 Airport Link Road
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expressions of support have been received in relation to this site <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Clay Lane constitutes a suitable, available and achievable area of land, capable of accommodating a significant scale of development, which may support, and be delivered in coordination with, the emerging Airport Relief Road. (Made by Persimmon Homes North West). <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 'comments only' have been received in relation to this site
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positively consider releasing the site from the Green Belt in order to allocate the identified land for a strategic scale of development or as a future development site under some form of safeguarded land designation. (Made by Persimmon Homes North West).
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS46: Land to the south and west of Beggarmans Lane
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 2 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully support the non- inclusion in the Core Strategy of those sites identified herein Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group (KCHG) agrees that there should be no consideration of the site for development, nor for safeguarding for future development. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections to the non-inclusion of this site received <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments only received
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to this policy/allocation have been submitted
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural and historic environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p> <p>The merits of sites in Other Settlements and Rural Areas may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS47: Land to the west of Blackhill Lane
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group (KCHG) agrees that there should be no consideration of the site for development, nor for safeguarding for future development. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections have been registered to the non-inclusion of this site <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 'comments only' have been received in relation to this site
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to this policy/allocation have been submitted
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS48: Land to the south west of Knutsford High School
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 2)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expressions of support have been received in relation to the non-inclusion of this site. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections have been registered to the non-inclusion of this site. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With lack of sufficient justification in the evidence base for the CS high level of proposed residential and employment land, and land to be safeguarded, consideration of this site (or part thereof) for development or future development would be premature. Land requirements of Knutsford Academy are significant and this site includes land adjacent to the existing Upper School. KCHG recommends CEC and Knutsford Town Council discuss with Knutsford Academy its land requirements to determine whether they are to be rationalised. If so, part of NPS48 might be required for educational use, possibly in exchange for land at the Lower School which might then be considered for potential Green Belt release as a brownfield site, potentially for residential use
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group recommends CEC and Knutsford Town Council discuss with Knutsford Academy its land requirements to determine whether they are to be rationalised. If so, part of NPS48 might be required for educational use, possibly in exchange for land at the Lower School which might then be considered for potential Green Belt release as a brownfield site, potentially for residential use
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and</p>

	the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12). The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS49: Land to the west of Parkgate Lane
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>No expressions of support have been received in relation to the non-inclusion site</i> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption that the ‘within town’ figure of dwellings is insufficient for a realistic level of future residential use, and that the release of some Green Belt land will be required. If development proposals at Parkgate North (for residential use) and Parkgate East (for employment use) are progressed, Knutsford will be surrounded by Green Belt land. It is unreasonable to make no future provision at Knutsford for no safeguarded land. Although the scale of such safeguarded land is best decided with reference to objective evidenced need, Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group (KCHG) recommends that NPS49 (Parkgate West) (or part thereof, in which case the land preferably at furthest distance from Tatton Park) is included for consideration as land to be safeguarded, subject to the following (in addition to any other conditions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the deletion from the Local Plan of the currently proposed safeguarded land north and north west of Knutsford; - provision of a tunnel under the rail line at Parkgate, to provide access additional to that existing over the rail line. Apparently a ‘Parkgate package’ would be sufficient for funding of such a tunnel, the package comprising Parkgate West (if safeguarded), and Parkgate North (if pp for residential use is granted); - that ‘package’, together with Parkgate East (if pp for employment use is granted) would require servicing including by local retail facilities, which would need to be reconsidered; - provision of a buffer from Tatton Park and not to intrude upon nor adversely affect long-distance views looking south from Tatton Lake or elsewhere as deemed by Knutsford Town Council as worthy of protecting. <p>•</p> <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ‘comments only’ have been received in relation to this site
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	Include site or part further from Tatton Park as safeguarded land.

<p>Council assessment of relevant issues</p>	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p> <p>Safeguarded land is considered in policy PG4.</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.</p>

