

Comments	Actions/Proposed/Taken	Object	Neutral	Support
The character and historic heritage needs to be preserved and over development, especially on small plots, be strictly controlled				x
The conservation area ought to be extended.	The boundary of the CA is not being redrawn			x
<p>Very interesting reading. Just a couple of small points:</p> <p>Section 6.15 Building Extensions and Alterations on page 43 refers to the detrimental impact of the sub-division of the large 19th Century houses, citing Earnscliff in Woodbrook Road, and "High-Lea in Macclesfield Road". Firstly, High Lea is in Underwood Road, not Macclesfield Road, and secondly, it is no longer sub-divided as we have restored the property to a single house (which included the demolition of a modern pastiche extension).</p> <p>Also, sections 9.9 and 9.10.2 of the Management Plan refer to the Legh Road Conservation Area in Knutsford, which I think may be unintentional.</p>	Points raised have been amended within the document			x
Totally agree that the restriction of overdevelopment of plots and the replacement of existing large buildings	Points considered			x

with those of even greater scale, but in white render as it is cheaper to build that way, should be prevented.				
<b>No comment</b>				x
It is about time this survey was carried out as so many developments are impacting negatively on the conservation area.	Not action or comment required			x
The Conservation Area Appraisal draft says that, "no recommendations have been made to alter the boundary". Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 Moss Lane are currently within the Alderley Edge Conservation Area according to the Cheshire East website map. However, the Townscape Appraisal Map in the appraisal draft completely excludes any part of Moss Lane from the Conservation Area. In July 2021 Cheshire East Built Conservation commented in a planning application for 1 Moss Lane that the property was in the Alderley Edge Conservation Area (application 21/0683M).	The Moss Lane properties fall within the Trafford Road Conservation Area which is separate to "The Edge" and will be required and have a separate appraisal. This will be clarified within the appraisal and also shown on the appraisal map for context	x		
The boundary of the Conservation Area in the Consultation Appraisal is quite different than the boundary of the Alderley Edge Conservation Area	This has been checked and the boundary on the website and on the appraisal are the same, there are 3 separate conservation areas, one of which abuts The Edge, which is Trafford RD.	x		

according to the current map on the Cheshire East website.	This will be clarified within the appraisal and also shown on the appraisal map for context			
The Conservation Area boundary in the current appraisal is not the same as in the approved Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan dated 28th July 2021 (see page 65).	This has been checked, the boundary for “The Edge” is the same in the Neighbourhood Plan referenced map and the existing boundary , also includes the references to the other 3 Conservation Areas. This will be clarified within the appraisal and also shown on the appraisal map for context	x		
Excellent and thorough.	No comment required			x
Excellent and thorough.	No comment required			x
The boundary of the Conservation Area in the Appraisal is in the Appendix on page 63. This boundary is not in accordance with the approved Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2030 on page 65. It appears that the Appraisal is therefore seeking to gain approval for a newly defined Conservation Area that is not in accordance with either the AE Neighbourhood Development Plan or the AE Conservation Area map currently on the Cheshire East website.	This has been checked, the boundary for “The Edge” is the same in the Neighbourhood Plan referenced map and the existing boundary , also includes the references to the other 3 Conservation Areas. This will be clarified within the appraisal and also shown on the appraisal map for context	x		
Firstly, there seems to be a mismatch to the map defining the conservation area. A number of homes in the area of Chapel Road, Stephens Street and Trafford Road	This has been checked, the boundary for “The Edge” is the same in the Neighbourhood Plan referenced map and the existing boundary ,			x

<p>are part of the current conservation area, yet the map alongside the updated report does not include this sector of Alderley Edge, however the report confirms that no changes are envisaged. Thus there must be an error to the map, if this could be checked.</p> <p>We believe the conservation area is crucial to Alderley Edge, in terms of preserving the unique character of the Victorian architecture, that has been a hallmark of the village since its development from the 1840's. As we all know there is a constant demand to develop and extend for financial gain, add new properties, provide additional parking in front gardens, remove mature trees etc. All these activities need to be managed carefully. A conservation area provides the necessary framework to preserve some of the village character of the last 180 years, that makes Alderley Edge so desirable.</p>	<p>also includes the references to the other 3 Conservation Areas. This will be clarified within the appraisal and also shown on the appraisal map for context</p>			
<p>Alderley Edge Parish Council welcome the review and are in support. However, the review covers only one of the four conservation areas in AE and we would welcome a review of the three remaining areas. Those areas are generally of a very different nature to the area around Macclesfield Rd, with less emphasis on</p>	<p>This has been discussed in a meeting with the Parish Council, future work programme will include review of the remaining 3 Conservation Areas.</p> <p>There will be reference made to the other 3 areas and also shown on the appraisal map for context.</p>			<p>x</p>

