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Overall Response
A total of 462 representations were received on the draft Knutsford Town Strategy

63% of these were submitted online via the consultation portal; 37% were questionnaires, letters and emails.

80% of the people who took part in the consultation provided information about their age. 3% of the people who provided their age were under the age of 26; 28% were aged 26 to 44; 40% were aged 45 to 65 and 29% were aged 66 and over.
There was one petition submitted to the draft Town Strategy consultation.

**Draft Knutsford Town Strategy – Site K Petition** (signed by 461 people)

A petition containing 489 signatories objecting to the inclusion of the site as a preferred option has been submitted.

The petition is against the development of Site K as this land contains Springwood, which is listed as Ancient Woodland, of which there is only 2% left in the entire UK. The area contains an abundance of beautiful wildlife and plant species. Signatories were concerned not only for the woodland, but also, with regards to amenities, school places, doctor’s surgeries and dentists, which are already in short supply and the additional traffic congestion to our town.
Q1 Vision
Do you agree or disagree with the Vision as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 85% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (18%); Agree (34%); Neither Agree or Disagree (16%); Disagree (11%); Strongly Disagree (23%)

Comments:
I would like to see more emphasis on sustainable forms of transport and energy generation.

The public infrastructure (roads, pavements, lighting, barriers, signage, cleaning etc) should be constantly well maintained and this should be positively and locally managed. (Present management seems remote, fragmented and ineffective. One prominent safety barrier has been left crumpled and dangerous for over six months.)

Almost 1m visitors come to Tatton Park and ways need to be developed to encourage as many of these to visit Knutsford. It is not just the landscape and heritage that attracts visitors; it is the quality restaurants; independent shops; Cranford; the fact that the layout is still the same hundreds of years on and its proximity to South Manchester.

I believe the vision is right to highlight the importance of Knutsford's unique character / heritage and to focus attention on protecting and enhancing this character / heritage. Priority should be given to this uniqueness over any design considerations noted in the vision such as 'local needs' (perceived), or 'balanced and integrated communities'. Also, free access to Tatton's mostly untouched park grounds is one of Knutsford's key assets and should be protected at all costs.

Vision is not snappily stated and doesn't flow into the Objectives and Strategy. As a piece of document writing it needs redrafting to be a proper Vision, Aims, Strategy, Objectives plan. The realisation of any vision in Knutsford is hampered by two main things A) Stakeholder engagement & B) lack of public land. A)Lack of joined up planning in its widest sense because of rushed timescales and poor identification of stakeholders -Besides commercial interests the usual Councillors and Town Plan reps
dominate plus the LAP interests of Longridge not community groups such as PTA’s, sports clubs, WI, Scouts & Guides, Lions etc:- B) Lack of land to improve community infrastructure facilities. In recent times most plots of land in the town have been developed so no room left. So Developer levy should be to provide land to allow future expansions not just money to move or upgrade existing facilities. Skate park, medical centre, rugby field, school expansion are impeded by lack of available land. 1) Vision is too weak with regard to community facilities related to open spaces for play and sports and leisure. These facilities have already been highlighted as deficient in both the Knutsford town plan and the Cheshire East snapshot plan and the Cheshire East Open spaces plan see P13Conclusion. Urgently the evidence document Sports and Leisure Needs Assessment needs drafting. 2) I question the vision of Knutsford as a visitor destination per se. It is first and foremost a working town for its residents. Developing it as a visitor attraction is confusing it with the vision for Tatton Park. Developing it as a visitor/tourist destination will add to transport and parking demands. 3) Any Tatton Park Vision impact on Knutsford needs considering in the infrastructure as the two are linked - think of it as our biggest open space. 4) Somehow the impact of Manchester Airport both positive and negative needs greater inclusion in the vision.

It’s a very narrow minded approach, it serves the ‘old school’ industries but does nothing for the people in Knutsford apart from destroy green belt and increase traffic. I’m not sure how building on Green Belt preserves the heritage of Knutsford; certainly you wouldn’t build on Stonehenge to preserve its heritage. Please, please, please don’t go building on Green Belt the future generations will thank you for nothing. If you’re going to spend some money make an attempt to make Knutsford the hub of something culturally unique like preserving our uniqueness. Knutsford is unique because it has not been ruined by bland housing developments and out of town shopping centres, if you are proposing that these things will improve Knutsford you clearly don’t understand why people chose to live there.

The land proposed for development as in section of the plan contains the clubs fisheries on Green Lane used as an amenity by many Knutsford residents and people from towns and villages in the surrounding Cheshire and South Manchester Area. These are young and old people of both sexes who enjoy the facilities and diverse range of coarse fish some of which are of specimen size that the fisheries contain. This land is predominantly agricultural with some used for cattle grazing. Finding suitable replacement fisheries in the locality would be nigh on impossible and would be significant loss to local residents who get a lot of enjoyment out of spending their leisure time fishing them. The club membership all agree removing the fishery to build on this land would be a backwards step and take away a prime facility used by many local Knutsford residents, therefore we wish it to be recorded that South Manchester Angling Club oppose this plan.

We need the planning in place as left to chance we would not have cohesion and community, failing to plan is planning to fail, thus using consultation with the public is the only right and proper way to move forward!

We support the vision statement assuming that the appropriate transport balance does actually mean that walking and cycling routes into the town and to local facilities will be made much safer and more attractive.

I do not agree with the vast invasion of the greenbelt that is proposed and do not think that Knutsford should become a large town, as it will change its character.

Knutsford is not able to maintain roads and pavements to a satisfactory condition for the population that we already have. There aren’t enough parking facilities in Knutsford. There is already too much traffic through the town. Greenbelt land should remain as greenbelt land. I’m paying a lot of money for my house to enjoy the view of the countryside (my house looks out directly onto zones A & B). Let’s see the money being spent on improving the town to cope with the traffic that we already have, and not on making the problem worse.

Knutsford Sports clubs and Egerton Football/Youth Club are vital areas for the children and adults alike, not just from Knutsford but Cheshire also, 1,000’s of people every year benefit from the excellent facilities, which not only improve health for those who attend, but the community benefits...
as a whole. These factors would disappear if houses were to be built.

I think the strategy on housing contradicts the need to retain the character of historic Knutsford and the priority to maintain the green spaces. It is this that adds to Knutsford’s character.

Like the parsons egg - it is good in parts. The vision statement "improved access to high quality leisure facilities" is incompatible with building houses in area D. The vision statement "Knutsford's importance as a visitor destination will have increased" implies more congestion and there is no coherent plan for dealing with current congestion levels.

More housing could be above shops or shop conversions. Conversion of King Street shops back to housing.

Needs to be more priority to attract visitors.

Whilst most of the vision is sound the provision of so many new homes in potentially vast estates cannot possibly achieve the aim of keeping the town’s character intact.

It will adversely impact existing house prices and cost the current residents money. The approaches to the town give the feel of the place. The approached to be built on will stop the place having a country look and feel. The report fails to indicate the need to improve existing infrastructure to support the new buildings (e.g. roads). What Knutsford really needs is a bypass not hundreds of extra residents!

I have selected "Strongly Disagree" for this answer, although that is not strictly correct. There are some aspects of the plan, objectives and strategy with which I do agree. However, my strong disagreement stems from the lack of apparent consideration given to those whose lives will be adversely affected by the immense quantity of building work to be undertaken, both before, during and after the work is completed. One only needs to look at the incredible disruption to the town centre and surrounding areas, caused by small pockets of gas mains replacements, to realise that any such undertakings are sure to cause untold disruption to businesses and residents alike. Such damage may well cause some businesses to fail, or move away and will also be seriously damaging to the individual values of the existing residential properties near to which they would be built. As I live in Tabley Close, I have grave reservations about the use of Sites B and A. For the houses at the end of Tabley Close (No.s 16 to 22), the loss of the view across Cheshire, from the back, would be a death knell for the equity built up in those properties. In fact, the very threat of this plan is likely to mean that we may very soon experience a reduction in the saleable value of our homes. We would therefore expect adequate and swift compensation for such a loss, if it happens, and would pursue such compensation aggressively. If area B were to be used for community orchards or gardens, that would be a preferable alternative but we would likely experience a greater insurance premium for buildings, contents and vehicles, as the influx of people into that area would represent a risk increase to insurance companies. I feel that the vision has not been thought out bearing the above in mind and also the inescapable fact that traffic in Knutsford is very heavy during rush-hour times and the slightest trouble on the M6 greatly magnifies the problem.

There are parts I agree with and parts I don’t.

I think the general tone is correct, but will watch with interest how these desires and requirements manifest in the coming years.

The strategy is short on underpinning detail or explanation for much of the proposed development in the town.

Generally agree. I do not really understand what "closer ties between Tatton Park and Knutsford" really means, but would be anxious that Tatton Park retains its current character. It is currently one of the best things about living in Knutsford.

It is easy to agree with the Vision - it lists a range of generic good things that any town would want.

I am appalled by the strategy that will completely swamp the east side of town, and remove rural entry to Knutsford, destroy tranquillity of current residents, and most importantly remove essential and extremely well used facilities like Knutsford Cricket, Cheshire Bowmen, tennis club, and Egerton and array of sports children use daily. Also houses that have current rural aspect will struggle to move or sell houses with this looming. Where is fair proportion of housing in other parts of town....Behind
Goughs lane, or opposite Beggermans Lane??? Mereheath Rd suffers from traffic to Tatton park and events. It could not cope with more housing and the traffic involved.

There is a strongly held view that decisions have already been made. Changes to this plan as a result of this survey will show that ‘you’ have listened.

1. The vision gives no reason for building in the green belt, other than number of dwellings which is not related to actual needs. The predicted population growth in Cheshire up to 2026 is 4.6%. The plan asks for an increase of 20-30% of number of dwellings.

2. The boundary of the town centre does not include all of the urban area of Knutsford. This distorts the argument for lack of development sites. There are enough development sites within the wider area, but can only be realised through flexible planning strategy and innovative redevelopments.

3. The report calls for more affordable housing. How can affordable housing be built on land that will attract premium value without allowing 1/2mill housing subsidising these dwellings? The location of the identified sites is not in easy walking distance of the town. The occupiers of the 1/2mill housing would be mobile and not work within the vicinity of Knutsford. Hence, it does not serve local needs.

4. The report gives no indication or explanation for why Knutsford needs an influx of more people. It gives no evidence of increase in number of jobs, which should be the reason for an increase in households.

5. The plan proposes to remove essential sporting facilities that serve the local community. The Olympic Games should have showed the importance of having access to such facilities. In particular, if the population in Knutsford should increase.

I do not believe that Knutsford needs any further development, more housing stock would be better provided in areas where there is employment and brown field sites in need of redevelopment. More housing requires more schools, health centres, etc.

I agree on the proviso that the protection of our heritage and cultural assets doesn't actually translate as "don't change anything ever" which seems to be the town’s current default setting. I’d also like to see the vision include a desire to improve the diversity of the population of Knutsford as a means of achieving the vision. We are an old, conservative town with quite a homogenous culture. I’d like to see initiatives to make it more family friendly and to attract different types of residents e.g. shock horror maybe someone who's not middle class, white, heterosexual, Tory voting!

Agree with most things except housing strategy

Based on the information I read, there are a few points which do not coincide with the vision statement, mainly: "easy access to open countryside" whereby green belt land is being targeted for major housing development; access to services etc, within cycling distances whereby, with an expected increase of town traffic due to more residents and tourists, there are to date limited safe cycling routes for families; and finally, with the Egerton school grounds being earmarked to be included in the new town centre boundaries, is this a threat to the school being able to continue to provide primary education to the anticipated rising levels of children?

2 x numbers of houses are required.

Don't spoil what we have by overdevelopment.

Maybe there could be something about remaining a small town.

Too much motherhood and apple pie not enough detail especially about infrastructure development. How do you reconcile increasing the housing without addressing the CURRENT parking, traffic and congestion problems? Why do you propose building on sports fields such as area D? What are the "exceptional circumstances" which justify intrusion in the Green belt

The Vision is laudable but is neither succinct or clear about defining what are the major attributes of Knutsford in the year 2030 that distinguish it (to the advantage of its community) from the other towns and their strategies as currently drafted. The Vision needs be one paragraph and the statements which are written after ‘where’ (second line) should serve as the objectives under the appropriate headings 1 to 7. The strategies that are then listed under in the objectives 1-7 need to be deliverable and not a ‘wish list’ this is because as stated right at the beginning this document ‘it needs
to provide a clear expression of what the town strategy is seeking to achieve and to positively direct the planning process’ (as it will appear in the Local Plan). The Town’s priorities that appear in the Local Plan and their delivery should be measurable particularly in relation to infrastructure such as health roads and social care. The development of closer ties between the town and Tatton Park should not appear in the vision but as an objective under objective 5 ‘Heritage’ and in Objective 2 ‘Economy’. The nature of the 'closer ties' between Tatton Park and Knutsford need clarification. What 'ties' exist currently and how will those be developed for example apprenticeships in gardening /conservation/countryside management for local students; employment and training opportunities through links with town heritage / visitor centre

| Knutsford Labour Party welcomes plans for the economic and social development of Knutsford. As a rather small town the modest expansion proposed should generate opportunities for diversifying residential, social and cultural provision and increasing employment and commercial development. However, whilst we welcome the serious attempt to protect the greenbelt we have considerable reservations about its selectivity and discriminatory impact which seems to favour those parts of the town where property values are at a premium at the expense of areas such as Longridge where residents are less likely to have the resources and the cultural capital to resist. We note that proposals for commercial development are concentrated around Longridge. This will depreciate the relative value of property in this area, further widening social division within the town when the reverse should be the aim with a focus on genuinely mixed development. Whilst it should boost employment this will not necessarily go to local people and will generate increased traffic levels at a time when reduction in the need to travel is becoming more and more urgent in order to protect the environment... Residential development and the infrastructure needed to support it lack plans for diversity of ownership and tenure. Provision for "affordability" where property values are already beyond the reach of those on the lower percentiles of income and wealth will reinforce disadvantage and social segregation when the driving force of development should be progress towards integration that will promote social inclusion and community cohesion. |

| What are 'sustainable areas'? |

| I have observed the Knutsford Town Strategy Draft Plan and I disagree with the proposed sites earmarked for development on plots A-B and C-E. The former two plots are based on the outskirts of Knutsford which may lead to inaccessibility issues for its residents to access the town centre especially if bungalows are constructed on the proposed site as this is more than likely to attract elder members of our society whom will be less mobile to access the town centre without some form of public transport facility being proposed. Secondly, with regards to plots C-E, these proposed sites look increasingly likely to encourage unaffordable and private dwellings for the more affluent members of our society as these plots are located in the affluent area of Mere where existing house prices are extremely unaffordable to the masses. Therefore, these proposed sites will not solve our ever increasing local population's requirement for cheap and affordable social housing which is desperately needed to accommodate our growing local population. These proposed sites will no doubt lead to another affluent gated community which will only attract the more affluent and wealthy individuals whom currently reside outside the Knutsford area thus leading to a segregated community that will find it increasingly difficult to integrate with the existing community. Consequently, this will not solve the increasing requirement to provide cheap and affordable social housing that our existing local community members so desperately require! Furthermore, with regards to plot K where it is proposed to construct a retail park at the Longridge site, it will almost definitely provide much needed local employment to the area which will significantly help stimulate economic activity within the Knutsford area which I strongly agree is required within the Knutsford locality in theory. However, I do not believe the plan has been thought through with competent consideration on a location point of view due to the fact that the elderly members of our community whom reside some distance away from the site will discover that the proposed retail park will be inaccessible to commute to and from the site unless some form of public transport is provided to and from the site. Furthermore, the site will also have a detrimental impact on local businesses within the area as they will not be able to actively |
compete with their larger competitors and consequently they may well go out of business creating more unemployment within the area. Finally, with regards to proposed sites H,I,J,L,M,N,O,P,Q,R,S and T I cannot understand why these sites are unsuitable for development as the sites can easily accommodate proportional social housing developments in order to help strengthen local community relations and multi-generational families remain residing within close proximity with one another.

I agree with the Vision but I can't agree with the Objectives and Strategy.

Knutsford has retained its identity and sense of community for several hundred years without this unnecessary intervention

Obviously everyone will agree with the vision.

The Vision is, to my mind, very much "motherhood and apple pie". To disagree would be nonsensical. Therefore it seems to be rather a pointless question. However, if I might comment on the overall document: I would have liked to see more specifics, and a greater emphasis on improving sustainability with respect to energy usage/conservation, renewable energy, recycling etc, as well as a clear commitment to reduce the town's reliance on the car.

1. No provision made for development and performance of the arts particularly music of all types. 2. No consideration of the adverse effect housing development will have on the destruction wild life habitats.

No mention is made of GP/Health care siting. Whether to remain as it is or potential new sites. Also improvement of the existing road system if it is to stay on the same site

1. Destruction of green belt is a non-reversible action. The purpose of green belt is to maintain the current definition of town and countryside. There are areas of brown-field that could be built upon without destroying the value of Knutsford as a defined town, rather than begin to envelope these market towns as part of the Manchester urban sprawl.
2. The traffic infrastructure has insufficient capacity to allow development of Knutsford. There is already a frequent problem with excessive traffic around the town and adding to the size of the town would only make this worse.
3. Building off Tabley Road would increase the traffic problem that already exists, both in terms of the speed problem that exists on this road that has been highlighted to the highways agency and to the MP, and also the use of rat-runs allowing drivers to use the residential streets to avoid the traffic problems in the centre of Knutsford and the junction between Tabley Road and Manchester Road.
4. The infrastructure of Knutsford does not facilitate the expansion of the town. Schooling, public transport, local jobs etc. is insufficient to warrant expansion. Expansion of areas that already have better local public transport/jobs etc. would make more sense.

I do not see the need for a 30% increase in the size of Knutsford. No demand. Look at the house sales - very slow.

I am not sure Knutsford needs any more housing and am very concerned about the proposed use of green belt land.

Green belt means green belt. Fill in any brown field sites with housing but don’t build on Green belt. The roads in Knutsford are congested enough with the current level of population and through flow of traffic. Especially if there are problems on the M6.

Despite the fine words the proposals simply aim to build on Green Belt. Therefore all the other guff in the plan about "sustainable communities" and "access to green spaces" and the other trite eco-bling terminology that peppers the document is shown for what it is - green wash to fundamentally change and destroy the character of a small market town. What is the point of hand wringing as the plan does about the "special" character of the town centre when the same plan works so hard to ruin that character around the outskirts. Typical Cheshire east ineptitude.

Having just recently moved to Knutsford I am shocked at the proposed vision. Whilst change over the years is inevitable I feel that the changes proposed will have a major impact on the town and do not feel that it is sustainable. Knutsford does not have the infrastructure in terms of the roads etc to support so many new houses. Up to 1280 houses is likely to mean at least 2000 extra cars on the road...
- this will put an enormous strain on our roads - one set of temporary traffic lights causes chaos and gridlock e.g. the Aldi traffic lights and the impact of the gas works being carried out. In addition the look of our lovely little town will change. Had I known about these changes sooner I would have reconsidered my position prior to buying - if I had wanted to live in a large commercial town with plenty of residential areas I would have moved to Wilmslow! I wanted to live in a historical picturesque town. I strongly oppose building on greenbelt land - find brown field sites if additional housing is required. I am deeply concerned about what will become of areas such as the moor - you say that you want to preserve such areas however extending the town boundaries to cover such areas will inevitably mean that you will want to build on these areas in the future. There is no need to extend the boundaries if this wasn’t the plan. I fail to see how you can increase parking in the town centre without spoiling the look and appeal of the town - unless you are planning to go underground then there is no suitable area for more parking. Also the proposed plans re shared spaces between pedestrians and vehicles will cause chaos and worsen the parking situation. Knutsford is an expensive place to live admittedly but in order to buy here I worked hard to achieve my dream - we do not want cheaper housing brought in - this will spoil the appeal for people. Knutsford simply cannot cope with more houses, cars and car parking - the history will become less of a priority as will our lovely greenbelt land. This vision is a serious cause for concern and, based on current information, completely unsustainable.

1. The document does not make it clear as to why we need to build on green belt.
2. It covers too many other important issues that each in their own right demand further consultation.
3. Aircraft noise (night flights) has a major impact on the lives of the residents of Knutsford and deserves more than a one line mention - section 2.9
4. There is too little information to make the decisions to redraw the boundaries of the town centre.

Agree but second point of Vision should be stronger. By 2030 we should aim for a road network that copes better than it does now with flows of traffic into and through the town.