Consultation Point	NPS50: Land South of Longridge
Representations received	Total: 7 (Support: 1 / Object: 4 / Comment Only: 2)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no consideration of the site for development, nor for safeguarding for future development. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be included. This area had not been farmed since it was part of the development by Manchester overspill. The site is within the constraints of the Birkin Brook like the Parkgate extension and not a blatant intrusion into the belt, as is the land north west of Knutsford • Part of this area, previously designated on a SHLAA 2012 map of Knutsford as area 3276 and clearly noted at that time as 'developable', should be allocated for development purposes. This area of former agricultural land has for many years been overgrown, derelict, wasteland being readily accessible from the road bounding south-west Longridge. • This effectively 'brownfield' land could be utilised for housing development at this time in lieu of either of the areas of valuable agricultural fields currently identified for housing to the north of Northwich Road or to the east of Manchester Road, Knutsford. • The proposal for the creation of a " high quality employment park " totally out of character for the approach to the historic market town of Knutsford and would be better located alongside the other employment sites within the town, thereby reducing the amount of high grade agricultural land needed to be taken out of the greenbelt. • No evidence that this site " includes Booths Mere which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest", , as there is no mention of Booths Mere being a SSSI. The remainder of the land is merely scrub land, not having been farmed for some 30 years. • This site is capable of taking some of the housing requirement for the town or provide some of the safeguarded land and thereby negate the need to use up top grade agricultural land to the NW of Knutsford. • Promote land east of Longridge for residential-led development for approx 250 dwellings. (<i>Detailed site information, masterplan, ecology report and tree report provided (made by Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Dewscope Ltd).</i>) • No explanation as to why sites to north west of Knutsford are preferable to this site. Constraints could be addressed. <p>Comment Only</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of this area, outwith Booths Mere, previously designated on a SHLAA 2012 map of Knutsford as area 3276 and clearly noted at that time as 'developable', should be allocated for development purposes. This area of former agricultural land has for many been overgrown, derelict, wasteland being readily accessible from the road bounding south-west Longridge. • Land could be utilised for housing in the short term in lieu of valuable farmland and currently identified for housing to the north of Northwich Road or to the east off Manchester Road, Knutsford. • Area identified for Employment Use off the A50 to be totally inappropriately located adjacent to the entry of a town like Knutsford.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate area 3276 in the Core strategy and remove either of the two areas identified above. • Remove employment park from CS18 and relocate it to NPS 50 Land south of Longridge • Allocate land east of Longridge for residential-led development (<i>made by Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Dewscope Ltd</i>)
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS51: Booths Hall Estate
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 0 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expressions of support have been received in relation to the non-inclusion of this site <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group (KCHG) recommend the inclusion of Booths Park as a Core Strategy site. Booths Park is described by CEC as one of seven “key employment/technological locations in Cheshire East and identified as being of particular significance to the economy in Cheshire East”. It is demonstrably incorrect that ‘a small number of sites concentrated in particular areas minimises the impact on the Green Belt’ (CS para 8.72) locations identified in north and north west Knutsford make significant incursions into open GB countryside, more obviously intruding into the Green Belt, and are visible from major highway thoroughfares. Much of Booths Park is hidden from view, and is effectively in a large cul-de-sac. Site can provide 150 new market and affordable homes and complementing existing employment and providing investment for sports facilities. The (business) Park is broadly full and half of its tenants have identified a requirement to expand in this location within the next three years. If they cannot be accommodated there is a real chance that, in time, businesses will move to other locations outside the area. Park contains cluster of high end knowledge based businesses recognised as a key growth sector for the national economy and for Cheshire East. Application for expansion of office floor space is estimated to accommodate circa 1,340 additional knowledge based jobs and has received general support and no technical objections to date Site has and close links to the town centre via a green network of paths, cycle ways and transport network. The site is effectively hidden to passing traffic from the main road and wider views into the site are screened from the Booth Park commercial development. The site has few constraints and is on less sensitive Green Belt land. The site is available and viable.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme will enable significant investment into community sports facilities. • There is local support for the proposed development. • Housing could be delivered in the early to middle phases of the Plan period. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 'comments only' have been received in relation to this site
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of the field to the north west of Booths Hall and south west of the Mere, Knutsford in the Core Strategy for 150 new market and affordable homes. The Green Belt boundary should be amended to exclude the 8.6Ha of land identified to deliver around 150 new homes and the wider site should be identified to deliver new community sports facilities and office accommodation within the Green Belt. (P4 Planning Limited on behalf of Bruntwood Estates Limited).
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p>
Recommendation	<p>The area of the site around Booths Hall has been included in the Local Plan Strategy as a committed employment site, following a recent grant of planning permission. The remainder of the site has not been allocated.</p> <p>The reference to Booths Mere being a SSSI has been removed from the Local Plan Strategy. It should correctly be referred to as a Scheduled Ancient Monument and will be afforded appropriate protection in line with English Heritage guidance.</p>

Consultation Point	NPS52 - Land between Gough's Lane and Chelford Road
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 2 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that there should be no consideration of the site for development, nor for safeguarding for future development • Support all the non-preferred sites, especially NPS52 due to its role in preventing ribbon development and urban sprawl from Knutsford to Ollerton and Marthall. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support development at land south of Oakleigh, Knutsford. No explanation as to why sites to north-west of Knutsford are preferable to this site. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate land south of Oakleigh for development.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>The merits of other may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS34 Glebe Farm (Extended Site)
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against further ribbon of development along Warmington Lane and into open countryside; Pressure on traffic would be increased at Cross Lane and Long Lane South junctions; No suggestions that S106/CIL would be forthcoming for the locality; Preferred site allocated at Glebe Farm meets requirements for development. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p>
Recommendation	Part of the site has now been progress to the Local Plan Strategy as part of the wider site at Glebe Farm (CS20).