<p>large plots with green cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trafford Road comprises smaller plots, with semi-detached villas, but with high architectural heritage value (esp Stevens St, with some unusual facades). The southern side of Stevens St has been subject to some redevelopment which has little in common with the older semi-detached villas on the other side of the road.</li><li>• Elm Grove does perhaps have more in common with the Edge conservation area, comprising villas on larger plots, so the same management plan as the Edge could possibly be adopted here.</li><li>• Davey Lane is a mix of houses including newer ones, some on quite small plots.</li></ul> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>6.3/2 change Plot sizes for each individual dwelling should be no smaller than 0.3 hectare or 0.7 acre To Plot sizes for each individual dwelling must be no smaller than 0.3 hectare or 0.7 acre</p> <p>6.3/3 change New development should not impinge on the setting or mature landscaping of adjacent properties to New development must not impinge on the setting or mature landscaping of</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>adjacent properties</p> <p>Very minor editorial points that might help with the final draft:  3.6 line 7 should be 'conservation area' and 'Edge' plus comma after 'elements' on the next line  4.4 line 3: delete comma  6.3 I think this should be 'exacerbated' not 'exasperated' - though I've no doubt all the construction traffic is indeed exasperating for neighbours</p> <p>Management Plan: 12.3 line 3 - spacing around comma</p>				
<p>My house is one of the affected houses on Whitebarn Road. I do not wish our house to be subject to article 4 direction. I do not wish to lose our permitted development rights, nor wish to make planning permission more difficult in the future. Surely the opinion of house owners who this directly impacts must carry far more weight than general members of the public, or those within the conservation area that are not impacted? I have spoken to many of the other residents who are impacted directly, and they all object to your proposals. Kind Regards</p>	<p>Article 4 directions will be reviewed and will be subject to a separate process and notification. The Article 4 direction is important to prevent loss of features of harm caused by home owners exercising their permitted development rights</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>This year will be our 25th year living on Whitebarn Road, and we still get a thrill when turning into the road. In that time we have never looked to change the traditional appearance of our property, and never will. Other than general repairs and ongoing maintenance work to the house, and some minor landscaping outside, the house is as we found it in 1997. However, having read a recent report, we are disturbed to find that we may now be subject to "Article 4 Direction", to which we would strongly object. To think we could possibly be denied permission to erect a simple garden shed, or have to apply to relay a path or replace fencing, seems unnecessarily restrictive. In the meantime we will continue to enjoy and respect the rural setting in which we live. Thankyou</p>	<p>Article 4 directions will be reviewed and will be subject to a separate process and notification. The Article 4 direction is important to prevent loss of features of harm caused by home owners exercising their permitted development rights</p>	<p>x</p>		
<p>I think that the demolition and rebuilding on the plot of some of the larger properties has had a negative impact on Alderley Edge.</p> <p>I also think that unsympathetic extensions have been and are being built onto period properties within the conservation area and this has a detrimental effect on the house and its neighbours.</p>	<p>No comment</p>			<p>x</p>