No building on Green Belt

Knutsford FC has specific and significant interest in Area D which has been put forward as suitable for Mixed Development The Club celebrates its 125th anniversary in 2013 and has been on this site for the past 80 years

Thought the document was very comprehensive and is certainly a long "wish list". I do, however, have a number of issues for consideration: - 1. A great deal of emphasis is placed on building on the Green Belt to meet housing needs and several areas have been identified for potential development. Surely the first priority is brownfield sites and I would have thought as much effort should have been put into identifying these within the town's boundaries. I also would have thought a process should be put in place to continuously identify over the next 20 years new brownfield sites as they become available to add to a potential "land bank". I am also surprised that no mention is made of empty properties within the town's boundaries, particularly those that have been empty for over 6 months and a strategy put in place for these to be acquired, particularly as affordable housing. My overall concern is that unless brownfield and emptying housing sites are not used as the first priorities, the Town Plan risks an emptying town centre whilst development continues into the Green Belt i.e. the doughnut effect. The Green Belt developments also damage the character of the town, its openness and starts to encroach on the surrounding rural villages. 2. The proposal talks about maintaining the historic nature etc of the town. I think this needs to be extended to clearly define what the Town Plan believes is the outer boundaries of the town. Over time, unless measureable parameters are set, we run the risk of Knutsford being over-developed and becoming more than just a county town. There are several examples in the recent press of such over-development where one town has grown from 3000 to 9000 houses and also the concerns about St Albans etc. 3. Finally I think that careful consideration
needs to be given to health and welfare issues to strike a balance, particularly for older people, to receive as much of their medical and welfare needs to be met in the town rather than travelling to other towns for those needs. Even Macclesfield is not an easy travel, unless you have a car, for someone in poor health. In my case, as an example, I have had to travel to the North Manchester, Manchester Royal, The Christie and Macclesfield for treatment. Mine is an extreme case and is only intended as an example. Overall for all issues in the Town Plan there should be a balance between cost and convenience for the community. The best solution is not always the cheapest and we need to ensure that changes are not made today that we will regret in the future.

Try to keep the town as is, not commuter area for Manchester.

Any vision should aim to keep Knutsford heritage, and continue to promote its tourism appeal which generates income for the town.

This is a small market town- the provision of 1/6th more housing in an already heavily congested area is farcical. The infrastructure for the town just does not accommodate this increase. The whole uniqueness of this small town is its quaintness- people visit it from the surrounding environs just for that fact. Do not spoil what is one of the few outstandingly beautiful small towns in the North West for the sake of it. If it aint broke, why fix it??? We are already struggling heavily for Doctors, school places etc. This is an ill thought out idea by people who obviously do not have Knutsford’s best interests at heart.

The "vision" is what we already have but without the expansion

This is far short of a strategy. It does not provide any reasons for why some sites around Knutsford are preferred for development and even worse, why many sites are not considered suitable. Considered by who and why?

The vision speaks of all sorts of things including good access to public transport and good social care facilities which are laudable and self-explanatory but then mentions ;closer ties’ with Tatton Park as having been beneficial without indicating what these ties might be.

The plan appears to have been compiled without consultation for the most important stakeholders, the residents of Knutsford. Further on investigation it is proving very difficult to find out who was involved in the creation of this plan

I have several concerns regarding the Vision, not least the manner in which it has been 'publicised'. I don’t believe the Town Strategy is particularly accessible or user-friendly. It takes quite some time to read and is not straightforward to comment on. There has been little/no information brought to the attention of Knutsford residents regarding these proposals. I am extremely concerned that the town will lose its identity if these housing and retail developments go ahead. Knutsford, as we know it, could become unrecognisable. It is one thing to embrace change, but developments of this magnitude would surely destroy the community spirit, peaceful ambience and appeal of the locale. Knutsford is currently a desirable place to live and raise children. The proposed influx of additional residents will dramatically change the current demographic and potentially have a negative effect on (existing) property prices. How will the substantial increase in traffic effect congestion and, therefore, pollution? The already overcrowded roads will become even less safe for drivers and pedestrians alike. A walk/trip to the town centre will become an unpleasant experience. Additional car parking in the town will also lead to overcrowding. Many of our green spaces will disappear. My biggest concern is the lack of proper and public consultation to air issues pertaining to the Vision and to properly gauge and consider the opinion of local residents.

Agree with the view that Knutsford will remain an historic town with a unique character, but uncomfortable with the implication of significant new development. I believe this will detract from the character of the town.

Some excellent town-centre thoughts. Housing ideas not thought through.

Knutsford currently cannot cope with the volume of traffic through the town during frequent motorway closures. The transport network must be improved for traffic flow up to and through the town.
Jargonistic and wishy-washy statements contradict statements made throughout the document. There is no supporting evidence to some of the fundamental changes being put forward i.e. housing need and business land allocation. It is also totally unacceptable to suggest building upon green belt land, which has been protected in legislation, and to suggest that new green belt land will be redefined, but that this time it will definitely be protected. Also, who is making these decisions? People from the locality - it should be, rather than parties that do not live or work in the area.

I do not believe that the deliverance plan will create the vision you have stated. I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that the town will not recover from Knutsford has an identity of a market town and a sense of community for several hundred years without this unnecessary intervention

The document covers a great deal of subject matter which unfortunately does not have the background information for me to honestly support. I agree the town needs to grow, I think we have to accept with current population changes and economic conditions this growth will not be of the nature that has been seen before and I believe new initiatives need to be inventive. I am not sure this vision achieves that, I am greatly disappointed that in the vision seems to eat up valuable sporting and leisure space which having witnessed the power of sport during 2012 is something that cannot be allowed to happen.

I fail to see why Knutsford and the surrounding countryside should be subject to additional construction for what is a meagre projected increase in population across the county. The infrastructure e.g. roads and utilities are already at capacity. One of the main benefits for Knutsford residents is its character and village 'feel' - this will be lost forever if any substantial building is done on what is green belt land.

Need to encourage/promote communal volunteer groups to be active in care and maintenance since central funding bound to be tight for foreseeable future

I think there is too much focus on building housing while the infrastructure in Knutsford is unable to support this; also we are destroying valuable greenbelt land in the process.

Totally generic vision that effectively applies to any community. Doesn’t really help when it comes to making difficult decisions later on for the strategy about how to balancing impacts/ necessary infrastructure provision associated with new development and maintaining character and accessibility of the town. Could do with being more prescriptive in certain areas, for example vision should includes statements such as - Seek to reduce through traffic levels from those at present even following development - Seek to reduce or maintain at existing levels traffic in the town centre. Introducing more prescriptive statements into vision would assist in highlighting the difficult decisions on future infrastructure requirements that need to be made. They may also be helpful when determining the scale and type of development that Knutsford can accommodate with differing levels of new infrastructure,

Knutsford is a small market town has a sense of community for several hundred years without this unnecessary intervention

80% of the proposed development sites are concentrated on Green Belt land in the North West of Knutsford. This includes valuable recreational land, playing fields and allotments.

Such large development would destroy the character of the town and area which is mainly an agricultural and tourist region

I agree with the ideas in the vision, however, ongoing work needs to be done to ensure that these visions are fulfilled and managed.

The social care facilities especially in regard to the older population have not been maintained adequately. The number of empty retail units in Knutsford is increasing.

I am not happy this is the right vision for our town. Why do we want to encourage visitors? Of course we want healthy lives. Leave the open countryside around us alone.

all the favoured housing development appears to be on the north side only of which the majority will be to disrupt the established community sports that every Knutsford child will use when they grow up
and provide affordable activity for Knutsford residents where memberships are £200 a year which is comparable to regular use of the leisure centre and considerably cheaper than the Mere club at £2000 a year and cottons at £600 a month. The statement to not develop the fields on the south side blocks M onwards seems inexplicable and one is very suspicious of the stakeholders motives as the choice of preferred development appears to be about the landlord profit and not the needs of the town. Single mass developments are not for Knutsford but Small developments on each block would allow the town to slowly absorb the developments without putting too much pressure on the town facilities but keep the school roles buoyant.

Town-centre ideas good. Housing ideas not thought through. Traffic flow through Knutsford suffers regular congestion.

The Vision itself, as with all Policy document visions, is agreeable, as it sets out what everyone would like to see for Knutsford. Where we have to be careful is in the implementation, as these factors will be weighted according to importance, and therefore the area most likely to be contentious is the building of new properties within the centre of Knutsford whilst attempting to ensure we maintain its cultural heritage. The market town feel will not be retained if large chain businesses such as Weatherspoons, Aldi etc continue to be allowed. This vision should not state all the right things and then in implementation all bow down to revenue and income.

There are elements within the Vision that I agree with but there are others with which I take issue. Hence my response in this section.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if your developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place i.e. the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how this would be used in the small town of Knutsford.
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced, when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.
6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

"All new development is well designed, reflective of Knutsford's character" - as long as Regent Street is not typical of any future new development.

I don't feel that I have been given all the necessary information to make a decision

A utopian vision. It's a pity that we can't mend our potholes in 2012 - which imbues a sense of cynicism in document

I do not believe that Knutsford can support such a large scale housing development without destroying the character of the town. The infrastructure cannot support the existing population. The schools have had to put up temporary class rooms this year to provide enough school places for the existing population and the roads are regularly grid locked not to mention them all being in a poor
state of repair. The council need to focus on providing adequate services for the existing population before they decide that they can accommodate an additional 1200 houses. I do not agree that any housing development should take place on green belt land. This should be protected.

It sounds good. I worry that it is not achievable.

The plans should involve the whole town when the housing development is considered. Not just the north or could the social considerations of property type and prices in the south be large in the planners thinking.

As the Strategy does not provide adequate protection for the Green Belt around Knutsford then cannot agree with the stated vision.

I think that the vision is generally good. However, I do have concerns about creating additional housing in Knutsford. This is purely due to the fact that traffic at school time and rush hours is already bad. Increasing the population of Knutsford will only make this worse and I do not see that the strategy addresses this.

I disagree with the proposed planning for area A, B, C, D, E, G, K I do not see there is enough evidence for the need for the quantity of housing which will radically change the historic town of Knutsford.

Although I agree with parts of the town plan in terms of improved transport links, I think that we first need to improve infrastructure in Knutsford before any increases in population are considered. Roads and other services are already stretched to the limit.

"Well connected" is too vague a term - need to stress that improved transport (road and rail) links will be established. Also need to state that facilities will be well maintained and kept up to date.

I do not believe that housing development is necessary or business case proven.

The economic benefits of the link between the town and Tatton Park must not be at the expense of the amenity of Tatton Park. The commercialisation of the Park is already changing its character from a quiet refuge to an adventure park. I appreciate the need for it to become self-financing, which will not be achieved by alienating its many current supporters and visitors. This does not preclude development; BeWilderWood and other theme park type activities (e.g. bungee jumping) should be located on the edge of the park with direct access rather than across the existing route through the park. This will ensure that the current tranquil nature of the main park is not endangered by high speed traffic across Knutsford Drive and loud music bouncing across the park. Your strategy pays lip service to the provision of affordable housing but performance in recent years and your short term plans show just how committed to it. With 6,000 homes in the town and a waiting list of 450, the plan to provide 64 affordable homes each year is pathetic especially as none have been provided in the last two years.

Very short period for consultation. I obtained copies as soon as they were placed in the library. I found it difficult to complete the questionnaire as I felt I was not in possession of some of the basic facts and issues. I only discovered on Sept. 26 that other materials were available on your web site. The main document does not draw attention to this. This material on site suitability would have been very valuable but somewhat overwhelming (distance from a post box!!) In the very short time still available I had been unable to fully analyse this material. The draft strategy seems to be largely the result of two meetings of a stakeholder panel. Which other interests as well as the municipal representatives took part? Which actual interests groups took part? There was no availability of meetings either Cheshire East professional /technical staff .If such a session(s) had been provided it would have made it much clearer as to how and why decisions had been reached. The volunteers at the one manned display did their best but rightly felt unable to inform on matters of fact or know why some other decisions had been reached.

Knutsford is surrounded by greenbelt countryside and inhabited by people who love it. Many visitors come to our town, they like the shops, the pubs and eating houses, and comment on the local’s friendliness. Tatton Park is a very popular place that we are fortunate enough to have on our doorstep. We cope with the aircraft that fly overhead. Our town is relatively unspoilt. The state of the dreadful roads is common knowledge, and certainly not as when we arrived here. How anyone living
in this area could contemplate building developments involving even more traffic amazes me. This plan can only have been conceived by people who have no clue as to existing conditions. Where are these extra residents going to send their children for schooling? Where do they seek medical and dental health from already oversubscribed surgeries? Where are they going to park in the town? How are they going to exit their new estates onto a main road with traffic frequently exceeding speed limits and crashing into our garden? Will protected trees remain protected or will they be cut down overnight mysteriously, with a paltry fine imposition? Shops and offices within the town remain closed due to excessive rates and rents demanded by avaricious landlords. The landowners are already losing out because of their greed. Houses remain unsold for months. Do we really want more empty premises? Whenever there is a road traffic incident on the nearby M6, or when the roads in the town are being dug up, travel through our town is at a standstill. Even on a normal Friday afternoon there is a huge tailback into the town. I attended a meeting many years ago at our Civic Centre regarding the development of Manchester Airport. Loud cheers came from the audience when I asked those dignitaries, consultants, ‘experts’, on the platform who lived in the town to raise their hand, not one hand appeared! Please do not be misled by so called professional consultants whose sole purpose is to make money for themselves. They have jobs to do, but not at my expense. If the Council does have money to pay these people, reconsider your budget then please spend it on what the residents want, namely decent roads and pavements.

I wish to make a positive suggestion for the new local plan. KEEP THE GREENBELT. The continued erosion of the greenbelt will leave us and future generations poorer. Let us conserve the precious green areas of our country. Already Cheshire East has allowed building on two sites (to my knowledge). Please let there be no more.

Knutsford contains one Air Quality Management Area (A50 Manchester Road) and a number of areas where levels of pollution are close to the Air Quality Objective. Transport: Improve and safeguard air quality in the town (particularly on the A50 Manchester Road) Car Parking: Develop low carbon incentivised parking / Infrastructure within the Town Centre

Knutsford is a small town that has grown over the years and has reached a point where the infrastructure is seriously strained. The Cheshire East Local Plan proposes more of the same, which implies expensive infrastructure investment that, at best, will only slightly ease the problems, and more likely will not be implemented due to its high cost. I would therefore like to propose an alternative which aims to create the areas of growth we need, whilst not exacerbating the problems we already have. The thinking behind this is the consideration of the engineering practicalities of such new developments. The alternative I propose involves creating new development ‘villages’ around Knutsford at strategic locations for work and communications. Such an option would leave Knutsford Town largely untouched, but enable the new locations to be purpose built. The ease of construction, the cost savings and the superior facilities would be considerable. Many of the objections to the Plan, such as the building on green belt land, unsuitability of roads across town for any increases in traffic, etc., could be answered if the developments were moved slightly outside of the town. The character of Knutsford would largely be kept; the green areas around town would still be there, whilst the new developments would impinge much less on Knutsford and be more suitable for longer term expansion, particularly towards the north and west. Knutsford has already been expanded beyond a convenient size for its centre and infrastructure. Tacking even more large developments onto the outskirts would make it even worse.

More emphasis should be placed on relieving the traffic congestion in and around our Town and improving the sporting facilities for all the community.

1. Tatton Park should not be included in Knutsford Town Plan
2. You ignore many Grade II Listed Buildings by excluding them out of the Town Centre Plan (B)

I consider it essential that health care and social care provisions for the already exceptionally high percentage of Knutsford residents aged 66 and over - which will increase by almost 50% by 2030 - must be provided locally in the town or within the Knutsford LAP area. This applies especially to the provision of both assessment and residential care of those with Alzheimer’s or other types of
dementia which will most probably affect 700 to 800 elderly residents by 2030 or thereabouts. It is 
totally unacceptable for such patients and for their close families to be separated by 10 to 20 miles at 
places such as Macclesfield and farther afield. Facilities in Knutsford should be the fulcrum for the 
treatment and care of those with dementia for the north-west region of Cheshire-East. Neither is it 
acceptable that such patients or their families should have to sell their homes in order to finance their 
care in residences that must frequently receive no-notice inspections to ensure that they are 100% 
safe, efficient and provide loving care, and that they are easily accessible by public or specially 
provided transport... 29% of Knutsford's population will be over 65 within 20 years.

I rather doubt most jobs and services being in walking/cycling distance Since parking is already a 
problem I am not supportive of more visitors, I believe such statements are driven by business rather 
than residents

I agree that improvements need to be made in Knutsford, especially in relation to connectivity as the 
public transport services for Knutsford is very poorly provided in terms of rail and bus services given 
that nearly 50% of the population do not work in or around Knutsford. The town is bumper to bumper 
with cars during rush hour which is frequently exacerbated when M6 traffic overflow comes through 
the town due to accidents etc. Resolving this issue should be a priority before additional housing is 
considered. Improvements to the town centre's infrastructure to support the existing community, its 
economy, the town centre, its heritage and the environment are welcome, but I have concerns over 
providing additional employment areas when the existing ones are not at full capacity, or close to 
reaching it. I am also strongly against greenbelt land being used to provide additional housing, 
brownfield land should be used first, wherever that may exist in the borough; if we start to build on 
greenbelt, it'll be the thin end of the wedge like university fees as more and more land is taken and 
therefore there will be no green spaces left in terms of natural countryside and agricultural land, for 
future generations to enjoy.

Too big an expansion of town would change it for the worse.

Glad to see there is a 'vision' forming. Broadly agree (since the aspirations are laudable and therefore
hard to disagree with) but even as visions go it is full of nice words and rather 'general'. Some firmer 
details would help e.g. is the population of Knutsford envisaged to grow, and if so by how much (5%, 
10%, 20%) and why? Is Knutsford aiming to foster more of its own industry, or focus on leisure, or be 
increasingly just a commuter town for Manchester? I.e. What assumptions have been made in the 
vision? These bigger picture details would then also help inform views on the rest of the Strategy.

I strongly believe we should not develop green belt land. I also believe we should not expand the town 
centre to include the Moor and Egerton Primary as this would leave both at risk of retail development 
in the future. I don’t think we need any more supermarkets in the town; we have adequate provision 
from Booths, Sainsbury’s, Co-op and Waitrose. We could use the Aldi site for some housing.

I hope that within the Strategy consideration is given to allowing smaller sites to be released in 
different parts of the town which would meet the needs of those residents choosing to live there. I 
believe that there is a real need for smaller sites to be developed so that people who have lived in the 
area for some time would be able to downsize in to more suitable accommodation. There is a real 
need for this type of housing, which, I believe, would also help to preserve the character of the town.

With the exception of Parkgate Industrial Estate, all planned expansion for housing is on prime 
aricultural greenbelt land. Whilst the strategy aims to 'protect green spaces and natural assets in and 
around the town' (p. 16), this doesn’t seem to amount to not building on it. There is a stated 'need' for 
64 affordable houses per year, which implies that ALL houses built by 2030 need to be affordable. One 
of the preferred sites - Area A - is on the best quality farmland in the area. The road into Knutsford 
from the A556 is already a bottleneck, and putting additional pressure on this road will make things 
worse.

The vision talk in vague terms about "sustainable areas" there is no mention in the vision of a vision of 
improving sustainability overall - which includes new buildings, vision for the transport system, Fair 
Trade, ethical community.
The vision is too generic with nebulous statements and could apply to many towns in the UK. The link between Tatton Park and the town should not be focused on economy alone as is stated here. Cheshire East's recent actions have resulted in reduced Social care provision in the town and there is an incoherent Health Strategy. This makes results in a lack of credibility in the Vision to support the changing demographic.

Not sure what you mean by "atypical population". It is not defined.

I do not really think my views will make any difference, but I have to try. All but one of the areas is wholly green belt, so none should be built on.

This vision will adversely affect our green belt and have a devastating impact on the abundance of natural resources surrounding us. We have added pollution due to the flight path. The trees are our only resource to clean the air that we breathe, absorb CO2 and produce oxygen. The plan will overpopulate Knutsford and irrevocably change the essence of our town and suffocate our resources disproportionately. I appreciate and respect Knutsford and its appealing qualities. I would not want a commercialised, huge development to live amongst and work. If I wanted this I would choose to live in a city.