Consultation Point	NPS35 Land to the North West of Booth Lane
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none • Objection Note. Objections from Town Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to non inclusion. This mixed use development site has extant planning approval for employment, retail, leisure, and tourism uses. Appropriate to develop in this manner; TC wouldn't support additional residential development south of Town • Site has a large part to play in future investment and regeneration opportunities for Middlewich Town • Transport, accessibility, connectivity issues apply equally to other sites • The development of this site would bring inward investment to contribute to provision of new services and facilities (hotel, retail, leisure) and to connect to and enhance the town centre offer. • This proposal, given its investment potential, (possible link road or infrastructure contributions?), and proximity to the proposed allocated site for 450 dwellings at Glebe Farm immediately adjacent (across the A533), links strongly to the Vision Statement behind the Town Strategy Plan • Comment Only • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the land to the North West of Booth Lane is included in the Core Strategy for the aforementioned reasons
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS14 Land South of Queens Drive
Representations received	Total: 5 (Support: 3 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support non inclusion of this site for environmental reasons • Objection • Part of the site has been granted planning permission (240 dwellings). An appeal on the same part of the site led to a permission for 270 dwellings. This should be reflected in the Core Strategy. This whole site should be reassessed given that it was considered sustainable through the permission for part of the site • Although the NE corner site is greenfield, it would now be acceptable as “rounding off indentation” of the “new” town boundary but not leading to any outward extension into open countryside Although it may have constraints, this part should be reconsidered for allocation as it is no more an outlying site than the one with permission • Comment Only
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider as a preferred site • Planning status for part of the site should be reflected in the Core Strategy. Remainder of site should be allocated for 95 dwellings. Please see attached Masterplan (PRENPS-842)
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>Part of this site now has outline planning permission: 12/244N for up to 270 dwellings allowed on appeal 18/7/2013, and 12/4654N for up to 240 dwellings granted on 1/3/2013 following completion of a legal agreement. The ‘Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013’ document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p>
Recommendation	The site as a whole is not allocated but the area with planning permission is now recognised as a committed housing site. The part of the site without permission has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS15 Land Bounded by the railway to the west and the River Weaver to the east
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 3 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support non inclusion for environmental reasons • Objection • none • Comment Only • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural and historic environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS16 Land to the South of Nantwich
Representations received	Total: 16 (Support: 13 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sustainable • It is important to retain the rural character and atmosphere of Stapeley which is a significant gateway into Nantwich • Proposal for 250 dwellings at Stapeley Water Gardens should be the absolute maximum housing allocation for the village of Stapeley. 146 dwellings have recently been permitted on Stapeley Water Gardens, therefore to achieve this maximum, a further 104 dwellings would be needed. This would meet the needs of the village of Stapeley for the twenty year period between 2010 and 2030 • 94.6% disagreed with this site at Town Strategy consultation • The area is a sensitive piece of land and should be kept for the vital local wildlife, recreational and agricultural use. Any house building in this area would destroy this vital habitat, as well as increase traffic congestion for local residents • Access to site would involve destruction of protected trees • Would undermine on-going development of local plan • Piecemeal development • North West Nantwich site will provide enough houses • Development cannot be delivered in short to medium term due to access and ownership constraints. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the NW corner site is greenfield, it would now be acceptable as rounding off indentation of the town boundary but not leading to any outward extension into open countryside • Although it may have constraints, this part should be reconsidered for allocation as it is no more an outlying site than the one with permission • No sound evidence to support its deletion from the plan, particularly when considered in context of CS22, SHLAA(2013) as suitable, achievable, and developable and capable of delivering 1,306 dwellings in medium-long term • More housing is required in Nantwich area, this site is comparative to other sites and there is no reason for this site not to be in the CS • The site can deliver in the region of 1,000 dwellings and be can be brought forward in phases • There is a need for additional sites • The site does not require significant investment or infrastructure • The extent of impact on landscape character can be mitigated • The development is sustainable with good accessibility <p>Comment Only</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider site as a preferred site; include NPS16 within preferred sites
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), local transport implications (Connectivity, chapter 14) and the creation of Stronger Communities (Chapter 12).</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 63 Land to the West of Poynton
Representations received	Total: 4 (Support: 1 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any significant development on this site would risk impacting adversely on the local Poynton community and would remove the greenbelt buffer that acts to safeguard Poynton and its individualism <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove land at Handforth East from CS and substitute with proposed 3 pieces of land If not substituted, allocate land anyway or safeguard it in CS Opposition to Handforth East Proposed 3 areas are more sustainable Support the short and long term promotion of land for development in-between the settlement boundary of Poynton and the Bypass route (NPS 63) Without reference to the development of land to the west of Poynton at Woodford Aerodrome and its subsequent contribution towards funding of the Relief Road, the Poynton Bypass is unlikely to be deliverable Evidence suggests that there are limited opportunities for brownfield development to meet the needs of the community and therefore some Green Belt release will be required The development of this site would accord with the housing objectives of the Framework <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where can the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document be viewed? it is difficult to comment without knowing what may be proposed elsewhere Allow access to view where development is proposed, rather than where it is not
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove land at Handforth East from CS and substitute with proposed 3 pieces of land If not substituted, allocate land anyway or safeguard it in CS Site NP6 63 should not be identified as a Strategic Site in the Development Strategy
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p>