<p>I agree that properties often have to be improved and extended but this should be done with respect to the style of the house.</p> <p>We are fortunate to have a variety of housing styles and this helps to make Alderley a pleasant place to live. Alderley really does need to be protected from unsympathetic development before it's too late.</p>				
<p>As the resident of St Mary's Cottage featured in Fig 1 of your Appraisal document I have a strong interest in your proposals.</p> <p>Firstly may I say the sentiment is noble, but it is unfortunate that it is preceded by 20 + years in which you have allowed excessive demolition and new build infill apparently with little restraint! The current at-risk status of the Conservation area is thus founded on Cheshire East's willingness to allow demolition and new high density build presumably because it gives more Council Revenue! My own house built in 1856 has had built next to it a disproportionately large detached house on a small steeply rising site as infill between mine and another historic house! Also even though Mottram Road forms the boundary of the Conservation</p>	<p>Further consideration will be given to Article 4 direction to the rest of the conservation areas.</p> <p>Primary consideration has been given to the focus of the villas for The Article 4 direction I, important to prevent loss of features of harm caused by home owners exercising their permitted development rights</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>area this did not inhibit Cheshire East from giving approval for the cricket club opposite to erect 8metre floodlights, which are ugly by day and offensive by night, like an industrial site and they hardly form a backdrop to a conservation area! So Cheshire East has had no plausible conservation policy! Having allowed excess unsightly development it is thus a bit offensive now to propose that the main action of Cheshire East's new enlightenment is to solely clamp down on any new plans affecting the remaining historic homes! The target of your actions should be to hinder any further erosion of visual and ambient standards across all development in the Conservation Area. This should apply particularly to the rash of new build and infill as they will undoubtedly want to expand and history shows the owners have little regard for conservation. It is thoughtless to split housing into those with or without historic interest and then devise strategies to tackle conservation area issues only amongst those of historic interest. My own experience is that in many examples including Redclyffe Grange, Woodland Cottage, Firwood Cottage and St Mary's Cottage, building modifications and extensions have been carried out with the utmost sensitivity for</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>design and standards, conserving the original historic ambience of buildings and boundaries. Action to insist on concern in planning for visual impact to houses, gardens and boundaries need to be administered across all properties and particularly applied to new build and infill to prevent them further eroding the qualities that make the area worth conserving!</p> <p>The Appraisal document is full of wise words, but at the end of the day it depends on how the Conservation principles are implemented by planning committees. In spite of guidance given they may individually have no interest in conservation, particularly that located distant from their own neighbourhoods. It rests on the council to put in place mechanisms to oversee decisions that appear to disregard the principles established by the Council as necessary to their conservation aims.</p>				
<p>In my Victorian house one of the bedrooms has been converted into a bathroom but you have to go through the main bedroom to get to the bathroom which makes it unsafe for guests/children so is badly in need of an extra bedroom and bathroom. It also still had an outside toilet when we moved in. It's got to be viable/worthwhile to do these alterations</p>	<p>No revision needed within the document</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>otherwise nobody will want to live in the house so it will eventually deteriorate.</p> <p>An old Victorian house needs to be updated to modern standards in quite a few areas ie bathrooms, kitchens, insulation, media, windows</p>				
<p>Proposed Article 4 Direction (7.2)</p> <p>1. Financial Loss &amp; Potential Claims on Cheshire East Council. The proposed introduction of Article 4 conditions to properties identified as ‘making a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area’ is expected (under Article 2.2.3 page 47) not to lead to any claims for compensation because the conditions will not be applied retrospectively. However, the imposition of Article 4 conditions will restrict the development opportunities of the property owners and potentially increase the cost &amp; time involved in future development / maintenance. This will be a financial penalty and could form the basis of potential claims against Cheshire East.</p> <p>For the past 20 years Cheshire East / Planning Inspectorate has permitted new</p>	<p>Article 4 directions will be reviewed and will be subject to a separate process and notification.</p> <p>The Article 4 direction is important to prevent loss of features of harm caused by homeowners exercising their permitted development rights.</p> <p>The process of Article 4 direction is not to restrict development but allow greater management of the LPA through an application.</p> <p>Plot ratios considered and amended where needed.</p> <p>Point 3- this paragraph has been revised to reflect the balance required in the NPPF.</p>	<p>x</p>		

development, knockdown/rebuild and property extensions that do not comply with either the existing CA rules or those proposed. Homeowners have benefitted from this situation.

The proposed implementation of Article 4 means that owners of the affected properties will lose the opportunity to change/develop their properties in line with the benefits secured by others and so will incur financial losses.

2. More Planning Department Capacity will be needed. If the Article 4 proposals are adopted then Cheshire East Council must have the capacity to handle the ensuing planning applications delivering a fast response time e.g 4 weeks turnaround. At present Cheshire East Council does not have this capability. It will be unacceptable and unfair if homeowners have to wait longer to ascertain if they can proceed to paint a window frame.