I have seen the proposals for the future of Knutsford and I am concerned that our town has neither the infrastructure nor facilities medial, schooling-car parking-road network / safety measures and social care provision to deal with the existing population. This is before we consider the potential destruction of Green Belt and prime Grade1 agricultural land. I am completely against the rampant building of housing without proper infrastructure, and the potential placing of land available to developers, whether it is for immediate use or for the future. I cannot believe there has not been a proper analysis of brown field sites throughout the entire area. However, having listened intently to Tatton Estates proposal yesterday evening at the Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group session, their proposal to develop land around Egerton Boys Club, either side of Mereheath Lane would seem to be the most sensible course of action if Green Belt must be molested. Tatton Estate has a long standing relationship with the town and are therefore a key stakeholder in the future wellbeing of the area. This area, edging onto Tatton Park would provide ample space for new housing, green space, education perhaps doubling up as a shared development of sports facilities, for example Knutsford Rugby Club, who still don’t have a home and run the risk of potentially folding in the future, unless one is found for them. These areas would seem to propose the least amount of disruption to existing Knutsford residents. Assuming Knutsford Cricket/Sports Club, Egerton Boys Club and Knutsford Football Club remained as a buffer between potential new development and existing housing. Further proposals in the Knutsford Town Plan suggest many improvements in all their guises to the infrastructure of the area. Councillor Rayne’s view at this meeting was there would appear to be very little money immediately in the pot for such, in my view much needed improvements. The way proposals have been, in my view slightly hidden in plain view do not particularly sit well with me either. Many people in my area either knew nothing of the proposals or of the survey until just recently. Many older people are either unable to access internet, or do not feel confident in doing so. Not everyone visits the local library or gets the local rag. So why was the Cheshire East Local Plan; Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation not sent through every door in Knutsford? Considering how, I hope you’ll agree, important it is to the people of Knutsford and its elected representatives that we allow people a well-considered say in proceedings, rather than a last minute sabre rattling panic, with fingers wagged and tempers frayed. Apparently the financing of such an undertaking was deemed not cost effective! Given how important this should be to the people of Knutsford, I suggest, at best that decision poorly considered. I agree that Knutsford has to move on, and it seems somewhat inevitable as things very rarely go backwards! However I feel strongly that many ducks have to be laid out in a row before we should even start to consider more people/cars etc. in the town. Infrastructures, particular the roads and public facilities/transport, road safety, pressure on schools and medical centres and car parking are all issues which I strongly feel need addressing only then perhaps should we consider more folk.

Agree with all vision points.
Whilst elements of the strategy document are sensible, it would appear that a decision has already been made to develop parts of our valuable Green Belt and yet having read the results of the Place Shaping Consultation do not believe that this is something that came through as an urgent need for Knutsford. In addition the document whilst clear on what areas the "panel" would like to see developed makes no real attempt to outline how the essential infrastructure required to support development on the proposed scale would be delivered. The few people in the town who had the opportunity to respond to the earlier survey would appear to have made it pretty clear that traffic, congestion and pressure on public services within the town were what they wanted to see addressed and yet much of this proposal seems to have ignored that and jumped straight to a focus on additional development at the expense of the Green Spaces that make the town the unique place to live that it is today. Disappointing and detached from the views of most local residents.

Apart from the first sentence, the Vision (chapter 3) is vague, ambiguous and uses undefined "buzzwords". What were the selection criteria for members of the Advisory Stakeholder Panel? Who were its members and how did they meet the criteria?

New development is not required. The council has not proved itself worthy of managing well designed development. The shocking state of Regent street is just one example of this. We already have a vibrant town centre with a unique character, beautiful open countryside (which is at risk by this plan) and good appropriate health and social care. Our town vision should be to maintain and care for the beautiful town that we have.

Specifically disagree with the proposed sites D and E (i.e. on Mereheath Lane and Egerton boys club).

Knutsford cannot grow with the current overloading of traffic and council provided infrastructure and services, we are already full.

Overall, most of the proposals are sensible, such as improvements to the town centre and emphasis on a high quality of life. Although it would be nice for Knutsford to remain its current size this is not realistic if we expect our children to have their own homes eventually, it is a good idea to plan for this change.

Much of the vision is very positive; however it means destroying large areas of green belt and does not comment on air and noise pollution. A green belt swap, whilst perhaps providing the same overall area of green belt within Cheshire East would not protect specific areas around Knutsford which would destroy the character, beauty and natural heritage of the town. These are all key statements contained within the Knutsford Town Plan based on the views of more than half the householders of the town.

Don't want to lose any green belt around Knutsford and I don't believe that a 'green belt swap' is acceptable.

We suggest the following amendment for the Vision statement: 'The community will have the opportunities to lead a healthy and active lifestyle by benefiting from participation in more and better leisure facilities and open spaces. These facilities will be welcoming to those with disadvantages and disabilities.'

I do not agree with any proposal that uses green field sites for further housing.

It is vital to prepare a framework for the future development of our town and cater for the population increase in a managed way.

Something a bit more about forward looking and as well as the unique traders to have good value services for those less wealthy and unable to travel.

I basically agree but disagree with all(any reference to future development in the Green Belt. The traffic system around the town is beyond capacity at present, as are the town centre car parks. Equally, development in the Green Belt would take valuable land out of food production. There is no NEED for further housing around the town: there may be a requirement but that is totally different.

I do not agree with the planned housing development.

as long as no negative impacts on current residents e.g. socio economic loss through decreased property prices or increased unemployment etc.
I have reservations on a number of aspects of the report which I will outline in the comments sections, but in the main I support much of the documents proposals.

Green belt is green belt and should be protected as such.

Includes access to open space, easy access to open countryside but there is nothing in the Vision about environmental quality or biodiversity.

This is generally supported by National Trust, including specifically the acknowledgement of the potential offered by the landscape and heritage assets in this area this includes the value of the employment opportunities provided by these resources and the economic value and prospects that they provide for the Knutsford area. National Trust would also wish to specifically support that part of the Vision relating to health, improved access to open spaces and ease of access to the open countryside.

Vision is fine, but I am not convinced it can be delivered in light of spending cuts and quality of what has allowed to be built in the past.

Points raised at a public meeting. There was no detail on improving ties with Tatton Park, on the town centre options there was no mention of the medical centre/hospital. Also no mention of the ageing population and housing for the elderly or residential homes. Other issues that need to be addressed are: Sheltered Housing, Car Parking, Road Access, no highways access issues addressed in the plan. In Knutsford carers call at the homes of the elderly rather than putting them in residential homes. Sheltered Housing, Car Parking, Road Access, no highways access issues addressed in the plan.

Sainsbury's broadly support the Council’s vision for Knutsford and wish to highlight the important economic contributions that their existing local convenience store in Canute Place makes to the local area and the viability and vitality of the town centre. Sainsbury’s suggest that the vision also include reference to the promotion of the economic potential of Knutsford as set out in Objective 2 of the draft Town Strategy. There should be an acknowledgement of the contribution that all scales of retail development can make towards the vitality and viability of centres. Furthermore, Sainsbury’s is committed to ensuring that the Knutsford store continues to complement the activities and facilities of the town centre.

The Knutsford Town Plan Group's survey for road improvements on King and Princess St should be taken into consideration and new medical facilities need to be easily accessible and cater for everyone’s needs. Support for small businesses needed.

The document has been put together without thought for feasibility of proposals

I would question what closer ties there are between Tatton Park and Knutsford. Tatton Park does its own thing and ignores Knutsford.

Tatton Park needs stronger management as it runs at a loss. It should not be included in town - Grade II Hardy Watt buildings should remain in the town centre, not excluded as B on plan.

We do not need VISIONS! Not enough emphasis on Local health & social care provision to suit the NEEDS of Local people

I had no idea this plan was being prepared. How was it publicised? Who, other than Town Council members, formed the Advisory Stakeholder Panel and how were they appointed?

So Knutsford’s legacy to the fantastic 2012 Olympic Games is to build over Knutsford’s best sporting facilities. Could you please post in-line a list showing which of the committee members live adjacent to one of the proposed building sites?

Please add that natural environment, particularly the Green Belt and other open spaces will have been protected. Also, the heritage aspects of the town, its historic buildings and the townscapes vistas will have been preserved, and preferably enhanced.

There are some aspects of which I may wish to challenge but others with which I can agree

There is no clear vision to address the current road congestion. Knutsford is crippled by commuter traffic passing through it during rush hour to large employers in the area (Barclays and Astra Zeneca). It is gridlocked if there are any delays on the M6 and traffic diverts through the town. Commuters cut through residential streets to avoid the congestion at the roundabout. The vision talks about...
'improved access' or 'good access' to services and facilities. I think the wording in the vision should be clearer that these improvements will be made within the town itself. It is not clear what is implied by 'closer ties between Tatton Park and Knutsford'. Is this vision in there to cover the proposed building of a 'theme park' in Tatton? I am not sure that this is in the best interests of the town.

We have chosen to strongly disagree with the vision based on the plans to expand into the Green Belt. Green Belt boundaries should only be reviewed in EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES and we do not consider the 'vision' to be an exceptional circumstance. I truly value and treasure our green belt across the whole of the UK and am appalled that this vision is even to be considered where it imposes on the green belt. We are not adverse to development and change BUT please leave the green belt alone. I understand that other towns are being considered as well and feel those where the green belt will remain unaffected would be better placed for development than Knutsford.

We refute that additional housing is required in the Town of Knutsford. The proposed Town Strategy will destroy ancient woodland, less than 2% now remains in the UK. The developments are proposed on precious green belt land whilst numerous inner city brown sites remain dilapidated and in need of renovation. The historic town of Knutsford already creeps under the weight of modern traffic, substantial additional development of any kind will push the inadequate road infrastructure to the point of collapse. The proposal to remove Knutsford’s Fire Station is irresponsible and resulting emergency response times would be inadequate and risks the welfare and life of current Knutsford inhabitants which would be exaggerated should the planning proposal be approved. Any information connected with these proposals appear to have been Stealthy and covert suggesting a deliberate planning strategy to push ahead largely uncontested and without the consent of local inhabitants and businesses. Proposals of this magnitude merit substantially more consultation and wide spread advertisement than has been provided.

Cheshire East Borough states that population increase will be 4.6% during the period, so why does Knutsford have to expand by 21%? The infrastructure will need radical upgrading. The plan states that open green spaces are to be enhanced, and CEC has previously stated that green belt should be preserved. Green Belt is there to stop urban sprawl, yet this is exactly what it is creating. Transport needs drastic improvement, and the new proposals for building struggle the most used, and frequently congested roads in the Town. After the euphoria of the Olympics the sporting facilities should be retained in their present location, where they are accessible to all. Why are the proposed new housing sites designated in one area of the town, with none in Bexton and Norbury Booths Wards? No reason is given except to say it is unsuitable. There is no logic in including area E (Egerton School) in the Town Centre and excluding area A, which is closer to the Town Centre, and a Conservation area. Access to the Parkgate area is only accessible by an old, weak, narrow humpback bridge over the Manchester to Chester, railway line. This bridge would have to be improved before any work was started.

Although some of the aims are laudable - improving bus and train services, the vision talks of open spaces and leisure facilities which will be lost if the plan goes ahead. Green belt will be built on, and long established and much loved facilities will be lost; I know they might be re-established elsewhere but there will be periods when the facilities will not be functioning and more green belt will be consumed in re-building. The community has an affinity will its space and recreational facilities, the proposals are reminiscent of the Eastern-block communists who tore communities apart, relocating them to allow building projects in the name of progress and economic development. The character of Knutsford would change forever, our schools would be bursting at the seams and the town would become a concrete jungle. The economic crisis should have taught us that the pursuit of wealth is not the be all and end all, citizens want open space and tranquillity in all aspects of life; not some concocted population-growth scheme that rips the heart out of the town.

1. Knutsford itself, and its current residents (including the young) do not believe that the town needs to grow larger to develop. More house-building means a diminution of the current aesthetic and social advantages of Knutsford. It will place greater pressure on the existing infrastructure. Accordingly the suggestion that there are "tough choices to be made about where development should go" is begging
the question of whether further building development is beneficial to the current and future residents of Knutsford. I am strongly of the view that this town will not be advantaged by additional house-building on any significant scale. House-building would be contrary to the NPPF requirement that any development be 'sustainable', and to the expressed views of current Knutsfordonians (see paragraph 1.20). House building on green-belt will be contrary to the Corporate Plan 1.23 re: improving green spaces [that surround the town]. The Core Strategy proposal for 460 - 1280 houses is immodest, being a 10 to 20% increase. This will swamp current services. Building more houses will not reduce the local house prices. People retire to Knutsford because it is quiet and desirable.

I would have liked general terms such as "local needs" define - also a vision to improve road traffic congestion

**Infrastructure at present is in need of clear and integrated development, particularly with regard to transport and traffic flow**

I strongly agree that all development should be "well designed" and "reflective of Knutsford’s character", but there must be more emphasis on the lack of a range of housing and the issues with transport to surrounding areas

**Firstly to take away the whole of green belt area around Knutsford will be devastating, not only environmentally creating stress and destruction to the local area living around a building site, but also the stress on motor connections, rail and traffic,**

I agree with the vision. However, I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that will not benefit the town as outlined in the vision for Knutsford.

The vision as laid out on page 10 is admirable but the plan contradicts it. Access to open countryside will be diminished and the environment will not be protected. The “vision” is therefore rhetoric. The identity of Knutsford will be destroyed by building on greenbelt land.

I agree with the vision. However, I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that will not benefit the town as outlined in the vision for Knutsford.

I agree that we need a vision, but I am concerned whose vision you are asking to be endorsed!

I fail to acknowledge that there is a necessity for building more housing in Knutsford; These are private developments that are for profit not for the benefit of the community. There are plenty of community facilities in Knutsford they are just too expensive to use. The Tourist information that was closed down fairly recently was perfectly adequate, however, as I think with the proposed developments many tourists will choose to stay away, perhaps it won’t be necessary. There are health care facilities which compared to some areas are very good and building the centre at Parkgate by using a significant area of Greenbelt, i.e. Dog wood is unacceptable. The leisure facilities at the leisure centre and Egerton are very good and I fail to accept the necessity to eat into green belt to improve something that is already working. The football pitch at Longridge has been moved and replaced by a multipurpose space of very poor quality freeing up what I presume is now a development plot at the end of higher Downs. The water table in this area cannot sustain more development. We have a sports barn at St John’s wood, paid for I believe by Lottery funding and Cheshire East all that is needed is for the community to be able to access it. To suggest the developing of local facilities for the elderly, having just closed down the dementia care unit at Bexton, is quite frankly beyond a joke, given that the main problem for the elderly identified is dementia. The local elderly projects on Longridge depend upon grants and small amounts of funding instead of finances which should be provided by a council. Our elderly should be cared for and respected. The Library provides internet access to meet local needs, We have asked repeatedly for allotments on Longridge and yet they can only be found in the plans in other identified areas. As to cultural provision, you have recently sold the cinema so that does away with that one.

Most of these 'vision' statements are very wide and unobjectionable. - Statements on jobs seem unrealistic- Knutsford is a commuting town (many highly qualified) - needing good rail/metro links to Greater Manchester and major employers. Others commute into Knutsford and need good public transport in and daily parking facilities. - Tatton Park link is a statement not a vision - some
commercial plans there could be detrimental - i.e. Wildwood proposals and threats to general amenity of the Park

It is very idealistic. May be best to concentrate on identifying what is actually achievable and essential.

I agree with the vision. However, I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that will not benefit the town as outlined in the vision for Knutsford.

Too much development is proposed, apart from that the vision preserves the town we know and love.

The vision in theory looks good. Whether or not this is attainable is a different question.

The proposed vision will spoil the character of Knutsford. Manchester road and Tabley road are already busy roads and the increase in housing will exacerbate the congestion particularly when there is an accident on the M6.

I agree on the level that the town needs to grow, accommodate moderate growth, and allow it to happen methodically, gradually, and organically. But, I also agree that the vision should apply to the town as it stands now, at its current population. Everything that is suggested would be great to have NOW for folks like us who chose to pay more to live in a town with unique character and a moderate pace of life. I've come back to this question last and I think everyone who took the intense 2+ hours to fill out this questionnaire should get a free pair of tickets to Alton Towers!!

It will be important to keep the virtues that Knutsford has, which are due largely to its existence as a small market town with a strong sense of community and a distinctive character. Any growth should take this into account and not be inappropriate.

1) Affordable Housing numbers at 64/year are not sensible. 20% of housing nationally is affordable, in Knutsford the job profile will require more not less market housing. Using such a figure brings the competence of Cheshire East into question (i.e. >100% of total housing allocation).

Much work is needed to achieve a well connected community (6th bullet point)

I want to protect the existing green belt boundaries and preserve the excellent sports facilities already in place at the Football, Cricket, Tennis Clubs as well as the Egerton Youth Club. This plan is a disgrace.

As the vision does not provide any information of how a busy town will support so many additional houses/people (schools, medical, traffic) I strongly do not support.

I have concerns about some of the potential development sites & am frankly amazed that I knew absolutely nothing about the whole exercise until yesterday, Sunday 30 September. Was this publicised in the Knutsford Guardian?

I find the Vision very woolly and imprecise. It is for God against Sin. For example: who will be the arbiter of well designed development? What is a 'sustainable area? How will I know the community is 'integrated' - whatever that means? If it had said that all new development in the built environment would draw on the rich variety of English vernacular architecture such that it complements the existing mix of historic and conserved domestic and commercial buildings i.e. created a Poundbury, I might have been able to agree. As a vision, you should have gone to Specsavers.

Whilst there appears to be a requirement for some additional domestic housing as is evidenced by the lack of middle range properties for sale for potential buyers, the proposed Housing Development areas appear to greatly exceed the requirement. If the areas now considered not suitable were added, the "overkill" in numbers of properties would be immense and Knutsford would lose its identity of being a small intimate town. Some local employees who currently commute may move into the town but there will still be many who travel in by road. Car parking, long and short term, is a serious failing in the document which should be given priority. Primary schools have been a sore point ever since the closure of St John’s Wood and Crosstown schools. A new school in the Parkgate area would be a definite benefit in the Over Knutsford ward and would stop any possibility of overcrowding at Manor Park school. However traffic lights at the junction of Parkgate Lane and Mobberley Road would be essential - there are already access delays at that junction when the staff in the industrial estate are going home in the late afternoon. Conversely the removal of Egerton School leaving Bexton the only primary school on the west of the town would cause even greater congestion in the Beggarmons Lane/Blackhill Lane/Bexton Lane. An alternative to Egerton is essential. It is rumoured that Tesco are
interested in occupying a site on the west of Manchester Road between Sugar Pit Lane and the Land Rover garage. The town survived with just the Co-op and Booths and the two late shops off Mobberley Road for many years before the arrival of Waitrose and Sainsburys. Now Aldi will probably be the second main supermarket store after Booths. Where is the need for Tescos and also it shouldn’t be directly on the main road to Manchester.

Knutsford is an historic market town which will lose its identity and charm if these developments continue. It already struggles with road congestion due to poor networks and overuse by the number of people already living in the area and people using it as a diversion when there are problems on the motorways surrounding it. Its schools are also full to overcrowding with Egerton already having to have new mobile classrooms to accommodate an extra class and spoil the area the children need to play. What a disaster it would be to add to this congestion!!!!

Infrastructure Priorities - I would also like to see the Local Authority determining priorities as soon as possible, particularly in respect of roads, footpaths, car parking, so that available funding is maximised at an early stage and with an integrated approach before developments are earmarked for consideration, even notionally. Congestion is becoming an increasing problem at peak times.

There is a lack of imagination and the vision does not protect the unique nature of our town.

There are at least two major problems. Firstly, the vision cites independent traders as an attractive feature of the town, then goes on to propose that Waitrose, Sainsbury's and the (proposed) Aldi will "absorb the identified capacity". This is highly undesirable, for the reasons cited in the vision (people are visiting Knutsford for its independent shops). The Aldi proposal should be abandoned, and their illegal demolition of the cottages (which, of course, decreased housing capacity ”, this would have been (and still could be) a perfectly good site for town centre accommodation) should be prosecuted and compensation obtained. Secondly, the upper limit of 1,280 dwellings increases housing in the area by nearly 20 per cent. Do we expect 20 per cent population growth in Knutsford over the next 18 years? This is ludicrous. So, the "vision" is actually to increase the size of Knutsford. Who is going to move here and why? Is such a large expansion of the town merited? There is no discussion of these issues. A better default would be to cap dwelling provision at the same rate as population growth over the period. If there's a need for further discussion (e.g. if there aren't enough houses for the people who already live in Knutsford and note that this is technically impossible unless we have large numbers of homeless, which we don't, then some discussion might go along those lines).

The Vision should refer to the continuing Green Belt around Knutsford (even if by 2030 the town has grown, using some Green Belt land).

The vision does not seem cohesive. Without a strategy for improving the traffic issues already being experienced within Knutsford, how can further development of this scale be contemplated? Toft Road and Adams Hill are natural bottlenecks for all traffic crossing Knutsford. With Tatton Park to the north and no money for a ring road to the south, something significant would need to be done to improve the flow of traffic across Knutsford. Although some people will commute West, major employers such as AstraZeneca and Barclays lie to the East of the town and are not mentioned in the document.