	<p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	<p>The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy. Site allocations for Poynton will be looked at through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>

Consultation Point	NPS 64: Land at Lower Park
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 1 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within the Green Belt • Concern that an increased number of houses will adversely impact on Poynton a degrade its rural surroundings in the absence of an agreed Local Plan <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an identified need to release land from the Green belt to accommodate development in Poynton. • This site no longer fulfils the purposes of Green Belt, is in a sustainable location and would form a natural rounding off to the settlement boundary particularly when the SEMMMS road is constructed by 2017 giving it a strong boundary. • Site is suitable, available and achievable, free from significant constraints and is deliverable. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would seem logical to identify sites for development in Poynton at this stage rather than leaving until Site Allocations
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider allocating this site in the Core Strategy given some development will be needed in Poynton to meet local needs.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy. Site allocations for Poynton will be looked at through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.

Consultation Point	NPS 65: Land North of Middlewood Road and East of Towers Road
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within the Green Belt • Concern that an increased number of houses will adversely impact on Poynton a degrade its rural surroundings in the absence of an agreed Local Plan <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of other may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy. Site allocations for Poynton will be looked at through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document

Consultation Point	NPS 66: Land to the West of Poynton Coppice
Representations received	Total: 3 (Support: 2 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within the Green Belt • Concern that an increased number of houses will adversely impact on Poynton a degrade its rural surroundings in the absence of an agreed Local Plan • Foothills of Lyme Park <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location well related to the existing settlement. • Sits below a landscape ridge and is also visually contained by mature planting • Allocation of this site would give greater certainty to the Plan • No physical constraints to development • No justification provided as to why Poynton is excluded from allocating strategic sites <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include within Core Strategy as a Strategic Site
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy. Site allocations for Poynton will be looked at through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.

Consultation Point	NPS 67: Land East of Poynton Industrial Estate
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 1 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within the Green Belt • Concern that an increased number of houses will adversely impact on Poynton a degrade its rural surroundings in the absence of an agreed Local Plan <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of other sites in may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy. Site allocations for Poynton will be looked at through the Site Allocations and Development Policies document

Consultation Point	NPS 23: Land West of Cookesmere Lane
Representations received	Total: 8 (Support: 8 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable location, distant from town centre and other facilities • Need more local employment opportunities rather than housing • Increased congestion and pollution in the local area • Would require a new bypass to the M6 • Prime agricultural land • Use brownfield sites • No local infrastructure to support development • Already too many houses approved in Sandbach • Supports wildlife <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandbach needs more employment opportunities not housing • No more housing in Sandbach until infrastructure is in place
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 24: Land at Marsh Green Road
Representations received	Total: 7 (Support: 7 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable location, distant from town centre and other facilities • Need more local employment opportunities rather than housing • Increased congestion and pollution in the local area • Infrastructure already overloaded • Would be overdevelopment of Elworth • Part of the green space that separates Elworth from Sandbach <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandbach needs more employment opportunities not housing
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS25: Land East of Cookesmere Lane
Representations received	Total: 5 (Support: 5 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable location, distant from town centre and other facilities • Would require a bypass to M6 • Increased congestion and pollution in the local area • Infrastructure already overloaded • Poor access <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None registered
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 26 Land at Congleton Road Sandbach
Council assessment of relevant issues	Outline planning permission 12/1903C for up to 160 dwellings, including access and associated infrastructure, and demolition of 130 Congleton Road, was granted at appeal dated 18/10/2013.
Recommendation	The site has been included as a committed site.