3. The Option to Demolish a Building and Rebuild must be retained. Avoiding building demolition is a creditable aim in order to sequester the embodied carbon, however the buildings under consideration are mostly at least 100 years old and so not necessarily fit for the

--	--	--	--	--

<p>lifestyle of today e.g old buildings cannot necessarily be adapted for the disabled. These old buildings will be extremely difficult and expensive to insulate to the future standards that will be mandated nor able to accommodate the future heating systems e.g heat pump / under floor heat exchange systems. The option (albeit meeting the Conservation Area requirements in terms of design standards) for demolition should be retained.</p> <p>Proposed New Development (7.3)</p> <p>1. Design Standards must be imposed. Proposed new developments must be sympathetic to the design standards required by the Conservation Area. It is highly unfortunate that recent developments have not been held to these standards.</p> <p>2. Plot Sizes determination inappropriate. Article 6.3.2 page 51 states that future New Developments should be on plot size of min 0.7 acre. Many of the plots within the Conservation Area have a total size of less than 0.7 acre (e.g the plot to the north of Langdale on the Congleton Road being developed by Porter and Daughter <a href="https://porteranddaughter.co.uk">https://porteranddaughter.co.uk</a> ). The</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>consequence of selecting 0.7 acre will be to refuse such a development in the future. A more appropriate approach will be to not define a plot size but to adopt a policy which requires developments to adopt the required design standards for the Conservation Area and avoid 'massing' on the plot.</p> <p>3. Inconsistency in Plot Sizes. The document states in Article 6.3.2 page 51 the minimum plot size for new developments is 0.7 acre i.e garden &amp; building combined. In Article 8.8.4 page 52 the document states an extension should not reduce the garden space to below 0.7 acre. So for a new build 0.2 acre house the plot size required is 0.7 acre but for an extended house of 0.2 acre a plot size of 0.9 acre will be required. This inconsistency needs to be corrected or will lead to more house knockdowns.</p>				
<p>I have added a paragraph to the submission made yesterday. This is Para 2 below</p> <p>1. Financial Loss &amp; Potential Claims on Cheshire East Council. The proposed introduction of Article 4 conditions to properties identified as 'making a positive contribution to the character of the</p>	<p>Article 4 directions will be reviewed and will be subject to a separate process and notification. The Article 4 direction is important to prevent loss of features of harm caused by home owners exercising their permitted development rights. The Direction wont prevent change, just manage it in line with current policy and guidance.</p>	<p>x</p>		

Conservation Area' is expected (under Article 2.2.3 page 47) not to lead to any claims for compensation because the conditions will not be applied retrospectively. However, the imposition of Article 4 conditions will restrict the development opportunities of the property owners and potentially increase the cost & time involved in future development / maintenance. This will be a financial penalty and could form the basis of potential claims against Cheshire East.

The financial impact on these owners will include the cost of the planning applications required to undertake works that would previously not require approvals. The proposal is therefore imposing costs to a group of property owners in the Conservation Area. This is unreasonable and will likely be challenged.

For the past 20 years Cheshire East / Planning Inspectorate has permitted new development, knockdown/rebuild and property extensions that do not comply with either the existing CA rules or those proposed. Homeowners have benefitted from this situation.

The proposed implementation of Article 4

--	--	--	--	--

<p>means that owners of the affected properties will lose the opportunity to change/develop their properties in line with the benefits secured by others and so will incur financial losses.</p>				
<p>ALDERLEY EDGE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL</p> <p>The Edge Association welcomes the opportunity to contribute our views on this document and we fully endorse the objective of preserving and enhancing the conservation area. Looking forward we agree with Heritage England that for the conservation area to avoid being on the risk register there is a need for its positive management in the forthcoming years. We have some proposals as to what steps could be taken to achieve this. We would like confirmation of which of the conservation areas in Alderley Edge this document covers.</p> <p>Firstly, we will address the issues raised in appendix 3 (p 64-69).</p> <p>Class A - The use of UV PVC and aluminium frames could be a positive move to improve insulation of a property on the proviso that they match the overall appearance of the rest of the building.</p> <p>Class AA - We agree with the proposal</p> <p>Class B - Agreed</p> <p>Class C - Agreed</p>	<p>Points considered and where relevant have been altered.</p> <p>Article 4 directions are considered an appropriate process to manage the conservation area, which buildings this will cover is under review with legal advice sought to ensure this provides robust evidence and justification</p>			<p>x</p>

Class D - Agreed but porches should only be permitted where the materials match the existing house.