Putting single large developments on either side of the town is a bad strategy. Has any consideration been given to more smaller developments? Education and health service provision also need to be set out. My children attend the Catholic primary school which is at full capacity already (has this year had to turn away Catholic children). By increasing the size of the population, you would force the redrawing of the catchment areas for all the schools and disadvantage large areas of the town. I appreciate that there are rumours of potentially another school being built, but has any thought been given to increasing the capacity of the existing schools? Consultation has been badly publicised until halfway through the consultation period. If this is just a consultation document, why have favoured sites been listed at all? Should this should be an open document of possible options with nothing ruled out? No reasons have been given as to why the other sites have been discounted. If access is a strong enough reason for discounting a site then sites G and K are equally inaccessible as sites R or S. If such extraordinary circumstances exist for redrawing the Green Belt boundaries, surely site P should be considered. Although this falls in the Leigh Road conservation area, a development of a smaller
number of less densely built houses could surely be considered. Perhaps plots could be offered to self-builders? Planning officers would then have full control of individual designs. If site surveys have been conducted they should also be shared with the public. Employers within the area are listed, but listing companies such as McLaren, Rolls Royce and Bentley is laughable. How many people do they employ? Even in comparison to the Land Rover dealership that is not mentioned, is in the same sector and occupies the same site Rolls Royce! No plans are set out as to how you will keep affordable housing affordable. If first-time buyers are allowed to purchase at preferential values, what will stop them capitalising on the "market" value of the property in 3/6/12 months? This has been seen in other areas of the country. More houses does not mean more jobs (baring perhaps a few in retail). There are already empty office units and retail outlets in Knutsford that have not been filled in years. Incentives to businesses to fill these properties would bring more benefit to the town than building on prime green belt land.

fine aims

Cheshire East Borough states that population increase will be 4.6% during the period, so why does Knutsford have to expand by 21%? The infrastructure will need radical upgrading. The plan states that open green spaces are to be enhanced, and CEC has previously stated that green belt should be preserved. Green Belt is there to stop urban sprawl, yet this is exactly what it is creating. Transport needs drastic improvement, and the new proposals for building straggle the most used, and frequently congested roads in the Town. After the euphoria of the Olympics the sporting facilities should be retained in their present location, where they are accessible to all. Why are the proposed new housing sites designated in one area of the town, with none in Bexton and Norbury Booths Wards? No reason is given except to say it is unsuitable. There is no logic in including area E (Egerton School) in the Town Centre and excluding area A, which is closer to the Town Centre, and a Conservation area. Access to the Parkgate area is only accessible by an old, weak, narrow humpback bridge over the Manchester to Chester, railway line. This bridge would have to be improved before any work was started.

Natural England support the vision statement set out within the draft Knutsford Town Strategy. The vision highlights opportunities for strengthening Knutsford sense of place by way of encouraging high quality design in both the built and natural environment.

Understand that we have little choice in matter

I am writing to register my objection to the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation.

The roads are crowded now.

It should not even be considering building on land currently used for playing fields or allotments

It sounds ok in theory

Some growth needs to happen and this vision is a chance to ensure that any growth is right for the town. This is a great opportunity to make sure that town gets everything it needs for the next 20 years and beyond.

Some growth needs to happen and this vision is the chance to ensure that any growth is right for the town. This is a great opportunity to make sure the town gets everything it needs for the next 20 years and beyond.

Knutsford is a beautiful quaint town and should be kept that way.

TOTALLY UNACHIEVABLE

Too broad, lacks focus.

Although a housing increase for Knutsford is obvious I would not like it to become a continuous sprawl through Altrincham into Manchester.

More priority and focus on facilities for younger generations who are the future of our town, Knutsford is suffering from a focus on the latter end of the lifecycle.

Agree with some points in vision as it is already here and what attracted us in first place. Knutsford's not broken - why try fix?
| Retain Green Belt and separation of settlements |
| By increasing housing and industrial units will allow the town to keep it’s character |
| Bland. Who would not state the tunes set down? Need a bolder, more dynamic vision. Just seems more of the same. |
| Strongly agree present picture should be maintained but proposals you present will do the opposite and totally destroy the uniqueness of Knutsford. |
| Vision in fine, but it fails to give sufficient attention to traffic and need to make town pedestrian only. |
Q2 Objectives and Strategy

Do you agree or disagree with the Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

Overall response:
Objective and Strategy 1: Sustainable Community

Do you agree or disagree with the Sustainable Community Objective and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 83% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (28%); Agree (42%); Neither Agree or Disagree (12%); Disagree (8%); Strongly Disagree (11%)

**Comments**

Not specific enough about sport and education

Knutsford is one of the main areas for visitors in Cheshire East and the development of a centrally located visitor information centre will assist in developing the visitor economy. We the vast array of facilities and events for visitors a well stocked VIC with knowledgeable staff linked to information provision at strategic points in the town centre is a priority.

I agree with all points with the following exceptions: I do not understand why children would require special facilities or allocated play spaces. Free access to Tatton grounds is an exceptional advantage that children in other towns do not have. Playing in the unspoiled landscape should be encouraged over special child provision. Additionally, library facilities could be strengthened by providing WC's in the library and separate, quite study spaces.

The major omission here is being specific about improving the provision for people with disabilities. They are a stakeholder group overlooked within the Knutsford community. As are teenagers. There should be a bullet point about positive action for disabilities. There should also be a point about areas of land under development being left vacant for any future community uses such as community hall/church/athletics club. Strategy point re play areas etc should provide specific reference to SKATEPARK. There is no paragraph in the background section about current community facilities needs a baseline to move on from.

You could put the tourist information, heritage centre in the library with a coffee shop, wifi and better
opening times.
Always
Hope it’s not just a paid paper exercise and these are real plans to be really rolled out for the people and the people do get involved and not expect everything done for them!
Being sustainable is part of what we should aim for, but this does not mean that we should build on green belt land.
Try visiting a few cities in China - this is what happens when you keep allowing towns to grow. Where will it all end?
Very limited ideas in the overall plan. Does not take into account how things work now.
The statement "increasing access to new and improved sports and leisure facilities" does not align with building houses in area D. Area D is the major sporting area within the town. The statement "identifying and allocating land for additional allotments, community gardens and orchards" is incompatible with building houses in area E.
Provision of new cinema with combined theatre and civic space on Tatton Street car park - this frees up the existing space.
To achieve a sustainable community and the aspirations contained within your statement we have to consider the proposed increase of households and property developments and the impact on the community. This is not referenced and therefore does not reflect a fair and objective set of statements.
These are basic requirements that any worthwhile council should already provide as a minimum.
For such an affluent town in the North West things like leisure facilities in Knutsford leave something to be desired. I am from Warrington originally and still work there. I recently joined Knutsford Leisure centre and if it wasn't for the travelling required after using the facilities I would have joined one of Warrington's leisure centres such as Broomfields instead. KLC may have a lovely little gym, but to be honest the rest of the facilities are severely lacking. Especially when the only real competition gym wise is Cottons at an extortionate £72 a month, you have an open market out there to cater for.
Sustainability is always desirable - who would ever vote against it? It can however be interpreted in more than one way and be better defined within this document, both short term and long term, with clear line of sight to benefits
Agree that infrastructure improvements are vital and need to be addressed before additional housing is built that will stress the infrastructure. Also agree that an Information / Visitor centre would be a good idea - more should be done to develop the towns cultural and heritage aspects which could help bring in more visitors and help the economy.
How can removing Playing field that host Knutsford tennis, cricket and bowmen as well as Egerton possibly be promoting community life. Utterly disgusted that this has been considered.
We support the bullet point at the foot of page 11 for an improvement to cultural provision, and note on page 37 under Infrastructure that there is the potential to create a new theatre space at the Civic Centre. Please consult the Theatres Trust on plans for this new space. Theatre use should be valued because a thriving theatre sector is a mark of a culturally enriched society. Our belief is that everyone has an equal right to experience theatre in buildings of the highest quality (whether newly designed, purpose-built or converted), that they are valued community assets, and they help us appreciate our arts, culture and heritage.
It is difficult to get one's mind around all the verbiage. It is pleasing that the Knutsford Town Plan which has been developed by Knutsford residents taking into account issues important to them. However since the KTP was developed many things have changed and renewed surveys/consultations need to be done to make it current. One can hardly argue with the 'motherhood and apple pie' of the words under sustainability. Essential to have focus centres like the Information Centre, Civic Hall One would expect more focus on green energy. Cheshire East needs to make strong representations to Manchester Airport to continue to reduce noise pollution and air pollution.
Please include some ideas on what this might look like in your strategy, especially around the improvement of leisure and fitness facilities and better provision for families and young people. E.g. Does this mean redevelopment of the leisure centre (long overdue) or attempts to attract a private gym to the town, both of which I would support? Young people might want nightclubs - would this be encouraged? It might be helpful to say what you wouldn't do?

To date there have been delays and debate with regards to the building of a super health centre to include the town's existing surgeries - and would it be sufficient for a growing population? With extending town boundaries, perhaps individual centres should remain/increase for ease of access? There will certainly be an immediate need for increasing the number of schools within town in light of the larger reception years we are currently seeing. The bullet points given in this section does seem to address important facets of our community.

| Improvement and extension of existing allotment facilities with appropriate financial support. |
| Can we afford all this? |
| Could add 'maintaining our surrounding 'Green Belt' land as it is!' |

There are too many inconsistencies between the strategy and what is proposed. For example "increasing access to new and improved leisure facilities" contradicts the proposal to build houses in area D which consists of sports fields. For example "identifying and allocating land for additional allotments" does not align with building houses in area E

The weakness in the drafting of the objectives is not in what they identify but in that there is no indication of those items which are a key to the delivery of the vision in 2030. Again through referring to other town strategies it is clear that they have been drafted succinctly and with reference to priority issues. In this paragraph there is a generic reference to the infrastructure required to support the community. Local health and social care facilities are then listed with along with 10 other items. The 'hottest issues' which have occupied the community in Knutsford over the last few years have been those of health provision (either redevelopment of doctors surgeries to meet current standards or the building of a medical centre) and the provision of care facilities that have been closed. The strategy has been written as if these problems have been solved they have not and therefore there has to be an acknowledgement of issues which are a priority otherwise they will not guide the planners in writing the Local Plan. Developing the infrastructure and facilities to meet health and social care should top the list. The reintroduction of a Visitor Centre should be planned in conjunction with improvements and developments within Canute Square and Red Cow Yard (refer to comment under Objective 3: Town Centre)

Currently facilities for the older teenagers are poor - much is focussed around primary age school children and 11-14

| The infrastructure must have priority within the present community and before any development takes place. Can we be confident that health and social care facilities, especially for the elderly WILL be developed, as quite the opposite seems to be happening at the moment? |
| Though it seems odd as with the planning which seeks to remove provisions of sports land. |
| This is very much akin to the Vision. What sane person wouldn't want to see these objectives met? In an ideal world they would be. However, it is not an ideal world. I’d be interested to see, for example, where the new space for "allotments, community gardens and orchards" is to be found, given the document's strong focus on new build and the apparent need for additional car-parking. We need detail. |
| It is contradictory to develop areas CDE that have sporting facilities. |

I think that Knutsford has already been developed to a good level over recent years. There are some things which could do with improving but without building on the green belt. Part of Knutsford's unique appeal is it's quaint town centre and surrounding green landscape.

| No building on Green belt or expansion of Knutsford |
| I fully support community events and activities - anything that encourages us to work together and |
support our local community is good. Knutsford has a great community spirit due to the size of the town - would be concerned about losing the community feel if the town was much bigger

I do not believe that the "Vision" is practicable.

Strongly support the revival of an Information Centre. Would this be located in the town centre core? Developing local health and social care facilities is a high priority as public transport links to Macclesfield are weak and seem likely to get poorer. Enhanced cultural provision sounds very interesting.

Proposing housing on Green Belt - appalling.

Providing the unique character of Knutsford is retained

See earlier comments

Provision of accessible health and social care is essential. Maintaining outside areas and sports facilities is critical.

Already got one

It is a wish-list so who wouldn't agree? However, even on such a list there are some I agree with more than others... Excellent objective as far as re-introducing the Visitor and Information Centre. Similarly, I can see strong reasons for developing allotments and community gardens but I’m not so sure about ‘orchards’. I don’t object to orchards but I wonder as to their relevance.

Providing the green belt remains intact whilst improvements are carried out, the strategy seems well intentioned

I have commented at Q 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

Agree, but would want to see new sports facilities created sympathetically with the local surroundings. For example, not a large sports centre that would just draw many people from surrounding areas (which would be of little benefit to local residents)

It is critical to provide areas for different demographics, e.g. more allotments - many homes in Knutsford have limited or no outdoor space suitable for growing fruit and veg, as well as a critical need for activity areas for older children such as a skate park. Education is also critical, we need to invest in our children’s future and the outdated facilities do not do this. Another area where Knutsford currently lets itself down is in the provision of markets such as farmers / Christmas. The Artisan market in Wilmslow provides a huge variety for shoppers, while also filling the main shopping street increasing footfall into the shops themselves. The Knutsford Christmas market in 2011 was a great idea, but had nothing of substance behind it. Offer stalls for lower prices to increase the offerings to visitors. The ad-hoc pedestrianisation of king street and the use of already pedestrianised areas such as Regent street and Silk mill street should be utilised to maximum effect. HOUSING - we need it desperatley... a key driver in the inflated house prices is the severe shortage of houses available!

Come on if you really want to keep the younger population in the town this needs to be rectified!!

Knutsford has poor transport links to Altrincham, Macclesfield etc which need improving. Currently booking Doctor and Dentist appointments is a struggle as always booked well in advance demonstrating how stretched these services are.

Knutsford does not need to be extended further. Our town is sustainable as it is. More houses etc will place further pressure on our current services.

Whilst I agree with the objective I do not think the strategy is correct. I do not believe that the deliverance plan will create the sustainability that you have stated. I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that the town will not recover from. Your plans will kill of up to 65 ha of primary agricultural land, 20 ha of community and private sports areas, 18 ha of biodiversity wood and scrubland as well as 2 lots of allotments when there a large waiting lists.

Knutsford is a small market own and not a suburb of Manchester or Chester which it is danger of becoming. Knutsford has retained its identity and sense of community for several hundred years with unnecessary intervention.
The community is already sustainable in its own right. Why should Knutsford be subject to expansion when the infrastructure cannot sustain it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just motherhood and apple pie!!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But simply words that would apply to any community, doesn't help the debate on how Knutsford should evolve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford is a small market town and not a suburb of Manchester or Chester which if this plan goes ahead is in danger of becoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, there is no reference made to agriculture as a local industry and its (potential) increasing importance to meet local and national food requirements in a future were climate change will impact the world's ability to feed itself. Nor the role that agriculture has to play with the community, e.g. farmer's markets, walking etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the ideas laid out in the sustainable communities section, and they would improve Knutsford if achieved. However, this document doesn't have any ideas on how funding will be raised to achieve these wide aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An information centre in Knutsford is essential. Local facilities for health and social care is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how does this marry with the idea of single large developments bias to one side of the town and not smaller developments around the town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I particularly support the following aspects:

1. Introduction of an information & visitor centre and equally I think good signage/maps should also be considered at key arrival points (train station, car parks etc).
2. Allocating land for community allotments, gardens and orchards.
3. Improving cultural provision - cinema, theatre etc. However, I do not agree that Knutsford needs more children’s play areas - the Moor area is sufficient and children should be encouraged to use the asset Tatton Park.

I agree, providing the strategy doesn't disadvantage current Knutsford residents.

There should be a bullet point indicating that the requirements for housing and employment to meet the towns need will be addressed.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford; it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if your developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place i.e. the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced ,when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.
6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.
Again - are we hearing these proposals from an authority which recently tried to close down the Stanley Day Centre? Your comments are particularly political in including the Civic Centre and the cinema - recently threatened with closure by the council and only prevented by Curzon stepping in.

There is very little detail in the plan about how/when/quality for informed consideration. I live in the area south of b. Why should this area have an employment use? The employment there currently is destination retail, does the plan allow for manufacturing? For me the "devil is in the detail"

Agree with parts but certainly not all of the stated aims

The extra strain of new housing in the proposed sites A, B, C, D & E will have a devastating effect on the nesting lapwings, badger sets, 4 species of bats. The impact of the proposed housing on the local infrastructure will be catastrophic - Knutsford town cannot cope with the traffic in 2012 let alone with an additional 1500 new homes.

This seems to be a template with "Knutsford" added, using key words that amount to common sense. I can’t make any comment on this.

Knutsford also should be the focus of support for those settlements and communities that form its hinterland.

The community cannot be sustained with the scale of developments proposed and this is not even referenced

The objectives and strategy could almost be seen as a list of the failings of the Cheshire and Knutsford’s councils over the past thirty years. These objectives are not even a possibility if the past thirty years are reflected on. What I believe most Knutsford residents would prefer is a straight talking realistic agenda that they believe could be achieved

Fully support the provision of activities for young people. More support and development for Scout and Brownie groups and other community focused groups.

3rd Bullet. Could a new Information and Visitor Centre be provided in the grossly underused County Court building? 5th. I repeat what I said in my comments on the Vision Statement. On local health and local care facilities, it is essential that these facilities and provisions focus especially on the consequences of the exceptionally high percentage of Knutsford residents that will be aged 66 and over during the coming 20 years. The numbers will increase by almost 50% by 2030. Health and care provisions for these elderly people must be local except where admission to hospital for major operations is necessary. Carting people with Alzheimer’s and other forms of dementia - of which there will potentially be 700 to 800 by 2030, each suffering from these afflictions in various degrees of seriousness. There must be facilities and provisions for these patients in Knutsford or within the Knutsford LAP area. It is unacceptable - as at present - for such patients and for their close families to be separated by 10 to 20 miles at places such as Macclesfield and farther afield. Facilities in Knutsford should be made the centre for the treatment and care of those with dementia for the north-west region of Cheshire-East. Last bullet. Now that the Cinema has been leased to a private company, sight must not be lost of the fact that the Cinema is located within the CIVIC CENTRE building. An improvement to the Cinema MUST NOT reduce the area contained by or the facilities of, the Civic Centre Meeting Rooms. They provide not only the largest but the best meeting rooms for all large Community events. I do not want Cheshire East Council even to consider approving a second cinema screen being introduced into the area which is now the Civic Centre’s largest and main meeting room. Any such notions would HAVE TO BE put out to full consultation, but better still, the notion should be ruled out altogether.

Consultant type speak of no real substance Some things are outside the remit/control of those who will implement the plan

Urgent need for a road system to cope with the existing level of traffic.

The key things here I think that are required is better leisure facilities where greater public access is achieved as it is currently limited due to it's attachment to the high school and a place for young adults to congregate as there is no provision at present, i.e. between the ages of 11 and 17.

Strongly agree because there are some very important aspects in this section, although there is quite
a mixed bag. e.g. I wouldn't see space for community gardens and orchards as quite the same level of importance as health facilities!

We need to preserve our open spaces and green belt land. Strengthening existing sports and social provision.

A lot of motherhood statements - nothing to disagree about

There seems to be confusion about the terms objectives and strategy - you need the strategy first and the objectives should identify ways of achieving the strategy. It would in fact be better to have used the terms aims and objectives. So objective 1 should read Aim 1 and the points below would be better termed objectives (although some of the things listed in the strategy are aims, not objectives. Not sure why some on the list have "appropriate" as an adjective and some have "excellent". I also think that there needs to be recognition of the wider use of the term sustainable, which includes identifying minimising environmental and social damage. Why not for example have as an objective that Knutsford becomes a fair trade town? Sustainability would also reference transport strongly (sustainable transport) These comments re mixing up Vision, Strategy, Aims and Objectives applies to all the sections.

The Objective is too generic. For example 'To strengthen the sustainable community' needs to say what a sustainable community means, how much it needs to be strengthened and how this will be measured. How 'sustainable' is the current Knutsford community? The Strategy is a list of generic statements. It needs to be more specific about where and how opportunities for teenagers can be improved.

If only you would do this. For example, reopen Bexton Hospital.

Developing existing healthcare facilities rather than creating one "super surgery", with a view to providing more services locally, rather than going to Macclesfield.

Many of our current resources are under used and poorly promoted. There are already youth clubs and sport facilities which I believe are not fully endorsed or funded. Our current transport is pitiful. Train services and bus services are being cut back and Sunday services make it virtually impossible to travel. Local health services have been cut or closed. Local current businesses cannot currently thrive as rates are so very high, making their end product so expensive and unaffordable to many. Perhaps supporting and promoting what we already have would be much more appropriate for our town without the need to turn Knutsford into a commercial myriad of anonymity containing mega proportions of cold, hard, commercial business. I cannot think of any where worse to live. My sister lives somewhere like this and children go to school with bullet proof glass in the reception area!