Consultation Point	NPS27: Land South West of A533
Representations received	Total: 6 (Support: 5 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is not sustainable and development would impact on local road network and services • Development here would mean loss of a Greenfield site • Wording of the core strategy should be changed to be clear that development at the northern section of the site is not possible <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to inclusion of the site in the NPS – development here will deliver a highly sustainable neighbourhood. • Planning application 13/2389c details site investigations that confirm no environmental or technical issues that would prevent development • Accessibility assessment confirms the site meets all accessibility standards apart from 1 (rail). • Site should be allocated to ensure plan is positively prepared and justified. <p>Comment Only</p>
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of NPS27 in the core strategy.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS28: Land off Houndings Lane
Representations received	Total: 8 (Support: 6 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is not sustainable and development would impact on local road network and services • Development here would mean loss of a Greenfield site • Wording of the core strategy should be changed to be clear that development at the northern section of the site is not possible <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to inclusion of the site in the NPS – development here will deliver a highly sustainable neighbourhood. • Planning application 13/2389c details site investigations that confirm no environmental or technical issues that would prevent development • Accessibility assessment confirms the site meets all accessibility standards apart from 1 (rail). • Site should be allocated to ensure plan is positively prepared and justified. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the south of Old Mill Lane/Houndings Lane, Sandbach should be included in the Core Strategy.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need and approach to planning for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS29: Land to the west of Wheelock Bypass
Representations received	Total: 4 (Support: 4 / Object: / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is on good agricultural land, is too far from the town centre and is not sustainable • Development here would put further pressure on roads, infrastructure and services <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS30: Land to the rear of Park Lane and Crewe Road
Representations received	Total: 25 (Support: 25 / Object: 0/ Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would increase pressure on roads, local services and infrastructure. • The site is homes to various wildlife, flora and fauna. • Suspected drainage problems on site • Greenfield site with high quality agricultural land • Brownfield sites should be used first • Site performs a green gap function between Wheelock and Sandbach • A Roman road traverses the site • There are listed buildings on site • There are areas of subsidence in the site • Development would compromise the Wheelock Trail as a countryside walk • Development will contribute to Sandbach losing its identify as a small market town <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14).</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 31 land at Hind Heath
Council assessment of relevant issues	Planning permission has been granted following the re-determination of the appeal by the Secretary of State, due to the High Court quashing the initial decision (ref 10/2608, 10/2609C). The proposals include up to 269 homes, open space, highway works and provision of a shared footpath and cycleway on land along the southern boundary of Hind Heath Road.
Recommendation	The site has been included as a committed site.

Consultation Point	NPS32: Land at Yeowood Farm
Representations received	Total: 78 (Support: 74 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 2)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would increase pressure on local highways and negatively impact local infrastructure • Site is at significant distance from Sandbach town centre • The performs an important green lung function between Eitley Heath and Elworth and Sandbach • The site is unsuitable for development due to the potential presence of contamination from an inactive landfill site. • The site is located in a brine subsidence area • There is no guarantee that supporting infrastructure will be delivered • The existing Yeowood proposal does not provide a suitable property mix to enable young people to live in the area • The land is grade two and three agricultural land and should not be developed • Brownfield sites should be a priority before development on Greenfield sites • The site is enjoyed for its recreational amenity value • This site is the last area of green land separating Eitley Heath and Wheelock • Future development in Sandbach must be supported by improvements and upgrading of Junction 17 of the M6 • Enough homes have been built in this area to meet local need <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment is poor and does not reflect the planning application submitted. The site is well related to Sandbach and will provide new facilities including retail, a marina, green infrastructure and community facilities. • The site relates well to the achievement of the Vision and Strategic Objectives and represents a sustainable urban extension to Sandbach on low quality, uneconomic farmland. • Development can protect existing heritage interests • Development can protect existing habitats • The location of this site and the ability to integrate it within the wider community offers CEC an opportunity to deliver a sustainable community. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandbach needs a new primary school to service new homes and
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Yeowood Farm proposals for housing , a primary school, a satellite doctors surgery, allotments, community orchard, marina and road improvements should be included in the Core Strategy.

considered	
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 33 Abbeyfields
Council assessment of relevant issues	Planning permission was granted via a recovered appeal in October 2013 for 280 dwellings, 10/3471C.
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy however is now considered a committed site.

Consultation Point	NPS 55: Land at Little Stanneylands
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of the role the site plays, the gap between Wilmslow and Handforth has not been robustly assessed. Given topographical constraints, a significant open gap would remain between Wilmslow and Handforth even if Little Stanneylands were to be released. • The land falls under a single ownership and is deliverable • There are no known contamination constraints which would affect viability and therefore deliverability. • Access to the site is possible via a new junction at the entrance to Stanneylands Hotel. • The site is sustainably located in most respects when assessed against Policy SD2 <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be included in the Core Strategy
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth in Key Service Centres is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS56: Land at Dean Row (West)
Representations received	Total: 5 (Support: 3 / Object: 3 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support (inclusion of site as NPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is significant and sensitive Green Belt land set between two areas of special designation • The site has a lack of infrastructure to support new development, is a relatively long distance from the town centre. • Impact on local services, highways and infrastructure will be negative • Dean Row is a separate Hamlet with its own character - development will subsume this into the urban area • Development will have a negative visual impact and result in the loss of open space of recreational value • There is a historic over reliance on this area of Wilmslow for new housing <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a danger that the housing needs of Wilmslow will not be met by dependence on the North Cheshire Growth Village proposals. • Wilmslow is one of the largest Key Service Centres in the Borough • Historically this area of land was envisaged as part of a large Dean Row urban extension in the 1970's. • If additional housing is required in Wilmslow then this site would form a logical and sustainable extension to the built up area. • Site is well related to Wilmslow and is deliverable. • The site at North Cheshire Growth Village would function in a different way Heathfield Farm (a site within the Dean Row West site) – the two sites also access different parts for the road network • The allocation of the North Cheshire Growth Village is not considered an impediment to the allocation of this site • Release of Green Belt will be required to accommodate new development and this site makes the lowest contribution possible to the function of the Green Belt • Ecological survey work has been carried out at the site, and those natural assets that exist are considered to be of low value. In event, the Development Statement has clearly identified how ecological features can be satisfactorily incorporated into any future development. • Allocation of land here would deliver the Strategic Priorities identifies in the Plan • There are no ecological, heritage or any other technical constraints which would prevent its development. It contributes minimally to the role of the Green Belt. There are no 'more appropriate' sites. <p>Comment Only</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider allocation in the event that North Cheshire Growth Village cannot meet housing needs of Wilmslow
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth in Key Service Centres is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13), Connectivity (chapter 14) and Stronger Communities (chapter 12)</p> <p>The merits of sites in Other Settlements and Rural Areas will be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 57 Land at Dean Row (eastern parcel)
Representations received	Total: 5 (Support: 3 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully support the non-inclusion of site, within a significant and sensitive green belt on edge of CEC region between Dean and Bollin Valleys which are areas of special designation. Close to Dean Row village with heritage, conservation and wildlife value. Adjacent development very undesirable. Inclusion would not be in line with CS Vision and Strategic Priorities. Petition from 'Friends of Dean Row', with 273 signatures: Question sustainability of site in view of the long distance to town centre so walking and cycling are unlikely; the lack of public transport. There would be a loss of Dean Row as a separate hamlet with its own character. Other adverse effects would include; urban sprawl; visual impact; loss of natural beauty and wildlife; loss of open spaces; drainage and flood risk; too much development in this area. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowner: Support development at Chapel Lane, off Dean Row Road, Wilmslow. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full Habitats Regulation Assessment is required. This has not been carried out and, and have merely touched the surface; covering just the European Sites is not a full Habitats Regulations Assessment. This is lip service to ecology.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete a full HRA. Allocate site for development.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13).</p> <p>The merits of sites will be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan

	Strategy.
--	-----------

Consultation Point	NPS 58 land north of Beech Road
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner: Land to the north of Beech Road, Alderley Edge is a sustainable, developable site and could provide affordable and retirement properties, as well as public open space. • The site would ensure that the right housing in the right location is provided for the skilled workforce required to attract inward investment into the area. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner: Allocation of land to the north of Beech Road, Alderley Edge.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Rural and Other Settlements as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The merits of sites in Other Settlements and Rural Areas will be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 59 Land at Ryley's farm
Representations received	Total: 0 (Support: 0 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 60: Rotherwood Road
Representations received	Total: 4 (Support: 1 / Object: 2 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glad this is a non preferred site. The peat bog should be conserved for its wildlife value. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a brownfield site that could meet some of Wilmslow's housing need. Alternatively it should be included as Safeguarded Land for longer term development. • Landowner: Support development of land at the property known as Rotherwood as a small scale urban extension of Wilmslow. Detailed site information attached. It is not clear why the other Wilmslow sites proposed to be safeguarded for future development are preferable to this site. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As no realistic alternative sites for residential uses have been identified within Wilmslow, the importance of the allocation of Upcast Lane as a Safeguarded Site is stressed.
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider as part of green belt review. Include as housing allocation. Alternatively view as longer term land • Landowner: Allocate land at property known as Rotherwood for development.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The site consists of both Brownfield and Greenfield land.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>The merits of other sites may be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 44 Chelford
Representations received	Total: 4 (Support: 4 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chelford PC supports the non-inclusion NPS44 except for SHLAA sites 3172, 3782 and 3175. We support development of these brown field sites for the continuing vitality of our community even though 3782 is designated Green Belt. The PC would not support the erosion of other Green Belt sites around the village including the other sites of NPS44 east of the railway. Support the non-inclusion of Site NPS 44 for housing development, but should be included as a location for transport use. Livestock market and road maintenance facility and former rail sidings may be suitable for a road/rail transfer for small and medium sized containers. There may be potential to include single storey brick building near the entrance. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of Site NPS 44 for transport use. Recognise sites within village
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Rural and Other Settlements as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of sites in Local Service Centres and Other Settlements and Rural Areas will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 45 Siddington
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 2 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the comments on pages 56 and 57, and sustainable development principles should be concentrating such development in Principal Towns, Key Service Centres and the North Cheshire Growth Village and oppose the use of any Green Belt Land in Cheshire East. • Support the on inclusion of site NPS 45. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in outside the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres, as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>The merits of sites in outside of the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres will be considered in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 13 Greater Wardle
Representations received	Total: 1 (Support: 0 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Objection (landowner)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the land at Wardle/Barbridge is, as a minimum, identified as safeguarded land for future residential development for the reasons identified. This will help to ensure that the Core Strategy is compliant with the NPPF and the tests of soundness in ensuring sufficient flexibility and that alternative growth options are in place should the supply of housing be restricted elsewhere. • Despite its greenfield status this land is not of high environmental quality and initial investigations have demonstrated that there are no major technical barriers to its development. The Pre Submission Core Strategy identifies land at Wardle Airfield (site reference CS28) for major employment development and other land at Wardle was also identified, but discounted, for a new settlement previously. There is a long history associated with the concept of a new sustainable settlement at Wardle. • The Council has also recently approved a major outline planning application for a strategic employment park on land at the former Wardle Airfield. This amounts to some 135,000 m². Over the course of the Plan period therefore it is evident that there will be a requirement for additional residential accommodation in this area which could provide a complementary role to the delivery of major employment development. • It is suggested that the identified land could provide a focus for a new sustainable community which would effectively represent an extension to the existing settlements of Wardle and Barbridge. The site could play a key role in helping the Council to meet its major growth plans including the delivery of 27,000 new homes by 2030. This land complies with the NPPF tests of being suitable, available and deliverable for residential development. It is therefore capable of being identified as a suitable location for residential land use. • The land is generally of lower environmental quality and is not restrained by any statutory or other landscape designations; The land is highly accessible and can the location can be made more sustainable. • The site could contribute towards affordable housing needs in this part of the borough where there has been historically a limited supply of new homes. <p>Comment Only</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the land at Wardle/Barbridge is, as a minimum, identified as safeguarded land for future residential development for the reasons identified. This will help to ensure that the Core Strategy is compliant with the NPPF and the tests of soundness in ensuring sufficient flexibility and that alternative growth options are in place should the supply of housing be restricted elsewhere.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The need to plan for growth is established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The merits of sites in sites outside the Principle Towns and Key Service Centres will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 20 Employment Area 3
Representations received	Total: 42 (Support: 41 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located a considerable distance from the existing urban area and does not have good access to local services and existing infrastructure. The site contains significant policy constraints, notably Green Belt designations, and unsustainable transport access, in term of employees reaching the site, as there is very limited public transport provision available in the area. • The sites lie within the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been advanced to justify either development or any alteration to the boundaries of the Green Belt at these locations. • Development would cause irreparable harm to the local environment, landscape and biodiversity contrary to both national and emerging local planning policies; • If development was to happen this would cause untold damage and harm to the local environment and landscapes. Also, this goes against both natural and local planning policies. • In nearby North Staffordshire there are many empty industrial units and a lot of brown field sites waiting development. • Site should not be in CS as it is in greenbelt; would result in loss of high quality agricultural land and jobs in the agric. sector; irreversible damage to environment, biodiversity, landscape; poor access to services and infrastructure, would not benefit Crewe regeneration; no longer required to fund improvements to the A500 and Junction 16. • Stoke-on-Trent City Council & Newcastle-Under-Lyme BC: 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. • The loss of farmland required by this development is wasteful because there is a vast amount of brown-field land suitable for industrial use in both Stoke, Newcastle and Crewe. These areas also have a large population and thus traffic would be minimised overall. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give support to site