Class E - We agree that outbuildings can be allowed in the rear gardens but they should be modest in size (e.g garden shed) as we could, and have seen infill with large swimming pools etc.

Class F - The creation of large hard surfaces at the front of residences could be problematic and we want this to be limited.

Class G - This proposal on chimney flues not exceeding 1 metre in height seems reasonable.

Class H - The proposal on microwave antennae seems acceptable.

Part 2

Class A - It seems prudent to impose limitations on materials used for fencing.

Class B - This seems OK.

Class C - We are OK with no limitations in colour of exterior painting.

The consultation document raises a number of issues that in our opinion deserve further attention. They are not in any order of priority.

(1) TREES The document rightly comments of the sylvan nature of the conservation area and we have seen some tragic examples of felling of trees in recent years. Our proposals are the

--	--	--	--	--

<p>following :- (a) approval to fell trees should only be given when they are dead, diseased, dying or dangerous, (b) notification of felling should be given in writing to immediate neighbours in a similar way to planning applications, (c) the consultation time should be extended to 8 weeks, (d) all applications should be accompanied by a tree re-planting program that compensates for the felled tree as well as photographic evidence of the tree to be felled.</p> <p>(2) CONSTRUCTION WORK. This is covered in the document but residents have to live with months and maybe years of constructors working practices that are far from “considerate”. We would like to see the following (a) weekend and bank holiday working is strictly forbidden and working hours should be clearly posted at the entrance to the construction site (alongside health and safety notices for hard hats etc). (b) road cleaning should be mandatory and repair of roads should be enforced in a “make good” statement in the decision notice. (c) the decision notice should ensure that off road parking for contractors vehicles is provided and that materials can be delivered without undue blockages of access roads for neighbouring residents.</p> <p>(3) DESIGN OF NEW BUILDS. The</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>document rightly points out that a mixture of designs of new builds has changed the character and nature of the conservation area in recent years. There are properties that blend in with the style of the area but equally there are some modern “block” designs that are not so easy on the eye. We trust that the Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Plan helps to address this issue but it would help if this document could be more explicit and give examples of designs that would not be acceptable in the future in order to “nip this practice” in the bud at an early stage.</p> <p>(4) TRAFFIC. Again the document addresses this issue, especially on the Macclesfield Road and the Congleton Road which get heavy use and abuse of speed restrictions. The recent practice of high performance sports cars coming to the village for enthusiast photography is difficult to manage however we support the Parish Council’s efforts to control all of these matters. Noise abatement notices should be considered reminding drivers of the 72dBs limit. Consideration should be given to the measures being adopted in some London Boroughs and in Hampshire.</p> <p>(5) KNOCK DOWN AND REBUILDS This has become an issue in the past 10 years and</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>as the document states the “villas of Alderley Edge” are disappearing slowly. We have joined forces with local residents in recent years to avert this type of practice by speculative developers and have been successful in stopping infills for a villa and a house that would lead to 3 or 4 houses/apartments etc. Is there a way that this practice of planning applications that are speculative “try ons” can be stopped at planning advice stage or before? In addition to the listed buildings ,which are in an annex in the document, it would be valuable if the document could have a list of properties in the document that are considered of special interest e.g. Beechfield House and High Elm as well as those that have been built in recent times that make a positive contribution to the conservation area. It is worthy of note that Beechfield House has been tastefully sub divided into individual homes and this is much more desirable than a new build option. Such an annex would be of help to the Edge Association and local residents when we are called into action to object to “speculative planning submissions”. It would also give some clear guidance on what is acceptable and unacceptable. We will submit a document entitled “Locally Important Buildings in Alderley Edge” that dates from 2007 that should</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>facilitate an updated list of properties that are either (a) listed, (b) make a positive contribution to the conservation area as denoted in Annex 1 or (c) are designated as one of these “Locally Important Buildings in Alderley Edge”. Planning Inspectors have allowed appeals in respect of proposals for new houses in plots much smaller than 0.7 acres, even though this was already a Conservation Area guideline. The argument was that there were already houses in the vicinity on smaller plots, hence that the insistence on 0.7 acres was unrealistic. We don’t have a problem with the guideline in itself, but there is no point in having guidelines which cannot be enforced through monitoring and compliance measures, or defended against Planning Inspectors.</p> <p>(6) ARTICLE 4 We note that in Appendix 1 (Townscape Appraisal Map) a number of properties marked in blue and green are “proposed” for Article 4 Direction as denoted by the asterisk. In our view, this needs further discussion and consultation as it is a significant step to be introduced via this document. The implications of applying for planning permission/permitted development rights under Article 4 for garden sheds, greenhouses, gazebos etc is</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>burdensome, time consuming and incurs unnecessary cost for home owners. If this is introduced, then perversely, one could argue that it should be introduced for all the conservation area not just the properties that are already making a positive contribution to the conservation area. In conclusion, we believe that this proposed measure should be removed from this document and subject to a separate consultation.</p> <p>We appreciate that some of these points are beyond the boundary of the document but without these measures the Alderley Edge Conservation Area could see further decline which we should try to prevent.</p> <p>We look forward to further discussion/consultation and hopefully adoption of some of the measures raised in this submission.</p> <p>The Edge Association.</p>				
<p>I live on the Congleton Road at Millers Gate which is the southernmost house within the Alderley Edge Conservation Area [AECA].</p> <p>I wish to object to the recommendations made in the AECA Appraisal in its entirety, and on two points in particular:</p> <p>1) I recently walked the AECA with the</p>	<p>Millers Gate is currently under appeal , therefore further specific comment on this wont be made through this process of CA review.</p> <p>Article 4 directions are considered an appropriate process to manage the conservation area, which buildings this will cover is under review with legal advice sought to ensure this provides robust evidence and justification</p>	<p>x</p>		