A priority for facilities for the elderly and teenage communities

Objective and strategy vague and ill defined.

We already have a sustainable community which has all of the features mentioned. We have wonderful sports facilities, with leisure centre, football fields, youth centres, Tatton Park, playgrounds, allotments (some of which would be destroyed by the development plans)

Simplistic aspirations, however the council is not meeting it's current obligations, why trust it in the future? Why is there a need for NEW sports facilities when the existing ones have restricted access hours? Why was the cinema saved by commercial intervention?

Tatton Park is a great beneficiary of CEC funding. It is a wonderful and valuable resource for Cheshire East and a far wider community. However, the park does not really benefit local businesses sufficiently. There needs to be far greater integration of the Park, the events and resources into the local community. This would provide much greater benefit to the local community and most likely reduce the cost to CEC.

Agree but feel it’s a picture of Utopia and totally unrealistic. Also, the question of infrastructure feels loaded - it all depends on the size of the community and if that expands greatly, then it will require even more development to sustain it.

We strongly support the strategy point: Increasing access to new and improved sports and leisure facilities. In addition we would like to see a strategy for improving the participation of people with
disadvantages and disabilities.

Sustainability also requires affordability at a time of public sector austerity, greater efficiency will enhance sustainability.

Basically agree

The group agrees that all development affecting Knutsford must be sustainable, with the correct infrastructure in place prior to any increase in population being imperative.

Ideas are good mention of provision for old and young, - how about provision for the mentally/ physically disabled? also lots of extra land needed to meet allotment demand.

At present, it could be argued the Knutsford as a town is not currently 'sustainable'. Residents must currently travel out of the town for many services, affordable shopping, medical services, and specific larger item shopping. Then when wishing to travel outside of the town, residents are hampered by poor public transport services, e.g. trains are only hourly, buses are the same or worse, and do not travel to many destinations, resulting in connections to other towns difficult. Residents without access to a car could feel trapped. Despite this, Knutsford remains a desirable place to live and work.

Includes identifying land for additional allotments, community gardens and orchards. The value of these land uses for wildlife has been generally overlooked and CWT very much welcomes their inclusion in this TS.

Sustainable community should also embrace other aspects of the health and well-being agenda, including access to a safeguarded, well-maintained and enhanced countryside and heritage assets. It is requested that a suitable bullet point is added to the text in the green shaded box.

Great, but how will this be delivered?!

Reintroduce information centre; better leisure facilities incorporating a theatre

Current facilities should be maintained

Past record - Supporting the civic centre and cinema. It seems not. Children's play areas?

Information and visitor centre best located at Knutsford Heritage Centre but financial support is required to do this.

Particularly facilities and activities for teenagers and reintroduction of visitor centre. There should be venues where teenagers can meet socially in the evening e.g. coffee, juice bars.

Flood risk; surface water and climate control will have a major impact on the delivery of a sustainable community specifically for the capacity of its supporting infrastructure [water supply and sewerage] capacity; not only the existing but their future needs.

Nothing here about local provision for health and social care needs

Already have a pretty good one. Wary of unsupported statements of future developments without plenty of detail for the public to inspect.

This can be done within the current Knutsford footprint and requires no development on green field sites It should be done with consent of people it directly affects.

The use of the word "sustainable" has not been defined in terms applicable to a community. However, the listed actions are all desirable, but I would give culture a higher ranking. The library and cinema in particular should be protected at all costs.

I agree and support the strategy for a sustainable community

At present a very high proportion of the community work out of Knutsford - part of your strategy could be to increase work opportunities within the town to reduce the carbon footprint of the working population.

The needs must be balanced against environmental considerations and the non development of greenbelt land. Knutsford's historic treasures must be preserved; the immense character of the town must be balanced against sensible developments.

Existing sports facilities should be retained in their present positions and anything developed alongside.
Again, some of the sentiments are laudable, but why do you have to destroy country side to improve facilities - improve the ones we have. There is no information on what ‘enhancing the provision of facilities means’, I wish there was; I am wrong to assume this will mean building on country side? The sports facilities we have are second to none in many ways: the tennis club, football ground, squash club, cricket club, boys club, and yet these will go in the name of progress. Like much of the document, the strategy is predicated upon an increase in population which Knutsford, as we know it, will not sustain. I am all for improving current facilities, library, cinema etc, but please have the brains to do these things without destroying our precious spaces and in so doing changing the character of the town for the worse. The section also speaks of maintaining and supporting community facilities how will this be achieved if you build on them.

Site B contains 2 fishing ponds which are very regularly and keenly used. These would be lost if the site is developed. Site A is adjacent to the woods on Tabley Hill which affords rough shooting. Its use for this purpose would be prevented if site A is developed. They together provide a great current leisure facility which would be lost, and aesthetic benefit to the very many pedestrians who (surprisingly) walk to the cemetery, particularly on weekends. This quiet road gives pedestrian access to the countryside for residents on this side of Knutsford (unlike Manchester Road which is unattractively busy for pedestrians.

Again I would like to see objective and strategy to improve local roads - Knutsford comes to a halt when there is a problem on the M6. Increasing visitor access will not happen with traffic congestion - remember the first Tatton RHS show when traffic didn’t move for an hour!

Provision of health and social care facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community.

There is a real need for a visitor centre again, and there is also a lack of skill and apprenticeship training opportunities within the town. Garden spaces, leisure facilities and cultural provision also need improvement.

Whilst I agree with the objective I do not think the strategy is realistic. I do not believe that the deliverance plan will create the sustainability stated. I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that the town will not recover from. Your plans will destroy up to 65 ha of primary agricultural land, 20 ha of community and private sports areas, 18 ha of biodiverse wood and scrubland as well as 2 areas of allotments.

Is this something that we should be doing anyway? I feel the proposals around a sustainable community do not reflect what’s positive about Knutsford and what we have to build upon - for example our cottage hospital and unspoilt green belt.

I fail to acknowledge that there is a necessity for building more 'affordable' housing in Knutsford, but acknowledge the need for a small amount of social housing. These are private developments that are for profit not for the benefit of the community. There are plenty of community facilities in Knutsford they are just too expensive to use. The Tourist information that was closed down fairly recently was perfectly adequate, however, as I think with the proposed developments many tourists will choose to stay away, perhaps it won't be necessary. Might I suggest the listed building opposite Waterstones which is currently falling to rack and ruin due to the high rates in the area. There are health care facilities which compared to some areas are very good and building the centre at Parkgate by using a significant area of Greenbelt, i.e. Dog wood is unacceptable. The leisure facilities at the leisure centre and Egerton are very good and I fail to accept the necessity to eat into green belt to improve something that is already working. The football pitch at Longridge has been moved and replaced by a multipurpose space of very poor quality freeing up what I presume is now a development plot at the
The water table in this area cannot sustain more development. We have a sports barn at St John’s wood, paid for I believe by Lottery funding and Cheshire East, all that is needed, is for the community to be able to access it. To suggest the developing of local facilities for the elderly having just closed down the dementia care unit at Bexton, is quite frankly beyond a joke, given that the main problem for the elderly identified is dementia. The local elderly projects on Longridge depend upon grants and small amounts of funding instead of finances which should be provided by a council. Our elderly should be cared for and respected. The Library provides internet access to meet local needs, We have asked repeatedly for allotments on Longridge and yet they can only be found in the plans in other identified areas. As to cultural provision, you have recently sold the cinema so that does away with that one. This consultation has not been open and transparent, very few people less than 10% of those we surveyed know about the implications particularly at this end of Knutsford. The suggestion to eat into Green Belt to provide another school is frankly insulting given that the community had a school, St John’s wood, which was taken from the community and is currently used for 40 children who are ferried in by taxi, at great cost...reopen this school if there is a need greater than that of 40 pupils! Children already play here but as the proposed developments on Longridge and Parkgate will create so much traffic they will no longer be safe to play on the streets, they risk being squashed...this policy to build is not necessary and I do not believe will benefit and kick start the economy, this has been tried in other countries and has failed miserably...additionally it relies on banks we salvaged at great financial cost, lending, which they are failing to do. There are huge swathes of Brown belt sites across the country and housing purchased by fat cat developers prior to the recession which they have failed to develop and that sit there empty...this is quite frankly immoral in the current climate...this government needs to have the courage to say build there or not at all...other councils across the country have refused to follow the directive in the NPPF and are refusing to build on Green belt land, but then Cheshire East is a conservative council so what hope Knutsford!

Re-introduction of information and visitor centre is essential - it should be open at weekends. - Need to consider that Mid Cheshire and South Trafford Colleges are near and public transport to them - Present allotments and sports facilities should not be threatened.

The emphasis should be on sustainable.

Whilst I agree with the objective I do not think the strategy is realistic. I do not believe that the deliverance plan will create the sustainability stated. I believe that the plans will alter Knutsford in ways that the town will not recover from. Your plans will destroy up to 65 ha of primary agricultural land, 20 ha of community and private sports areas, 18 ha of biodiverse wood and scrubland as well as 2 areas of allotments.

Existing leisure centre facilities are poor. Schools are oversubscribed. If between 450 and 1200 new homes are built, can the town afford to meet the needs of new families and the elderly? Schools are bustling at the seams right now, would it be as easy to build a new school as it is to build a bunch of new houses? I can't stand trying to get through the Canute roundabout in the mornings and late afternoons, traffic is always so backed up, how can that change to accommodate more commuters and school-runners? And wasn't there talk of stopping the bus circuit? If a bunch of elderly housing is built on the edge of town, it's too far to walk. I just feel like the town is having difficulties sustaining the community that it is today, let alone an increased population. If Knutsford could do something like Winsford and pull off building a new leisure centre with a theatre that attracts speakers and activities for additional income, we could totally use it now! I prefer to pay an arm and a leg to go to Cottons where I can work out in a proper aerobics room and have my young son play safely in a warm kiddy pool.

I especially support the provision of a Visitor Centre, as Knutsford is popular with groups and individuals visiting attractions like Tatton and Tabley and also events and this is beneficial to the economy. Local healthcare and social services are vital, especially with a mixture of an aging population and young families it should be possible to get to these (both inside and outside
Knutsford) without having a car. Hopefully the references to infrastructure and transport include attention to the state of the highways - both road surfaces and pavements. The general state around the town can only be described as appalling, and presumably after the completion of the current gas works and the impact of another winter will only get worse.

1. These representations are made on behalf of the Manchester Meeting Room Trust which represents the interests of local Church Communities across South Manchester and East Cheshire, which form part of the wider Brethren Church Community. Members of the Brethren Church Community seek to meet in purpose built halls which are appointed Places of Worship. Such facilities are used only for Christian worship and congregation and not for secular or other activities they are used for services, church meetings, prayers, Bible readings, Gospel sermons, The Lord Supper, etc. 2. The main purpose of these submissions is to highlight what we believe are shortcomings in the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation in terms of planning positively to meet all community development needs, with a particular emphasis on places of worship and meeting facilities for all faith groups. The Government has recognised the value of faith communities within the wider community: Multi-cultural communities are often multi-faith communities and this should be fully recognised in policies aimed at promoting diversity. We aim to support strong and active communities in which people of all races and backgrounds are respected. We recognise faith communities as an important part of the local community and value the experience, skills and diversity they bring to wider society. (Department of Communities and Local Government website)

3. Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) indicates that the planning system needs to perform a number of roles, including a social role. The social role is seen as: supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being.

4. Paragraph 70 of the NPPF indicates that in order to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs planning policies and decisions should, amongst other things: plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. Not only does the NPPF provide broad policy support for a diverse range of local community facilities, including places of worship, but it also requires planning to plan positively for such facilities in the same way they are required to plan positively for other forms of development (e.g. housing, business, retail, leisure, etc).

5. Furthermore, in considering the narrower issue of providing for development of community facilities the needs of faith groups and communities for meeting halls/places of worship are no less relevant than other development types such as education, health, leisure and cultural facilities. All too frequently, however, the development needs of faith groups and communities are marginalised or ignored.

6. In the South Manchester/East Cheshire area it is anticipated that there will be growth in congregation numbers occasioned by organic growth of established Brethren communities and by inward migration of growth business establishments, related housing relocations and influx of whole family groups, staff and capital investments from other areas.

7. Facility requirements for Brethren Church Communities are two-fold: (I) Local/neighbourhood facilities the key requirement for the local group is a meeting place for regular worship, with the principal service being the Lords Supper on Sunday mornings. For practical reasons this service is organised around relatively small whole family groups of congregants (typically 30-45 persons) to provide for a communal level of involvement and avoid protracted services. It is the established practice of Brethren communities to provide local/neighbourhood facilities in close proximity to the local congregation. That can often relate to a relatively dispersed rural congregation. (ii)
Principal/Township facilities established practice of the Brethren community is to provide principal/township meeting halls to accommodate the collective assembling of all the local groups for a range of Church Services and meetings, and also to accommodate periodic attendance by visitor groups from the nearest neighbouring township. The building/facility requirements generated by the organic growth and locational evolution of Brethren communities will generate legitimate development needs for both local/ neighbourhood and principal/township halls. It is appropriate that the emerging planning policy framework for East Cheshire plans positively to meet these development needs.

8. The Introduction to the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation points out that the proposed Cheshire East Local Plan (CELP) will look at the social, economic and environmental needs of the area generally and the towns within it (paragraph 1.6). However, paragraph 1.7 of the Draft Consultation states: It will also consider the needs of other types of land-use, such as employment, retail and leisure uses. It is worrying that such a limited list of other development types is listed. We feel that the document should explicitly state that all of the communities development needs (including community buildings, meeting halls and places of worship) are planned for. Paragraph 70 of the NPPF requires planning policies to plan positively for the provision of community facilities, including meeting places and places of worship.

9. The Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation states the objective for a Sustainable Community as follows: To strengthen the sustainable community, where all members are able to contribute and where all of the infrastructure required to support the current and future community. This is a positive objective as it appears to recognise that all infrastructure required to support community needs are planned for and provided. However, the subsequent Strategy box contains a comprehensive exposition of the types of infrastructure and facilities envisaged (e.g. Information and visitor Centre; health and social care facilities for older people; sport; allotments; gardens and orchards; play area; library; theatre; cinema) but faith related facilities such as places of worship or meeting halls are not even mentioned. In our view such facilities are of equal merit in planning terms (and in terms of their value in supporting sustainable communities) and should be explicitly provided for in the CELP.

10. In taking the CELP forward it is our view that a policy framework must be provided which recognises the legitimate development needs of all faith communities. Indeed, it is our clear view that, to ensure consistency with the NPPF, such development needs must be positively planned for.

The strategy is clearly written by a consortium that does not understand living in Knutsford with no underlying business case for these proposed new houses.

This is a wish list not a strategy. As with the Vision: where are the specifics? We have just abandoned a health centre, where are the updated surgeries to go? The preferred development areas will wipe out allotments yet the strategy is to increase them. How about six-day opening of the library? What does 'securing excellent educational facilities' actually mean?

Particularly agree that existing facilities should be supported, maintained, enhanced and even extended for the benefit of the community.

Agree in principle, although there was no detail whatsoever about how these objectives would be achieved so impossible to comment further.

Location of community facilities and services need to be most appropriately sited for the population they serve. Those services used by the whole population should be located in the town centre - including a new health centre for Knutsford (if a new health centre is decided. The previous suggested location at Shaw Heath was not in the town centre and inaccessible to many residents - which is why it was not supported).

What in this strategy item does Knutsford not already have?..... a community orchard!

Existing sports facilities should be retained in their present positions, and anything developed alongside.

Natural England support the importance of Objective 1, to strengthen the sustainable community. In particular, strategies to promote Knutsford town centre by improving local services and access to
services, as this will reduce the need to travel and contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Local business
For local business and local traders not multinationals
Not necessary
Sports and leisure facilities are good. Don’t change them
The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them
Yes infrastructure is needed but not based on expansion
Knutsford has been sustainable since Canute, don’t interfere with it.
People research information electronically - information centre would be largely empty. Don’t agree with moving sports facilities further from town centre.
If new facilities are to be provided/improved new housing development must be taken into account
Where is the money coming from for all you propose?
Funding?
Are we not already sustainable? If not why not?
Need to at least maintain far better improved sporting facilities.
Leisure facilities particularly and facilities for children
Knutsford - a lovely town surrounded by countryside don’t you know when you’re lucky?
re-open visitor centre and improve health and social care facilities
No indication how will be achieved. Linked to additional population resulting from housing land release.
Providing the age profile can be addressed - younger people to replace the age profile
Most essential elements could be achieved with very little effort and minimal expense
Health is contentious - what is intended?
Who pays?
Objective and Strategy 2: Economy

Do you agree or disagree with the Economy Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 82% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (17%); Agree (47%); Neither Agree or Disagree (19%); Disagree (12%); Strongly Disagree (5%)

Comments:

Public transport links to existing development at Parkgate? Wouldn’t a station there be of economic benefit?

Increasing the visitor offer and tourism potential by maximising the benefits of Knutsford’s landscape, heritage, shopping, restaurant, pubs and other entertainment and recreational assets is a must because the more visitors to the town, the more the above get used the more the business will invest and the more jobs they will create. Added to this is the number of businesses who will be attracted due to the high footfall and profile of the town

Particularly support to existing local businesses. Providing incubators is a sound suggestion but of little benefit if existing businesses cannot be retained. High rental costs are putting our unique, independent businesses at risk. Pressure from chain stores should be resisted.

Strategy should include positions of employment being created for 1) Town centre business manager and 2) Employment areas development manager. There should be an employment agency. Impact of Manchester Airport needs consideration. A major employer and source of employees are the Towns schools; they should be considered an economic asset.

If the Western Rail link from Crewe to Manchester Airport via Knutsford was developed it would benefit the economy of the town hugely, not sure why this has not been specifically mentioned as it has been discussed for over a decade now. Adding more industrial units to Longridge would provide jobs but it also increases traffic and pollution, are these things you want to be increasing? Building
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be good for Knutsford if we could support our Heritage Centre more, it is definitely something we should help and show boat as anyone wanting to visit and really find out about us, it is here they will go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate estate needs expansion and should have a better access point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a tradesman, extra homes will certainly provide me with more work, but I don’t see this as necessary in any way though. If you REALLY want to boost the economy, deal with the traffic situation first. Making it easier for people to get in and out of the town centre should be the most important consideration. Many times, I’ve taken my custom elsewhere because the town is in gridlock, or due to lack of parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will rely on greater connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree with the reference to Parkgate. This industrial estate is on the wrong side of town and should phased out and replaced by housing. An alternative business park should be located on land near west of KHS near the motorway with access to Northwich Road, thereby reviving the Adams Hill Brook street area of much heavy traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The emphasis should be to optimise current and vacant facilities rather than new builds. The proposals recently for Tatton Park would align to this strategy and highlights an inappropriate attention to the impact on existing residents and their environment (roads, access to countryside, Tatton). Therefore the strategy does not reflect the need to balance economic development with current standard of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You need to decide what Knutsford is, is it to be an industrial town or a dormitory town? What you describe is more businesses. Why do you mention privately owned sites under your strategy e.g. Radbroke Hall. You are proposing to lose a lot of green land around the town how can that be reconciled with ‘The benefit of landscape heritage’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree, although I draw attention to my comments in question 1, regarding how these plans will affect the existing residents in Tabley Close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses in Knutsford in the current economic climate need a massive amount of support. Sara, who owns Cherry Tree, is having to close down due to ever increasing rentals and overheads. One by one the little independents, another is the cook/kitchen utensil shop, are being forced to close with seemingly no help or incentive for them to stay. The only new comers to town and the only ones who can afford the rent etc are the likes of Waitrose, Sainsbury’s, and Aldi. Again these are very convenient but I would rather show my support and shop local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current high skill, high tech economy should be maintained and actively encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the idea of business incubator units. Am worried about the seeming increase in empty shopping units in the town centre, perhaps more should be done encourage new businesses to take on the empty units and to support those already trading. Would be especially good if greater diversity of occupiers could be encouraged, a vibrant town centre is vital to the sustainability of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot argue with that again it is all common sense. Opening up access to Parkgate site by bridge over railway is ESSENTIAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I run my own business and would find the following really helpful: places to hold meetings which could be used on a free or very cheap basis, office space with internet connection to be hired on a pay as you go basis, promotion of apprenticeships and better links with local schools for work experience/internships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with improving existing employment areas (Booths Hall, industrial estates) however consideration must be made for employee parking and increased traffic along these roads. I cannot see increasing the number of occupants in the town centre due to the crowded layout that already exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving links between town centre with an emphasis on sustainable transport - walking, cycling,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and public transport.