consultation to be considered	
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Rural and Other Settlements as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of sites in Other Settlements and Rural Areas will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 21 Employment area 1
Representations received	Total: 38 (Support: 37 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located a considerable distance from the existing urban area and does not have good access to local services and existing infrastructure. The site contains significant policy constraints, notably Green Belt designations, and unsustainable transport access, in term of employees reaching the site, as there is very limited public transport provision available in the area. • The sites lie within the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been advanced to justify either development or any alteration to the boundaries of the Green Belt at these locations. • Development would cause irreparable harm to the local environment, landscape and biodiversity contrary to both national and emerging local planning policies; • If development was to happen this would cause untold damage and harm to the local environment and landscapes. Also, this goes against both natural and local planning policies. • In nearby North Staffordshire there are many empty industrial units and a lot of brown field sites waiting development. • Site should not be in CS as it is in greenbelt; would result in loss of high quality agricultural land and jobs in the agric. sector; irreversible damage to environment, biodiversity, landscape; poor access to services and infrastructure, would not benefit Crewe regeneration; no longer required to fund improvements to the A500 and Junction 16. • Stoke-on-Trent City Council & Newcastle-Under-Lyme BC: 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. • The loss of farmland required by this development is wasteful because there is a vast amount of brown-field land suitable for industrial use in both Stoke, Newcastle and Crewe. These areas also have a large population and thus traffic would be minimised overall. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support site