<p>Townscape Appraisal Map, (as found at Appendix 1 of the Appraisal), and it is clear to me that the map is out of date. On my walkabout I noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• one recently built house and one “in construction” house that do not appear on the map at all</li><li>• several houses that are clearly spectacular original villas that are neither identified as listed buildings, nor identified for Article 4 Direction in this appraisal</li><li>• One house that has been identified for Article 4 Direction, but appears to be less than 5 years old</li><li>• At least two houses that have been identified for Article 4 Direction but appear to be no older than the 1970s.</li><li>• No one has been to inspect my home in relation to this appraisal, and upon talking to other neighbours and friends throughout the AECA no one has been to inspect anyone else’s either.</li></ul> <p>It appears to me therefore that the appraisal has been based on an out-of-date map of a previously selected sample of homes, and so is little more than a desktop exercise. A desktop exercise will not pass the legal requirements for using Article 4 Directions as set out in the NPFF. NPFF para 53 requires you to have robust evidence before using Article 4</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

Directions, and for it to be applied to the smallest geographical area possible. Given the variety of architecture, plot sizes and building ages that exists across the AECA, evidence could only be “robust” if it has been obtained on a case-by-case basis, and my enquiries noted above lead me to think that you have not done this. I believe that the appraisal is therefore fatally flawed, and that you will need to start again. I’d suggest that the map should be updated first, then a fresh list of potential candidates for Article 4 Direction provisionally identified, and then research can be conducted on a case-by-case basis in order to establish whether sufficiently robust evidence exists to use Article 4 Direction per house.

2) In the course of (successfully) applying for planning permission to build a two-storey extension to the rear and side elevations of Millers Gate in 2020, I was required to submit a heritage report. The heritage report for Millers Gate noted several key points: the house was built approximately 1940 (not 1910 as first thought by the case officer), it was not built by an architect of note, nor lived in by anyone famous or notorious. It was further noted that the house has had several extensions and alterations to it