When the roads are gridlocked by M6 traffic - bypass.

The tourism economy of Knutsford is dependent upon the uniqueness and the quality of what is on offer as these are central to marketing and word of mouth promotion. A marketing strategy should be developed for the town in which the promotion of the town centre (as currently listed in objective 4) and Tatton are key elements. What is meant by the term "links"

Crucial to improve links between town centre and other main employment areas such as airport and Altrincham.

We shouldn't be looking to increase local employment if there is no realistic demand. I say this because many of the offices, shops and particularly industrial units on Parkgate, Longridge and other areas are EMPTY and have been for a considerable amount of time. We should not be building on greenfield sites where there is clearly NO demand. So the 'appropriate' sites should be on existing brownfield sites.

Need to look at balance of business rates against high rentals and the balance of small business to survive

Again, it would be hard to disagree, but what about the specifics? How exactly will these objectives be met?

Why was the development by Bentley's of Knutsford not linked to the funding of another access bridge/tunnel to Parkgate, this should have been carried out as part of the development there. How can Parkgate expand without this - there has been a lack of initiative and drive on this. Knutsford has a wonderful High School - all businesses need to be made aware of this and forge links with it in some way. The local press could help much more with this in promoting the school and local businesses.

There is already sufficient areas for industrial employment opportunities and a significant proportion are currently vacant. Knutsford currently does not need employment opportunities and employment should not be developed through industrial development, which would damage the nature of the market town.

Communications and parking would be most benefit to commerce.

I think that improving existing provision can help the economy of Knutsford without large scale house building and industrial units going up on green belt land.

Lets fill the industrial units that currently lie empty before building more

No building on Green Belt or expansion of Knutsford.

Do not agree with increasing shopping areas for visitors and tourism - this should be done instead by increasing leisure activities and events on the outskirts of town. We need to protect and look after our local boutiques and local businesses and not encourage large high street shops to the area which will adversely affect our local shops. Existing employment areas should be promoted and improved before spoiling the town centre by creating new sites. existing employers should be supported

Other than the extant industrial estates, where is the land for development of new sites for employment? Every square inch of Knutsford has been developed and it is like a mediaeval town with the Green Belt as its walls. You have not looked at what kind of employment you would wish to encourage here and the fact that we do not have the infrastructure to build it. At least 6 years ago planning permission was given for development on Parkgate Industrial Estate which required an underpass under the railway line. The Portfolio holder told us it was a win win situation and MBC would provide the money for the underpass as a driver. It would all be completed in 2006. We are still waiting! The land contiguous with the Parkgate Industrial is also ecologically important (EAI done by Penny Anderson Ass. for Randall Brookes for an application there approx. 4/5 years ago). Expansion of that would be detrimental to that Birkin Brook area and your own vision on natural environment and green spaces.

Employment / mixed use development on Green Belt is unnecessary given the real need for jobs in Crewe, Congleton and Macclesfield
Develop what you have already in the town. Affordable rents, rates etc.

Already got one.

Looks like a list of desirables with no comment whatsoever on what is required to achieve either the promotion of the economic potential of Knutsford nor enhancing the town's visitor economy.

I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box.

Largely agree but would not want to see new allocations of land for businesses if it was to the detriment of the local character. Would not want to see Knutsford turned into an out of town retail park.

The vision is positive, but as we hear regularly the costs of running a retail establishment in Knutsford is often beyond the capability of individual / boutique shop owners. Another critical issue with improving the economy on Knutsford is Parking... this issue needs resolving ASAP... either by building a suitable, tiered car park or excavating to hide a tiered car park underground. Office parking in Knutsford is difficult, stopping many firms from taking office space, and those who do, then their staff are forced to use existing car parks (limiting the spaces for shoppers / visitors) or using the free space in residential roads surrounding the towns. sort out parking and then companies and visitors will come to Knutsford.

We have a good mix of shops and businesses. There is vacant shop and business space in and around the town. No need to build more. We do not want our identity to become another faceless town. We need our individuality and independent shops to continue to draw in visitors. Large chains would not benefit our town.

Whilst I agree with the general objective I do not believe that the strategy is correct. At present there are approx. 9% empty units in the town centre, and 20% industrial units standing empty, not including Booths Hall. If these units were fully utilized there would be no employment problems in the Knutsford area. What is needed is cheaper rent and rates to help new start ups, as well as encouraging growth of existing businesses.

The Knutsford economy is largely based on being an administrative or leisure facility. For leisure, I mean visiting the restaurants and bars in the town and visiting Tatton Park. Expansion will overload the existing local roads and parking which are already at capacity, and overloaded during certain events such as events in Tatton and when there are problems on the M6.

Need more visitor accommodation - hotels etc

The main problem is that businesses are charged too high rents from the landlords, the town is full of restaurant chains and not enough small businesses, grocers, bakers etc that would really benefit the town.

Too generic.

However, there is no reference made to agriculture as a local industry and its (potential) increasing importance to meet local and national food requirements in a future were climate change will impact the world's ability to feed itself. Nor the role that agriculture has to play with the community, e.g. farmer's markets, walking etc.

The economy can be strengthen significantly by the improvement of transportation links such as bus and train links, entry on and off the M6 and M56, and the link between the two. This would be a cheap and effective alteration which could improve investment in the area and also the amount of money that residents and visitors spend in the town. I agree there should be appropriate increases in employment opportunities, but this needs to be done sensibly. There would be no sense in increasing retail units for example if existing units lie empty due to the high rents. Parking rates and availability, and unit rental costs are a prohibitive factor for visitors and businesses.

The visitor economy in Knutsford should be enhanced because it will support the specialist retail shops. Expanding other employment sites is not essential to maintaining the character of the town.

Knutsford independent shops cannot survive for the long term because the landlord rates and rent are...
prohibitive to the footfall. i.e. car parking and its cost are directly associated with the success of shops. Every parking ticket may be a success for Cheshire East but it drives the payee to the supermarket and potentially a loss of £1000 a year in shopping value. You don't need a degree in planning to see this link.

Whilst I agree with the majority of the strategy for this objective, I would be cautious about identifying and allocating appropriate sites for new and expanding employment opportunities with regards to the aesthetic look and feel of any new office buildings and they should be thought out carefully regarding location. For example, the offices on Tatton Street (on route to the most vital tourist asset Tatton park) should not have been allowed - this route should be full of independent shops and attractions and not mundane office blocks that ruin the heritage market town feel of Knutsford.

I think it is important that future business opportunities reflect the size and nature of the town. I do not wish to see industrial parks or large corporate setting up. A lot of people live in Knutsford to escape city life and I think it is important that the town remains an environment for local and independent businesses.

The attraction to visitors depends partly on shopping but chiefly on heritage. It has a "distinctive character" that draws visitors. If the town grows too large this there is a risk that this "distinctive character" would be undermined.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford; it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if you developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place i.e. the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced ,when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.
6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

Up-grading some roads and providing cycle lanes will be necessary if this is to work together with the strategies for providing a sustainable community and enhancing the environment.

Once again a long wish list of idealistic aims, which have no chance of happening in reality. We couldn't even get the other access to the Parkfield commercial estate sorted.

the trading estates seem under-used currently, so this is good.

What plans exist to improve the current areas of commercial development improving the access to and from these areas to connect to the main roads?

Agree with parts but certainly not all of the stated aims

I agree that the economy in Knutsford needs to be strengthened, Who wouldn’t???? Rents are too high, visitor numbers are low, parking is scarce but how can you improve this? It says to improve links
between towns and increase visitors but it doesn't say how. We need ideas not statements of the obvious.

Need to ensure that consumer spending does not leak out of the town to neighbouring centres. Need to improve and promote the market.

does not include reference to encouraging existing business

The objectives and strategy could almost be seen as a list of the failings of the Cheshire and Knutsford’s councils over the past thirty years. These objectives are not even a possibility if the past thirty years are reflected on. What I believe most Knutsford residents would prefer is a straight talking realistic agenda that they believe could be achieved. The plan talks about improving the town centre. Twenty years ago we had a town with a good mixture of real shops. Now all we have are restaurants, coffee shops, estate agents and pubs. The decline in the facilities for local residents over the past two decades has not been addressed by the local councils, and I believe in twenty years time all we will have is a town visited by the tourist.

Transport to and from Parkgate and Longridge estates causes traffic chaos at peak times.

How does the Council influence, for example, Barclays at Radbrooke Hall?? The entire list of targeted employment areas is on the opposite side of the town to most of the proposed new housing thus increasing traffic flow through an already very congested town - there is no sense of joined up thinking! Again a focus on more tourists - how many residents would support this proposition?

Need for affordable rents for businesses to thrive.

The only concern I have is over the creation of new employment sites as the current sites nowhere near full capacity and I think it is too early to assume that the economy will improve significantly to justify additional employment sites.

A lot of the bullets in this section do depend on what the vision for the future of the town really is (see earlier comments). Personally I do not believe the strategy should be to put a big emphasis on 'industrialising' Knutsford by big efforts to promote local industry. Knutsford has significant local historical and leisure opportunities and a better focus for the vision could be on prioritising these and drawing visitors into the town.

I don’t agree with the construction of and further industrial or retail units until we have filled existing empty ones. Stanley road trading estate, Parkgate, booth hall for example all have empty units. There are also many empty shop units in the town centre. We need to reduce rates/rents to help existing traders and encourage new ones to the town.

Does Knutsford really need more restaurants???? If enhancing the town’s visitor economy really means putting a theme park in Tatton Park, then I’m against it. (Not that Tatton Park is even mentioned as part of the strategy.)

What about taking a leaf out of Boris Johnson’s book and have as an economic objective for Knutsford to be a town that pays a "living wage"?

Bland 'apple pie' statements

transport to Wilmslow and Warrington would help.

How can the extra jobs created benefit the residents of Knutsford if you overpopulate the area? The added population created will be disproportionately elevated to the employment opportunities made available. What makes Knutsford most attractive is that it is quaint. Visitors are attracted to Knutsford for that very reason. Work within that remit and support enterprises and initiatives to promote the town’s unique prominence.

Very careful consideration needs to be given to new businesses to ensure you are not just moving business from one site to another, causing vacant premises elsewhere; or that you put the smaller businesses out of business

Objective and strategy vague and ill defined. When will definitive plans be available?

I agree with supporting existing employment sites, and feel that the use of these should be maximised, but do not agree that we should have additional sites unless this can be done on
brownfield sites. We have a beautiful historic town, not an industrial town.

However there are a lot of empty shops in Knutsford at present without building any more.

A strong economy will benefit all. Where is the investment in the market hall? Why is the old town hall still empty? Where is the planning enforcement on the ALDI site?

I particularly think there is scope to promote and improve existing employment areas and to use technology to improve flexible working.

To promote the visitor economy, infrastructure projects are critical, i.e. King St Enhancement, improved parking, better signage, improved transport connections including the Metro Link to the airport. There needs to be a properly manned and clearly signed visitor centre, encourage historical activities on a regular basis. Key employment area of Parkgate does not provided sufficient local employment. Even new retail developments such as Waitrose do not employ local people, why is this? Access to Parkgate needs to be improved to allow for easier freight movements. Relocation of industrial/commercial properties to the north west of the town is not really the answer as this would eradicate far too much green belt.

Again it all sounds wonderful in an ideal world. OK if the new sites identified are in areas already agreed for development and not green belt. Tourism always seems to revolve around Tatton Park which does not benefit the town in any way, just Tatton. All Tatton seems to bring to this town is inconvenience and traffic problems. We are given nothing by Tatton and it causes us problems and a great deal of resentment.

Health and wellbeing services can also be major employers in both the public, voluntary and public sectors. The increased use of personalised budgets for health and social care are likely to increase the mix of provision.

Basically agree

As the group’s primary remit is the heritage and conservation of Knutsford, it does not feel it appropriate to comment on items outside that remit.

Already employment sites unused in Knutsford these should be used before new development is considered if visitor numbers are to increased substantial additional funding is required to improve transport infrastructure. Also improvements are required in public toilets, refuse disposal/recycling points and street cleanliness.

Knutsford benefits from a highly entrepreneurial community, many of whom go unnoticed, perhaps unrewarded. This must be promoted and enhanced. Education standards especially in the high school (Academy) must be improved and enhanced, as currently the school appears to attract many pupils from outside the town who may not contribute to the town as much as we would wish, whilst many of town’s student population choose to travel out of town. This cannot be sustainable for our young, and the reasons should be investigated.

it is agreed that there is additional potential for the visitor economy in the Knutsford area and it is appropriate to look to tap into this through sustainable tourism initiatives. It will be important to ensure that the qualities of this offer are not compromised by other aspects of the Knutsford ambition, including by the careful consideration of the amount and location of new development.

Unrealistic to expect many people actually work and live in same town. Improving transport links will only encourage commuting in an out of town which is already a reality.

Provision of High speed broadband and other new technologies to all properties, old and new and those on the rural outskirts need to be prioritised. This will ensure small businesses and home run businesses can contribute to the local economy.

Discourage heavy traffic coming through the centre of Knutsford

Particularly small businesses and connections between education and training providers.

No comments to make at this stage.

Knutsford was a market town and is principally a dormitory town. Don't want to turn Knutsford into a light industrial town, with its adverse consequences. High property rental charges and rates do little to
encourage the return of the type of shops that once flourished here. Pedestrianisation will change the character of the town (which you say elsewhere you wish to retain) and reduce short term parking (which you admit is at a premium) for the elderly in particular.

This can be done within the current Knutsford footprint and requires no development on green field sites it should be done with consent of people it directly affects.

The type of appropriate business/industry should be defined.

We agree with the principle but would wish to raise 2 points: 1) The identification and allocation of appropriate sites should consider promoting and improving the existing employment areas as opposed to developing new sites. Of the existing sites mentioned in the plan there are many vacant units (c. 20%), please consider ways of improving and developing these before committing to new sites. 2) We agree with retaining young people and the working population and are aware that there is are plenty of council and ex-council properties well below the national average making such housing affordable to first time buyers.

Too much emphasis on expansion.

Knutsford must be protected to ensure significant numbers of tourists continue to visit, attracted by the historic and natural charms of the town. One of Knutsford’s many attractions is the cosmopolitan town centre which boasts a number of unique shopping experiences for local inhabitants and visitors alike. Knutsford does not enhance its scenic reputation with potential visitors through the continued development of trading and industrial estates. Many recent commercial developments remain unoccupied rendering the proposal for future commercial expansion unnecessary.

Access to Parkgate needs to be substantially improved. New information point could be implemented immediately.

Although I agree with most of what is written, what does identify and allocate sites for employment mean. Again, there is not enough detail to comment. I hope this is not more built-up areas. I think improving communication links is a jolly good idea. Established sites, such as Parkgate industrial estate etc should be used to their full potential. I am not sure how tourism will be enhanced if Knutsford’s wonderful surroundings are built on.

I do not regard it as appropriate to build on green belt farm land to ‘create a range of employment opportunities. Further the farmland is currently the economic well-being of the town by being farmed, providing employment that way.

Development of employment opportunities that would enable young people to develop fulfilling careers paying them realistic salaries that would enable them to live and work locally. This would result in more balanced demographic than at present.

Development needed to ensure a young, working population is retained, with particular emphasis on transport within and out of the town, and also on connections between trainers, education and employers. Business rates are also incredibly high.

Whilst I agree with the general objective I do not believe that the strategy is realistic. At present approximately 9% of the units in the town centre, and 20% of industrial units are standing empty (not including Booths Hall). There is no need to build more industrial units if there as many empty units in the town waiting to be utilised.

I don’t believe there is any need to “create” additional employment opportunities. There are numerous opportunities within easy reach in neighbouring major cities, towns etc. What is needed is an accessible and effective public transport system to allow people to travel to work. Furthermore, with increasing opportunities for people to work at home there will be reduced need for employment spaces as such in the future. The only employment Knutsford will require is that associated with the additional health, education & social needs associated with the growing population.

Whilst I agree with the general objective I do not believe that the strategy is realistic. At present approximately 9% of the units in the town centre, and 20% of industrial units are standing empty (not including Booths Hall). There is no need to build more industrial units if there as many empty units in the town waiting to be utilised.
This is something that the council has been found wanting, particularly when 100's of jobs have been lost and local companies have had their hands tied!

There are already employment spaces in Knutsford, currently lying empty due to extortionate rates in the area. New business will find it hard to develop unless this is addressed. Parkgate is full of empty units as is the new development on Mobberley road where Bentleys is. I fail to see how you are going to improve links with the town centre and other areas when the roads will be so congested that traffic cannot flow and to suggest moving the fire station at a time that you are proposing to develop is lunacy in action. There are properties above shops standing empty and might I suggest a ceiling on the rental that private landlords charge for properties in areas to encourage young people to stay, most just cannot afford to live here given the current rents and property prices...as to affordable housing, that is what was supposed to be being built on Longridge by Plum Life, they are not affordable in any way shape or form to a new buyer, these ideas are merely a profit making exercise by East Cheshire and the developers. As the town will be too congested to encourage visitors to the centre of town I suspect it will have the opposite effect to benefiting the economy, I will probably find it quicker to shop in Wythenshawe than attempt to get into the town centre....I feel that tourists will start to stay away if their only option is to sit in traffic for huge chunks of their leisure time...perhaps this is why Cheshire East are rapidly building links with Tatton to plug the gap as tourism falls, The obscene Wychcote wood decimation will involve covering a large chunk of the park with concrete for parking, Cheshire East and Tatton seem to have forgotten that they are merely custodians for a park that was given to the people of Knutsford by Lord Egerton, he will be turning in his grave ! On the plans that we saw at a recent meeting re Parkgate development proposals, references to employment are made, insinuating that employment will be provided, one of these is the Bentley building, which has no intention of employing people from the local community currently..I find this extremely misleading

The creation of employment opportunities is likely to be problematic - it is necessary to support the current shops and services which are sometimes priced-out by high rents. A new industrial estate just this side of Northwich has not been completed and too much emphasis on employment may compromise Knutsford's attractiveness for tourism and residence.

Need to exercise caution. Establishing new industries could interfere with the town's existing attractions.

Whilst I agree with the general objective I do not believe that the strategy is realistic. At present approximately 9% of the units in the town centre, and 20% of industrial units are standing empty (not including Booths Hall). There is no need to build more industrial units if there as many empty units in the town waiting to be utilised.

lower the rates on the existing commercial properties in the town centre and fill those empty units.

Some good intentions but wanting to promote employment opportunities and develop Parkgate, Longridge and Radbrook Hall, yet have the majority of new homes built to accommodate the growing community In areas identified within plots A, B, C, D & E will choke all traffic links across town. Manchester Road is unnavigable at many times of the rush hour day so adding even more residents to one side of town seems counterproductive - how long before the Knutsford by-pass starts generating interest and momentum?

I think the percentage of available space to lease in the town centre has increased from 6% since the 2010 report. Just walk down King Street. The types of shops that make the town centre quaint and unique seem to be closing. Out of curiosity I looked at the monthly lease for the kitchen store space - no wonder it is still available! How can small businesses be supported and sustained when they have to make a boatload of revenue every month to just pay the bills? If more businesses are built over in the Parkgate area and new houses built on the M6 side of town, the roads through town would most definitely have to change to get people to work within a reasonable amount of time. Even at 11am the traffic can be incredibly backed up. Where's everyone going? I agree with some of the ideas here but the current state isn't so great.

This needs care - growth into the Green Belt should take place only where it is absolutely essential. I
believe Knutsford will always be something of a commuter town, with people working in Manchester or Chester, so good communications - rail, bus, and car, possibly eventually Metrolink will be important. However existing employment areas should also be improved - this doesn’t necessarily mean growth in the area they cover.

The USP of Knutsford its literary, cultural and architectural heritage as a small but historically significant market town. The addition of 1280 houses on what amounts to an overspill estate will do nothing to enhance its tourist and visitor economy. Let’s fill the existing empty industrial/commercial units before planning new ones. Nantwich is a prime example of a once pleasant market town similar to Knutsford damaged by wholesale housing developments on the periphery. Employment in Knutsford before housing. The town needs to develop a centre of expertise, as Daresbury has in science, in order to attract similar high skill companies to the area and make use of the above average educational and intellectual skills resident in the area.

Booths Hall is a historic designed landscape for which Cheshire Gardens Trust have completed and issued a report. The parkland landscape and pleasure grounds are marred by insensitive 1980s office development but essential elements are still present and should be conserved. This site could be an asset for Knutsford if treated sensitively. Radbroke Hall is some way out of Knutsford and not even on the map. It also was a historic designed landscape.

The type of housing being provided in the new plan is low cost housing and supposed to boost the economy... would these people really shop in Knutsford’s boutique...high priced shops???!!!