consultation to be considered	
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Rural and Other Settlements as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>Any future development will be subject to policies in the Local Plan Strategy including those which protect the natural environment (the approach to which is established in Sustainable Environment policies, chapter 13) and Connectivity (chapter 14)</p> <p>The merits of sites in Other Settlements and Rural Areas will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 22 Village B Barthomley
Representations received	Total: 43 (Support: 42 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support site <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located a considerable distance from the existing urban area and does not have good access to local services and existing infrastructure. The site contains significant policy constraints, notably Green Belt designations, and unsustainable transport access, in term of employees reaching the site, as there is very limited public transport provision available in the area. • The sites lie within the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been advanced to justify either development or any alteration to the boundaries of the Green Belt at these locations. • Development would cause irreparable harm to the local environment, landscape and biodiversity contrary to both national and emerging local planning policies. • If development was to happen this would cause untold damage and harm to the local environment and landscapes. Also, this goes against both natural and local planning policies. • Site should not be in CS as it is in greenbelt; would result in loss of high quality agricultural land and jobs in the agric. sector; irreversible damage to environment, biodiversity, landscape; poor access to services and infrastructure, would not benefit Crewe regeneration; no longer required to fund improvements to the A500 and Junction 16. • Stoke-on-Trent City Council & Newcastle-Under-Lyme BC: 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. • The loss of farmland required by this development is wasteful because there is a vast amount of brown-field land suitable for industrial use in Stoke, Newcastle and Crewe. These areas also have a large population and thus traffic would be minimised overall. • The site would break up the countryside between Crewe and Alsager so making it less valuable for wildlife, • Although the road system needs considerable improvement this development will mean it has to be completely redesigned. • High quality agricultural land will be lost, • Crewe and Alsager will become just one large conurbation leading to the Potteries,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no point Green Belts if they can be just ignored. It is crucial that such a beautiful and historic area should be preserved for future generations. • There is no existing infrastructure. • The site would not deliver sustainable development or wider infrastructure needs, and does not successfully contribute to the delivery of the Core Strategy Vision and Strategic Priorities or wider policy objectives • Green belt, farming land should not be used for this development. The development would destroy the rural environment around the village of Barthomley, which is a historic parish. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support site
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Rural and Other Settlements as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The approach to Green Belt is established in Policy PG3; the Green Belt Review 2013</p> <p>The merits of sites in Other Settlements and Rural Areas will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 62 Land at Audlem road, Audlem
Representations received	Total: 2 (Support: 1 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 0)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is miles from employment centres. • There is little demand for housing, and there are currently 40+ properties for sale- some less than 100k. • High schools are full and the surgery is oversubscribed. There are few jobs in the village. • There is barely any public transport so development would increase car traffic across Cheshire East. • Site is agricultural land within open countryside. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner/ prospective developer: The Council has a great deal of supporting information before it in two recent planning applications which demonstrates that this is a deliverable, sustainable site. • It is noted that the comments regarding Site NPS62 state that the scheme is not well related to the existing settlement. However, the Officer's Assessment contained in the Committee Report regarding 13/2224N concluded "the development performs well in terms of the [accessibility] checklist and for this reason is considered to be more sustainable than some sites on the edge of the principle towns." In short, the outline assessment undertaken as part of the plan making process does not reflect the more detailed assessment undertaken by the Case Officer. • Accordingly, whilst the Council may decide not to allocate any sites within the LSCs in the CS, this site should be correctly assessed and found sustainable and deliverable in any future relevant policy document. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be correctly assessed and found sustainable and deliverable in any future relevant policy document.
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The merits of sites in Local Service Centres will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>

Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.
-----------------------	---

Consultation Point	NPS 53 Land at junction of Town and Smith Lane, Mobberley
Representations received	Total: 6 (Support: 4 / Object: 1 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E-petition with 79 signatures (an additional 27 signatures to a previous version submitted re 'Possible Additional Sites' consultation.) The village school is full and amenities are over-subscribed. Smith Lane is unsuitable for extra traffic; development will destroy the character and identity of the village. Local roads and amenities would not be able to satisfactorily cope with the increase in demand placed upon them by this development. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has been previously promoted. Site is suitable, available and achievable for residential/mixed use. Development would round off Mobberley naturally on a well-contained site which makes nothing more than a contribution to the Green Belt. There is a need for Green belt release, including in Local Service Centres. There is a lack of credible brownfield alternatives. <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> none
Council assessment of relevant issues	<p>The 'Pre-Submission Core Strategy Non-Preferred Sites, November 2013' document outlines key reasons this site has not been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for growth in Local Service Centres as established by Chapter 8 of the Local Plan Strategy, specifically policies PG1, PG2 and PG6.</p> <p>The merits of sites in Local Service Centres will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.</p>
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.

Consultation Point	NPS 54 Ilfords Mobberley
Representations received	Total: 5 (Support: 4 / Object: 0 / Comment Only: 1)
Relevant issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of proposed development on Ilford site is too large. • Some more modest development in keeping with the village character may be appropriate, especially if new amenities and open space is included. A new planning brief is required. • E-petition with 79 signatures (an additional 27 signatures to a previous version submitted re 'Possible Additional Sites' consultation.) The village school is full and amenities are over-subscribed; Smith Lane is unsuitable for extra traffic; development will destroy the character and identity of the village. • Thoroughly support the Mobberley sites not being included in the Core Strategy. We now look forward to these sites also not being included in the Site Allocations and Development Policies document for the reasons already submitted. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none <p>Comment Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
List of policy changes submitted during consultation to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none
Council assessment of relevant issues	The merits of sites in Local Service Centres will be considered in the Site allocations and Development Policies document.
Recommendation	The site has not been progressed to inclusion in the Local Plan Strategy.