--	--	--	--	--

<p>over the years and retains very few of its original features, with these limited to two small leaded windows, which are of very limited historic or architectural interest. The house has a neutral contribution to the AECA. The house does not sit within the core area of the AECA, but within the boundary that was extended in 1997 to include buildings along the Congleton Road.</p> <p>In summary therefore, Millers Gate has been shown to offer only “neutral contribution” to the AECA character, and it is additionally beyond doubt that there is no “robust evidence” to support Article 4 Direction being used. Accordingly, Millers Gate should be excluded from the appraisal in any case.</p> <p>After thought. My assumption is that this appraisal is a well-intended effort to tackle one of the bigger blights on the AECA, which is that of bad houses being built (both large and small) that will not stand the test of time, that are either neutral or (worse still) negatively contribute to the AECA character and will never become a heritage asset of tomorrow. The problem is that Article 4 Direction on just 80 houses won't stop bad houses being built on the many other plots that will remain</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>unprotected. The fact that the appraisal includes newly built and 1970s houses shows that the author acknowledges that newly built houses can have a positive contribution to the AECA. Long may it continue. Time would be better spent ensuring that “negative contribution” houses are never built again. CEC already has the tools to control this though, and the use of Article 4 Direction isn’t it.</p>				
<p>It is good that it makes reference to the Neighbourhood Plan specific policies to protect the character and heritage of the Alderley Edge area (as a member of the Steering Group).</p> <p>On a slightly different but related point, it appears that some new or extending businesses/ developments in the village centre are not adhering to the Neighbourhood Plan Shop Front Design Guide which can adversely affect the character of the centre (although I realise that this does not come within the Alderley Edge Conservation Area).</p>	<p>No comment</p>			<p>x</p>
<p>The Townscape Appraisal Map shows that the large majority of properties within the Conservation Area are not considered to make a positive contribution. Some of these were built before the Conservation Area was first</p>	<p>Article 4 directions will be considered carefully and legal advice sought in respect of how best to protect the conservation area.</p>		<p>x</p>	

<p>established in 1974, but most are due to the Planning Committee and Planning Inspectorate being unable to prevent unsympathetic development or enforce non-compliance in subsequent years.</p> <p>It seems contradictory and punitive to remove permitted development rights from householders who have diligently conserved their properties over the years, and not from the properties which represent the true threat to the Conservation Area. For example, a requirement to apply for planning permission to erect a garden shed or replace windows would be excessive at the best of times, but when there is a long backlog of planning applications and Cheshire East have suspended their pre-application advice and permitted development enquiry services, it seems most unfair.</p> <p>I would suggest that any removal of permitted development rights should apply to all properties within the Conservation Area rather than just those which are considered to make a positive contribution. Further, removal of permitted development rights should be restricted to substantial modifications, and minor works such as sympathetic replacement windows and garden sheds</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>should be exempt.</p> <p>I propose that any such removal of permitted development rights should be suspended until Cheshire East have been able to reinstate the pre-application advice and permitted development enquiry services. In addition, I would suggest a low-cost fast-tracked application service for any applications which have only been made necessary due to the removal of permitted development rights.</p>				
<p>The Conservation Area boundary in the new Appraisal is not in accordance with the approved Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Plan 2021-2030!</p>	<p>This has been checked and is correct, that NP map shows all the AE conservation areas.</p>	<p>x</p>		
<p>In general, I am supportive of the appraisal; however, I would like to see the following amendments made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specific reference should be made to the requirement to comply with the Design Codes of the Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Plan at Section 3.2 of the Management Plan;</li> <li>- Specific reference should be made to the requirement to comply with the Design Codes of the Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Plan at Section 3.7 of the Management Plan;</li> </ul>	<p>Changes made to the document to include more references to the neighbourhood plan</p>			<p>x</p>

<p>- At Section 5.2 of the Management Plan, the words "retaining existing as well as including the provision of new trees and hedging" should be added and "where appropriate" removed.</p> <p>- Section 6.3.1 of the Management Plan, should be given a higher prominence and the words "New development should respect historic plot ratios (usually one detached dwelling within a large garden)" be replaced with "New development must respect historic plot ratios (usually one detached dwelling within a large garden)."</p> <p>- Section 6.3.2 of the Management Plan, should be given a higher prominence and the words "should be no smaller than 0.3 hectare" replaced with "must be no smaller than 0.3 hectare".</p> <p>Finally, please can the Alderley Edge Conservation Area be extended to include all properties on the road known as "Orchard Green", which currently shares a boundary with both the Alderley Edge Conservation Area and the Trafford Road Conservation Area. If Orchard Green is considered inappropriate for inclusion in the former, please could it be considered for inclusion in the latter (Trafford Road Conservation Area), as its current exclusion is an anomaly.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