Invest in promoting existing and future employment in any way possible.

I like living in Knutsford, partly because I can work and shop locally, and eat out and socialise in the town.

Agree in principle although, again, little detail to evaluate. Also, are we going to retain or retrain young people and workers? They should be able to go elsewhere if they wish!

Not sure what 'incubator units' are so I don't know if they are appropriate for Knutsford

Jobs in Knutsford (at their current scale) are important for the town's economy and many residents are able to work outside the town, because of good road links.

There are already a number of empty business units (office/light industrial/retail) available in Knutsford. Capacity isn't the issue. Rates and rents are the issues - I know I tried to occupy one and the break-even point was unrealistic. Incentives for businesses will bring jobs. I do not feel that Tatton Park is exploited to its potential. For example, a small part of the site away from the main house and attractions could be used as a caravan site. Chatsworth house has a Caravan Club site which is tastefully disguised from the main house, but is always fully booked. This could bring a significant revenue stream into the facility and more visitors to Knutsford. The council cannot realistically improve telecommunications so don't put it in the strategy.

need to face up to the problems that any increase in traffic will bring

Access to Parkgate needs to be substantially improved. New information point could be implemented immediately.

Natural England agree with Objective 2, to promote the economic potential of the town, including enhancing the towns visitor economy by maximising the benefits of the landscape and recreational assets as this has the potential to promote sustainable tourism and leisure developments.

Not necessary.

The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them.

Yes increase visitor strategy by improving not expanding.

The economy, as you call it, will always find its own level without help.

Already ample pubs and restaurants in the town.

Please don’t build any more industrial units until all the existing ones are in full use!

Tourism and visitor economy already well provided for. Town centre has more of interest for visitors than facilities for residents - ghost town most of the week.
Shops in the town should sell 'normal' goods that 'normal' people want to buy.

Agree with some aspects. For the size of Knutsford probably enough retail and light industry. Would be difficult for Knutsford to cope with traffic.

Putting new building up will not sustain the economy long term.

Lower rents and rates for town centre shops!!!

People need jobs, small businesses flourish any influence of CE safeguarding against 800 redundancies at Radbrooke Hall?

Existing sites before providing 'white elephant' sites that remain empty

Not clear how additional sites will be provided. There are still vacant sites within existing employment areas.

Need to attract quality jobs to reduce the travel to work profile.

Achievable by consultation with interested parties on voluntary basis and minimal expense.

Traffic and parking are part of visitor needs.
Objective and Strategy 3: Town Centre

Do you agree or disagree with the Town Centre Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 82% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (21%); Agree (45%); Neither Agree or Disagree (18%); Disagree (7%); Strongly Disagree (9%)

Comments:

Public realm has got to be in keeping with the town centre and add value to the offer. More linkages between different parts of the town are crucial to the development. The shared use of King Street would enhance the character of the town and would invite an alfresco feel and bring visitors to the town that would be worried about the narrow pavements.

Agree with all points but would dissuade efforts to encourage a 'larger range of convenience goods'. This presumably looks to establish Knutsford as a place that meets all local needs. However, it also puts some of our most unique shops at risk. Many local residents and visitors enjoy Knutsford because it has shops that cannot be seen elsewhere - providing very particular products and services. It is unlikely that visitors and local residents would stroll around streets providing typical convenience goods. I do fully support attempts to improve pedestrian movement through the town. Knutsford is starting to struggle with the increased traffic. If this is not tackled, Knutsford will lose its unique character.

The play area on the Moor whilst not part of the town centre - contributes to visitors to the Town and as a feature should be supported by the Town Centre businesses and residents. Open spaces within the town should be protected as over the years some have been lost and this has added to the congestion. Cities appreciate Green lungs within - they do not seek to crowd out with development and then swap facilities the outskirts.

Really nothing new in this section, again if you listened to what businesses want its free parking or
minimum of 2-3 hours just like in Northwich. Also lower rents would help but you wouldn’t want to do anything about that would you as your taxes might suffer...!

The strategy does not propose an appropriate balance between the needs of pedestrians and other users, and stronger actions such as complete pedestrianisation of key town centre routes and closing King Street as a through route should be taken.

Too crowded.

Cycling does need addressing, as you can’t cycle safely, park your bike safely nor use public transport with your bike, but cycling especially for disable people (me) is great exercise. And it is the mode of transport for kids! I predicted a good few years ago that town centres are dead men walking, I buy 95% online and have all delivered as it is so much cheaper, as the next generation grows and matures more and more online shopping will take place and town centres will become ghostly, it is all down to cost and overheads, they will die if this crash waiting to happen is not approached! Pubs close hand over fist as the new generation uses social media to socialise and at £3/£4 a pint, it’s a no brainer why they don’t see it as a viable night out, goodbye pubs!

We support the town centre objective and strategy assuming that again the appropriate balance in transport terms does mean that there will be a genuine attempt to improve the walking and cycling environment. At the moment Knutsford is very much a town designed for and around the private car.

The two main streets urgently need to be made more pedestrian and disabled friendly. The current situation cannot be allowed to continue, and the small minority of traders who oppose such a move should not be allowed to continue to block this when most Knutsfordians have wanted it for many years.

Pedestrianisation aids the elderly and parents with children.

Redevelop Tatton Street car park, Caledonia House and Laura Ashley site.

Please leave Sessions House alone!

Needs a multi-storey car park behind Canute square for office parking and long term parking. Needs cheaper short term parking at the other locations.

Although I agree with a shared surface scheme I am strongly against pedestrianisation as the effects on Wilmslow and Altrincham have had dire consequences to the towns.

What does shred surface mean? Does it mean pedestrians and bikes only? You seem to be encouraging houses being split into apartments, is that what we really want? The route to King street from the library is a problem because you built the library in the wrong place! There seem to be a lot of meaningless buzz words that do not mean much such as ‘inclusive access for all’. Presumably improving the links between the centre and the rest means redeveloping all the roads and losing more of the town!

Please see comments for Economy. Also pedestrian access in Knutsford really needs to be improved. I know to keep the heritage etc it must be difficult but King Street and Princess Street in particular are hard enough to negotiate as an able bodied person let alone those that struggle with wheelchairs, pushchairs etc. In icy weather you are literally dicing with death trying to walk round. Also vehicles negotiate these roads at amazing dangerous speeds considering it’s such a pedestrian area and difficult to navigate.

The current confused developments across the town centre have shown a complete disregard for any sense of a coordinated plan - if one ever existed. The opportunity to ensure that future development enhances the town, is one to be embraced.

Care needs to be taken when changing road access / usage to avoid putting off visitors. Being able to quickly nip into the town centre in a car is currently a plus point for the town. Also not sure that shops offering a "larger range of convenience goods" need to be prioritised. There is already the Co-op, Waitrose and Sainsbury’s in addition to Booths. Would rather encourage more diversity and independent retailers to strengthen the unique character of the town - this is what brings visitors here!
Traffic into Knutsford down Mereheath will be unbearable. This will totally put visitors travelling to the town. Aesthetically the drive into Knutsford through Mere will be ruined as no longer look rural, but a massive housing estate with no green fields. This will put visitors/tourists off and be damaging to economy of Knutsford.

I feel Knutsford town centre (Upper and Lower Street as a minimum) show be pedestrian only.

So called 'pedestrianisation' has long been over due, but either by shared space or wider pavements make it easier to walk by shops at least two abreast or with prams. I would restrict parking and have road wide enough for only one vehicle. Retail forces as ever have always determined what outlets are profitable in Knutsford. We need more useful shops rather than estate agents and multiple restaurants and wine bars.

I'm a mum to a young baby but never take my pram to the town centre because the pavements are too narrow and difficult to manoeuvre around. I don't see how a shared access scheme could improve this because there is no option to widen the streets. I would prefer to see the pedestrianisation of King Street as long as traffic issues could be addressed and access for deliveries to shops. It seemed to work in Grove Street in Wilmslow? This policy needs much more explanation to residents. Fully support the idea of improving Canute Place. It doesn't give a good enough first impression of the town to people arriving off the M6.

Definitely agree that need to offer more shops satisfying everyday needs. We have enough supermarkets but not enough hardware, haberdashery, ordinary shoe shops etc. No need for any more kitchen or bathroom stores. The loss of the mobile phone shop - and even of the carpet shop - were deeply felt.

Do not understand what you mean by "Shared surface scheme" for King Street, Princess Street, etc. This should be better explained as it does not appear in the glossary. With regards to "improving the town's inclusive access for all" what would be beneficial is widening Garden Road to allow for improved flow of traffic as currently residents park on one side of the curved road and often it is a game of chicken trying to get to Mereheath Lane (for sporting facilities) and Tatton Park. Also, it would be beneficial for walkers to have a zebra crossing connecting Tabley Road to Garden Road for access to the above-mentioned.

Maintaining road and pavement surfaces in a satisfactory condition.

Existing roads and pavements need vital refurbishment.

Parking always a problem.

Must add something about 'improving the regular markets in Silk Mill Street'.

One of the major issues for independent retailers in the town is the high rents. The development of small affordable units that can be rented by specialist/artisan retailers are essential if the town centre is to maintain the diversity and quality of shops that distinguish it from other towns. Similar consideration should be given to the development of small office/meeting places that can be hired daily by one person businesses. Again what is meant by the term ‘links’ i.e. physical links such as cycle paths etc.

Very strongly think that pedestrianisation and cycle-friendly routes need to be improved. Footpath width on King Street is sometimes less than a foot.

Pedestrian access good idea

Definitely agree with shared surface schemes for King St, Princess St, Minshull & Church Hill. Would like to see a 20mph throughout the town! Concerned about redevelopment of the Sessions House. It is a historic landmark and important feature of the town. Needs conserving somehow.

I particularly agree with the idea of pedestrianisation. However, I don't understand the increasing drive to support all the shop owners. Many don't sell goods that most people want to buy and most are NOT owned or run by local people. The chains that operate take their profits for shareholders and don't re-invest in the local community and the boutiques are rarely owned by people from Knutsford. We should help the shops but not at a detriment to the local people. I also think that landlords are
charging too much... (however I wouldn't want to mess with an open market)

Canute Place needs to be improved in terms of traffic flow and should be considered in any shared surface schemes.

I don't know what a 'shared surface scheme' means I would be in favour of making part of King Street 'pedestrian only' part of the time.

Although I have to say it's a shame the idea of full pedestrianisation of King Street (for example) had to be abandoned mainly because of a perceived need for people to drive along it to shop (which doesn't appear to be the case in many neighbouring towns: Northwich, Macclesfield, etc). Is this entirely consistent with the "Sustainable Community" ideals?

Shared surface schemes create danger and confusion—this is particularly evident at the Poynton development.

Bring people to live in the town by using the rooms above businesses. Young people would love to live so close to a vibrant town centre such as Knutsford. The combined traffic scheme can work - the French do this very successfully in their towns. Narrow one way road with occasional bays for short parking or deliveries. Interesting textures for the road and pavements, coloured road markings and high quality street furniture, cycle racks and bollards to separate various areas. Together with decorated shop fronts and hanging baskets it would look brilliant. At present Knutsford looks really dreary on a dark night because there is a real shortage of street lighting and lots of restaurants have blacked out windows. It is also looks quite forbidding.

Some high rise buildings would be good for residential use.

I think the town centre would benefit from improved parking and public transport links.

Why bother? If you have ruined the outskirts of the town by building on Green Belt why not crack on and ruin the town centre as well and call in Knutsford Keynes?

Existing retailers should be supported but object to bringing in high street stores which will inevitably happen. Disagree with more convenience stores - booths, Sainsbury, Waitrose and the co-op should be ample for the town centre - we don't want a town full of supermarkets and other convenience stores. I fully support the local market Deeply concerned about the shared surface scheme and the effect this would have - need more information on this.

1. There is too much focus on the need to develop hospitality business in the centre of town and too little regard for residents who live in the town centre. This is the centre of Knutsford not the centre of Manchester and allowing night clubs to open until 3 am is not a good idea. 2. Priority should be given to pedestrian spaces and traffic calming measures to improve safety before encouraging more people/cars into the town centre.

You can designate any number of A1 uses that you wish but unless there is a change of Gov. policy you cannot dictate what retailed in that business therefore cannot guarantee a diverse range of shops. We have 19 hairdressers (A1) and as one ladies' dress shop closes another one opens, same with food type takeaways in the class (sandwich shops etc). How will you develop the Sessions House? This is a Grade 11* listed building with many original fixtures. When the Lord Chancellor's office was considering closing it, approx. 10 years ago, the then Conservation Officer, wrote a planning brief for it. May I suggest you refer to it? I see no use in extending the town Centre area, where can you develop that commercially? It would be nice to have the first and second floors of buildings as residential, they used to be but the last LPA gave permission for most of them to be turned into offices and took commuted sums in lieu of car parking. This money was never used for car parking provision in Knutsford. If you have residential use, where will people park their cars? Knutsford has bad transport facilities and I think that most people will want to be able to park. There is insufficient car parking in the Town Centre and nowhere to build a car park (this has been looked at countless times by planners) and the historic nature of the Town Centre make a multi storey car park inappropriate. Park and Ride (from where to where?) was looked at by Knutsford town council in the early 2000s and dismissed by MBC. If we wish to retain the built heritage we a design statement for the Town Centre that is adhered to and not treated as a moveable feast as the Local Plan policies...
were. Shared surfaces are a good idea.

With experience of a shared surface scheme in Ashford, Kent, I am not confident of the benefits to pedestrians. In areas of joint use confusion creeps in over which party has priority. Personal safety is a worry. I can't comment fully until details of the scheme are available. Would roadside parking be excluded in the shared space area?

Your plans to protect the Town Centre are superfluous if you have ruined the rest of the town

Make the town centre safe and attractive to walk around. Address poor issues such as pavement quality.

I am particularly keen on developing the potential for residential property within the town centre. I believe 24-hour occupation creates a more secure and comfortable environment with a greater sense of community; providing improved care for the town centre through ownership and responsibility i.e. the centre is not a ghost town after the retail units, bars and restaurants have closed.

Again another list of "nice to haves" with no indication of priority of levels of investment required to achieve any of these improvements

I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

Would welcome some pedestrian zones on King Street, as we have young family. Would not want to see more convenience stores. Waitrose, Coop, Sainsbury’s and Booths are sufficient.

How many more shops offering a diverse range of convenience goods do we need?? We already have the Co-op, Booths, Waitrose, Sainsbury’s and soon Aldi... enough!! We need more variety in other areas of the retail sector!! NOT more supermarkets... more and more people buy their groceries online so we do not need more to cater for ad hoc purchases! SHARED SURFACE I am guessing = pedestrianisation??!! Permanent pedestrianisation is not really a viable option, but it can be done on an ad hoc basis. King Street can be closed from the entrance to the car park through to just beyond Piccolinos, or even further, still allowing people to get through the town, but also enabling events such as the Artisan market, Christmas markets etc once a month... come on give it a try! ?? Improving links between Library and King Street - how can this be achieved.. The council elected to house the library away from the town centre, what is the suggestion a tunnel / subway under the main road?? Let’s be realistic!!

With the probable extra volume of traffic, the potential for accidents is real as is the undoubted town centre and surrounding roads being gridlocked, especially at peak times and throughout the day

As long as this would mean the support of independent businesses and not the introduction or large chains then this seems a good idea

We have a good mix of shops and businesses. There is vacant shop and business space in and around the town. No need to build more. We do not want our identity to become another faceless town. We need our individuality and independent shops to continue to draw in visitors. Large chains would not benefit our town. Our green and open spaces should be left alone.

I agree with most of the strategy, I do not believe the changes to the town boundary should be as large as you plan

Knutsford Town Centre is historic and in a conservation area.

The Town has to build upon its history and heritage and needs to focus on becoming a new breed of market town as opposed to allowing the current failing high street culture develop further. We have to accept that the high street revolution is in its infancy and so developing a new high street culture is critical

The Knutsford economy is largely based on being an administrative or leisure facility. For leisure, I mean visiting the restaurants and bars in the town and visiting Tatton Park. Expansion will overload the existing local roads and parking which are already at capacity, and overloaded during certain events such as events in Tatton and when there are problems on the M6

Maintain and keep clean high-quality public areas - particularly pavements Do not rule out Pedestrianisation in King St as set out in the Knutsford Town Plan

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:
**Objective and Strategy 3: Town Centre**
Other elements of the vision are wholly generic, for some reason this element notes specific schemes, for example introduction of shared surface scheme on King Street (which I support). However if specific schemes are being identified at this stage then other items should be included. It should discuss maintaining or reducing traffic levels in town centre as a whole. Such an objective would influence development options prioritising development that provides alternative routes for passing through the Canute Square/ King Edward Road roundabout. New development providing new links between Northwich Road and Manchester Road around NW of town or between Northwich Road and Toft Road around west side of town would then be preferable to sites which simply add traffic onto the existing network with no potential for mitigation. Without these links difficult to see how further development will not impact adversely impact on access to town centre negating the vision.

Knutsford town centre is historic and in a conservation area

The town centre should be pedestrianised. Can you imagine the "rat run" in the morning giving way to pedestrians?

I would like to see reference to increasing the mix of retail outlets. At the moment, a visitor would see Knutsford as a town of supermarkets (we already have 4 in the town centre, with a 5th being built) and coffee shops/restaurants.

Knutsford has yet to come to terms with controlling traffic in the two main shopping streets and introducing some pedestrianisation.

Current opportunities are not being taken. For example, there are few links between promoting the town with various shows at Tatton Park (including the flower show). Local produce and businesses need to be promoted. For example an artisan market. On the difficult issue of pedestrianisation of King Street, I am not convinced the 'shared space' preferred solution would be safe enough for pedestrians, especially with the large numbers of elderly and young children (including buggies) in the town on an average day. Empty retail units need to be filled or utilised.

Knutsford does not need any more convenience stores. At present there is the Co-op, Booths, Waitrose and Sainsbury’s and then potentially Aldi as well. The traffic issue in Knutsford is long overdue and it has been made worse by the Sainsbury’s convenience store.

We live in Egerton square area B and are to be taken out of the town centre. Why? We are very much representative of the character of the town. Does this mean that we will be removed from the conservation area and will be subjected to these mad proposed planning laws of allowing 8m extensions. We are critical to any ideas on pedestrian of king St and if we are out of the town centre, I assume we will not be part of those considerations. Pedestrianisation is a good idea but has to be a compromise between us excepting use of the unmade up road car drivers only getting access to the car parks King St is no longer a through road for those looking to avoid Adams Hill King St is split at Minshull St.

I certainly do not support 'more shops offering a range of convenience goods'. There are already a range of supermarkets (Booths, Sainsbury’s, Waitrose) which offer different priced goods to shoppers of differing financial means and along with the independent DIY shop on Tatton Street they cater sufficiently for convenience goods in Knutsford. We are a small heritage town and we do not need any more. The integration of chain superstores such as Aldi will bring the quality of Knutsford down. If there is insistence that there is still a need for more convenience shops attracting certain demographics, they should be located in those areas and not in the middle of Knutsford. Visitors and tourists will not want to source convenience goods! They want quirky independent shops only found in Knutsford - many of whom are already currently leaving (e.g. the Cookery shop on Bottom St, Agape, the knitting shop etc) due to inflated rental rates. It is unhelpful that the Library has no toilet (access at Booths is not sufficient or acceptable for those needing to use the library for work) and there should be a quiet room implemented. Many library users (e.g. PhD students, workers etc) are being driven away by the frequency of children’s hours etc resulting in a smaller user group. My fiancé is a mature PhD student and architect by trade and intended to use the library when we moved to Knutsford, for studying. He has been unable to do so due to the lack of either facility outlined above.
Whilst I understand there is an important policy to get children reading, they should not become the dominant audience/user which then excludes other members of society. I agree with 'ensuring that consideration is given to those who live in and close to the town centre' - one such policy that should be implemented is designated residents parking spaces on Tatton Street car park. I lived there for a year (on Tatton Street opposite the car park) and even though I paid for a residents pass, was often unable to park due to fighting tourists for spaces. This was ridiculous seeing as I was a resident. Tatton Street should be made one-way as every week (I know from first hand experience) there are violent verbal exchanges between drivers trying to access both directions - this is inhibited by the on street parking allowed on Tatton Street and the misunderstanding of most road users as to which side should give way. A one way system or road markings giving priority should be considered.

Knutsford Town Centre ranks highly in the list of historic town centres in England and every effort needs to be made to maintain its vitality and viability whilst making selective and sympathetic improvements to the fabric of the town centre.

Insufficient thought given to the need for pedestrianisation - for the benefit of residents and visitors.

Adequate but discrete parking provision is the key. Any recourse to multi-storey solutions could undermine the 'feel' of the place.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford. It does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if your developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender. and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place i.e. the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how this would be used in the small town of Knutsford.
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced ,when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.
6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

The reason that I am neither agreeing nor disagreeing with these objectives/strategies is that they are so unremittingly upbeat and optimistic that they become completely unrealistic.

The town centre is currently difficult to negotiate with wheelchairs or pushchairs so improvements in pedestrian space would be a good idea. I am not sure about "allowing for a more diverse range of shops, particularly those offering a larger range of convenience goods" I am not sure what this means. Do you mean more chain stores? I think this will cause the town to lose some of its character. One of the special things about Knutsford town is that it isn't full of chain stores like every single other high street everywhere.

The development of the moor is a terrible idea. Why build unwanted shops and loose most families favourite part of Knutsford. Development of the town centre is not necessary - rents need to be decreased and parking sorted.
Need to provide an appropriate level of car parking that is conveniently located and well designed and managed at low cost to users to encourage their use as opposed to ‘free’ on street parking.

I agree although I still think King Street should be pedestrianised.

The objectives and strategy could almost be seen as a list of the failings of the Cheshire and Knutsford’s councils over the past thirty years. These objectives are not even a possibility if the past thirty years are reflected on. What I believe most Knutsford residents would prefer is a straight talking realistic agenda that they believe could be achieved. The plan talks about improving the town centre. Twenty years ago we had a town with a good mixture of real shops. Now all we have are restaurants coffee shops, estate agents and pubs. The decline in the facilities for local residents over the past two decades has not been addressed by the local councils, and I believe in twenty years time all we will have is a town visited by the tourist.

Again traffic chaos with not enough parking spaces.

Canute Place should definitely be improved! Pedestrian only for Christmas markets etc? Pedestrian only on King Street on Saturdays? Street market on Saturday morning? Better parking facilities at reasonable rates. Improve and promote the indoor and outdoor Markets. .

Create a central town meeting place in Canute Square - a dramatic piazza for many activities.

Bullets 6, 7 and 8. This statement is jumping the gun. The Town Plan has only just completed a Survey of Town views on King Street and other street improvements. I was responsible for analysing every response to the 571 Questionnaires, and for undertaking all of the analyses that are contained in Appendix B and in Annexes 1 and 2 of the Knutsford Town Plan Report on the Improvement of King Street. I am left in no doubt from this and other observations since the study ended that what the present DRAFT Strategy statement implies - that of Level Surface Shared Space - does NOT have the support of a majority of residents and businesses. While an average of 88% want IMPROVEMENTS to Pedestrian Priority, only ONE-THIRD favour Shared Space without pavements. In addition, Shared Space with level surfaces will be the most expensive option. Moreover, when the main worry and dislike of parents with prams, buggies and walking toddlers, invalids in wheelchairs and buggies, unsighted, poorly sighted and deaf people, and very elderly people with significant walking impairments, nervous afflictions and /or poor hearing is the present narrowness or absence of pavements and the closeness of passing vehicles, why would any of these groups of people welcome taking away pavements altogether? It doesn’t make any sense. Another factor is that experience in Europe and towns in England of the use of Level Surface Shared Space finds that pedestrians are only happy with this when Traffic Flow Rates are low. That means maximum 100 cars per hour or much less. The LOWEST flow rate in King Street Knutsford during the working and shopping day is between 275 and 350 per hour. The rate during peak periods of the shopping and working day is between 350 and 450 vehicles per hour. Actually, I am personally carrying out counting tests to build up data on traffic flow rates at the present time to validate the data. I will inform CEC in due course what rates I find from these counts. If you stand and observe the traffic flow in the different parts of the street and imagine that it was a completely flat surface, it immediately becomes obvious that pedestrians in King Street would hardly ever be walking in the centre of the road - they would be creeping along the edges, fearful of passing traffic. Traffic would probably drive slightly slower than today, but that would merely REDUCE the average distance between vehicles which would give pedestrians less space, not more. I propose to CEC that bullets 7 and 8 (i.e. the assumed solution) simply be deleted but leave bullet 6 as it is, without any amplification.

Affordable rents for businesses to thrive.

I also believe that the section of road on King street between the florists, Knutsford Bloom at one end and at the other where car can exit the car park behind king street should be pedestrianised it would allow a more safe and comfortable environment for people to shop.

Strongly agree with all of these. I have become dismayed about the apparent polarisation of the debate about pedestrianisation of King Street (to do it or not). Other places have schemes where traffic is allowed during business hours but not after 6pm when restaurants and bars are open etc.
hope we can think about something creative like this (is this what a 'shared surface scheme' might consider?). Very pleased to see cyclists getting some priority in this section - cycle ways and cycle parking racks might help encourage more cycling and less driving into/around the town.

Retail development only for King Street. Reduce business rates so more shops can survive.

However I am not satisfied that the proposals take enough account of the urgent requirements for adequate off street parking.

Improving the pavements and the possibility of a type of shared pedestrianisation is a good idea. We also need better parking to support the town centre. We have plenty of supermarkets and should encourage other types of retail. The current traffic problems are preventing people shopping in Knutsford as it is near impossible to get in to the town some days.

Think that there should be an aim/objective for making the town safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

Has to say how 'independent retailers' will be supported. So practically within a free market how can you support an independent retailer with an advantage over another national retailer?

No cycle paths, as roads are too narrow. Make Crandford Avenue one-way, opposite way to Stanley road, with free residents parking. Make on-street parking for 1 hour not 20 minutes. Add handrail on Church Hill, for safety reasons.

Especially the exploitation of first and second floors of properties to deliver part of the strategy for affordable housing.

Pedestrianise King Street from Church Hill to Minshull Street, and allow deliveries only up to 10 a.m.

I think there is room for improvement to the existing transport system and pedestrian areas to the town centre. I don't think we need more exclusive, expensive boutiques. I don't feel we need more than the 4 existing convenience/supermarket stores that we already have and another under construction. Unique selling point, I understand, but if it is too exclusive and overpriced it excludes many. I think there needs to be balance between these needs and enterprises to make Knutsford more appealing to visitors, residents and potential shoppers.

Priority for independent shops and car parking.

Objective and strategy vague and ill defined. For example: what is meant by "improving links between different parts of the town centre"? This could mean anything from resurfacing the footpaths to putting in more telephone lines.

I agree in the main with the Town centre objectives with the exception of more convenience goods. We have three convenience stores and a market already. BUT again, any improvements should be of an acceptable quality, nit the cheap shoddy workmanship we have experienced when valuable heritage cobbles are 'mis-placed' and then Regent Street is paved with cheap shoddy rubbish which has failed with a couple of years of installation. Our council should concentrate on high quality care and maintenance of the town's assets.

The rates appear to cause an empty shop problem (for example the recently departed fish shop in Canute Square).

Currently the re-development of Regents Street is a complete failure visually and commercially. Why is the George ballroom still empty? The lack of council management/enforcement lost the original cobbles (refer to tourism etc), and the replacement surface is totally unsuitable and is damaged with repairs being needed now. Where is the council? Why should we trust you to do anything else correctly? Quality of road and street repairs is appalling (see top of King Street near Tatton Park) Sympathetic development rather than development at any cost.

Linking the town centre to outlying areas should be a priority. (It would improve quality of life, reduce dependency on cars and promote local business).

King St pedestrian enhancement scheme needs to be implemented to provide easier pedestrian access to the businesses. This should be widened to include Princess St, Church Hill and Minshull St. Provide improved parking facilities. Better integration with Tatton Park to encourage more visitors to
come into the town rather than just the park. It is unconscionable that this facility costs Cheshire East so much money each year and the local businesses of the town do not benefit. There simply isn't the space available to permit the growth of larger convenience stores within the town centre. To want to preserve the present blend of individual retailers and street character whilst adding in larger convenience stores is dichotomous. The key elements that bring visitors into the town are the unique retail outlets, the fact that King St is different to most other towns in character and content. Bring national chain stores into the town or out of town developments destroys character and unique attributes. Making the town easier to navigate and enabling free roaming, without having to use a vehicle is a key factor of the strategy. This involves improving walkways, road crossings and signage.

Generally agree but don't feel a need for housing in the town centre - there isn't enough room for all in your vision. And it would cause more traffic congestion.

You can't promote the town centre without an increase in car parking provision. How do you expect people to get here? Thinking about this is not joined up.

There needs to be a mix of the types of retail and services that will support the different economic circumstances of the population, so as well as independent and specialist there are good value general providers that will support those who have less choice due to their financial circumstances. The town centre is in some ways an ideal place for a one-stop shop for the population to meet their health and wellbeing needs, but this will need to be balanced against the traffic and parking issues this may create.

Knutsford as a small Cheshire Market Town is very well defined by its Town Centre. The group feels very strongly that the character and historic nature of the town centre should be retained, and strengthened, and its historic buildings, roads, ginnels and green spaces should be protected as a priority. Any and all future development in Knutsford must be sensitive to its surroundings and the character of the town centre as a whole. KCHG supports the principles of: - the town centre being the focus of retail and other commercial uses in Knutsford; - the encouragement of residential use in the town centre; However, KCHG notes that the references to ‘shared surface’ schemes might more properly be to ‘pedestrian priority’ schemes.

Pedestrian priority would be preferable to shared surface schemes where motorised vehicles still tend to take preference often at the expense and danger to pedestrians.

Why does Knutsford require more shops offering a larger range of convenience goods? We already have four supermarkets and are due to get a fifth, Aldi. It would have been better to use the Aldi site for housing. At least the listed cottages might then not have been demolished and mature trees cut down. There is not mention of the Regent St/Royal George, that are underutilised and the shoddy materials used for paving Regent St need replacing. 'Improving the links between different parts of the town centre, e.g. the Library to King St.' What an odd and arbitrary example! What is proposed as an improvement? I can't imagine anything beneficial that could be done.

Need for controls on top/bottom street vehicular access and parking in order to mitigate risks of R.T.A. and reduce congestion. Independent shops should be supported by preventing supermarket growth. Providing no development has any effect on schools or their land.

Promotion of Knutsford as a destination of choice must be a key objective. But to entice people into the town, access must be improved. Residents have long expressed concern over parking issues, pedestrian access in particular to King and Princess Street, and therefore such access must be enhanced and improved as a priority, with the highly characteristic ginnels also included in this enhancement, hopefully with a view to promoting pedestrian rather than vehicular access around the town in general. I would personally prefer upper rooms in the town centre to remain as business premises where possible, as inviting more residential areas into our town centre streets may exacerbate the traffic issues we already have. Parking facilities must also be considered, with free, nearly free or affordable off street parking a priority for both business and residential use.

Includes improving the public realm, which could also include areas of nature conservation value.

Again great, but allowing three national supermarket chains to set up shop recently in town doesn't
really support independent shops does it! Also, 'shared surface' is quite specific - should it read pedestrian priority?

Trial pedestrianisation in certain before actually destroying any footpath/road surfaces.

A clear plan needs to be drawn up for a long-term parking solution in the town, which keeps the character of the town centre but makes the shops, businesses and bars accessible. Transport links to rural communities, if improved or very least maintained will strengthen the town centre visitors and so keep its vibrancy.

Objective 3 seeks to promote the town centre and support existing retail and commercial provision, directing retail development within the town centre. In addition, it states that schemes to enhance and/or extend independent shops and specialist retailers will be given positive consideration.

Sainsbury’s support the promotion of the town centre and the Council’s aim to focus new retail and leisure development within the Town Centre, in accordance with NPPF guidance and to ensure sustainable development. However, they question the ‘positive consideration’ to be given to schemes relating to independent and specialist retailers; it is considered that all schemes for sustainable development (regardless of the end occupier or applicant) should be considered in a favourable light as per the presumption in favour set out in the NPPF.

The ‘shared surface’ proposal for King Street should be prioritised.

See Knutsford Town Plan Group’s suggestions and survey. Cycling across the Moor needs policing or signs erected.

Sessions House frontage should be considered

Shared space in King St is wrong. We need "pedestrian priority" - must remove rat run of 400 cars/hr - place obstacles in way.

Visitors Centre required in town.

More drop kerbs to improve crossing facilities and widen narrow pavements. Shared surfaces inappropriate - would add to pedestrian safety concerns. Improvements should prioritise Princes Street as is in worse condition.

Particularly a more diverse range of jobs - too many high end kitchen/bathroom shops. Less emphasis on car provision in town centre.

The protection, identification; planning and timely delivery of water supply and sewerage infrastructure should be a major consideration for the plan. To meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework [Framework] the Council must provide strategic policies -To facilitate the timely delivery of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and flood risk In addition, the Council [via Local Plans] should: -Plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework; and -Assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and its treatment, utilities, health, flood risk; surface water and its ability to meet forecast demands. Unfortunately the plan has not taken into consideration the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply; wastewater; its treatment and/or flood risk. The Council should therefore redraft the plan and include comments that: - Satisfies requirements of the Framework for the provision of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and flood risk; and - Assesses the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and its treatment, utilities, health, flood risk and its ability to meet forecast demands.

What is meant by the improvement of links between, for example, King Street and the library? Are there sufficient already (passages/roadways)? Perhaps some are not user friendly, but the town is built on the side of a hill and quite adequate for the majority.

There are already plenty of convenience stores and all current empty units need to be used.

Strongly agree with the proposal to support independent shops/retailers. Point 4 needs expansion and clarification. I would have thought that including the proposed ALDI store, there will be an adequate supply of “convenience goods” (but these need defining).

What is a 'shared surface scheme' - could not find this in the glossary.
**Objective and Strategy 3: Town Centre**

- **Essential** that Knutsford retains its old world charm and character.
- I particularly agree with the promotion of a variety of retail outlets. At present we have a ludicrous duplication of grocery outlets all competing for the same limited amount of trade. No-one asked for the intrusion of national chains into the town where we already had local shops providing the same range of goods.

- The objectives appear positive, but as ever the execution of any proposals need to be considered with all sensitivity.
- Shared access is debatable from a safety viewpoint, considering the narrow streets, residential nature of the Town Centre and need for delivery and service vehicles. Development should take into account the age and character of the Town, and ensure shop fronts and any developments reflect this.
- Yes, develop the town centre in a sympathetic way. Some previous planner need to be strung up for allowing some of the buildings which have popped up next to architectural gems. No more car parks, get people cycling, walking and using public transport.

- This is a much greener solution to any housing need, giving great pedestrian access to the town centre and enlivening it at night.

- Not convinced that Knutsford will benefit from a shared surface scheme

- Independent shops and specialist retailers are a significant tourist attraction

- Need to support small businesses in order to retain individual character of the town

- I agree with most of the strategy, I do not believe the changes to the town boundary should be as large as you plan.

- The most important thing is to maintain the fabric of the town centre - this is basic but is not achieved currently. There is AMPLE car parking already.

- I agree with most of the strategy, I do not believe the changes to the town boundary should be as large as you plan.

- This is a double edged sword, as the importance of keeping our historic town centre is combined with residential development. The proposed residential developments would be a total disaster for town’s folk, with only a few benefiting.

- I agree that the town centre needs improving; we have historic buildings that are falling into disrepair. Please explain how building retail areas outside of the town centre and then making the centre inaccessible due to road traffic congestion and incredibly poor bus services will support businesses currently in the town?...as to cyclists travelling to this end of town, forget it, they won't arrive alive, having been squashed along the way. Just what do you mean by a Shared surface scheme? The town centre I do not believe will survive more development; I feel people will cease to come to Knutsford for pleasure. It is a market town not a suburb of a large city and I feel its character will be destroyed. I agree that utilising spaces above shops, not currently used would be positive especially for residential accommodation; historically this is what they were used for. Inclusive access!! How? I believe we will be so congested with traffic that it will be extremely difficult to access anything. I do not believe the town centre roads will cope with much more traffic, all the major junctions in the town are congested as it is and Parkgate if it includes the medical centre, another school, additional housing and more units will be extremely congested causing traffic to start to use the local estates as a rat run to get into the town centre, putting young people at risk, most of the alternative routes pass the local schools, how does this make sense?

- I do not understand what a 'shared surface scheme' is. - Am against pedestrianisation. - All redevelopment in the town centre so far has been rather bland and has not enhanced Knutsford’s historic character. (e.g. Regent Street)

- But not at the loss of more of the town’s heritage which seems to disappear at a rate commensurate with development at the moment. Consider the George Yard and what has happened in the 15th century buildings opposite on King Street.

- I agree with most of the strategy, I do not believe the changes to the town boundary should be as
large as you plan.

Again, lower the rates on existing commercial properties. The current range of shops is fairly unique - it's what makes Knutsford so and high-street big brand shops should be limited. Altrincham and Northwich provide them.

Why is the Heath reserved for dog walkers and fun fairs? Perhaps you should look at this "central park" as a designated space for redevelopment - a park with a lake, cycle and running areas. Have you ever been to Boston Common / Boston Garden (Boston, MA)? You would positively impact the prosperity of the town if you stopped looking at the Heath as an untouchable green space and regarded it as what it is, an unengaging, uninspiring waste of space, ripe for repurposing!

One of the reasons why I am happy living here is the town centre. I enjoy the architecture and the offering of restaurants and fun shops (that seem to be closing...). Feels nice when I'm there but also approachable, friendly, affordable, and family friendly (except for pushing a pram down those pavements, forget it!). I don't like driving down Princess or King Street - I'd be all for pedestrianising but that seems to have been looked at and shot down - then again they sometimes become a way of avoiding the heinous traffic that can build up. Again, it's like, I am agreeing with the vision here but the reality of it?

Although I understand why businesses are worried that they may lose trade if drivers cannot park outside their premises, I think shared either a shared surface scheme or timed pedestrianisation (basically giving the pedestrian priority) would make shopping and visiting Knutsford a more pleasurable experience for all. Improvement of the rather characterless Canute Place and redevelopment of Red Cow yard is a good idea, and the Market needs to be enhanced and local traders encouraged - Knutsford is after all a market town.

Care should be taken not to expand retail area without evidence of long term need. Leisure and residential use may have greater potential.

I live in hopes that these good intentions will be achieved. The obstacles are significant. A Big Bang housing development will only encourage further commuting out of Knutsford and certainly not improve the current retail offer while mini-multiples price locally owned and run enterprises from the town centre. The irony is that there used to be excellent communication between the library and King Street. That library was sold off for a Â£1 and now Aldi has the area where its expansion - and incidentally - a medical centre could have been built. If the Vision for an historic market town is to be realised, get rid of the less than sympathetic '60s buildings in Canute place and replace with others more sympathetic to the older properties.

It is rumoured that Tesco are interested in occupying a site on the west of Manchester Road between Sugar Pit Lane and the Land Rover garage. The town survived with just the Co-op and Booths and the two late shops off Mobberley Road for many years before the arrival of Waitrose and Sainsbury’s. Now Aldi will probably be the second main supermarket store after Booths. Where is the need for Tescos and also it shouldn’t be directly on the main road to Manchester.

lack of parking and general congestion is a real problem already....deal with that first!!!! also very poor road conditions as a regular bike rider often find myself dangerously having to avoid pot holes or hit them when other traffic around nearly falling off or damaging my tyres!!!

Particularly concentrate on improving the town’s ‘inclusive access for all’.

I am totally opposed to any form of pedestrianisation of King Street or Princess Street. I believe that the unique nature of our top and bottom streets should be retained i.e. there should be no widening of footways or any shared surfaces.

I would definitely favour some form of pedestrianisation for King Street, Princess Street, Minshull Street and Church Hill (in other words, as a suggested possibility). I currently struggle walking along the pavements which are very uneven and narrow. When accompanying my friend with a child in a pushchair, it is very difficult to walk through the town. In addition my elderly relatives in wheelchairs find the pavements challenging.

The major problem is with the proposed pedestrianisation. A part of the appeal of Knutsford is for rich
people to drive their expensive cars down the street, while ordinary townspeople and visitors look on with (supposed) envy. If this facility is removed, it is likely to remove also the rich visitors and their wallets. I think this would be highly undesirable. It follows that both the through routes and the on-street parking must remain. You can see an example of the potential disaster by comparing with the pedestrianised street in Wilmslow, which is now stripped of wine bars and fancy restaurants with well-heeled visitors now cruising the strip outside Hoopers and down to Gilberts that does remain. In short, there would be no quicker way to shut down the town centre than to pedestrianise it. The early experiment with pedestrianisation, with the street at the back of the Royal George, is delivering mixed results. It’s attracted some big, buzzy outlets (all of which are chains, i.e. the opposite of the independent traders which the vision identifies as an attractive aspect of the town) but it’s too early to say how long they’ll stick around for. The street can be practically deserted at many times of the day and night. I’d advise letting this experiment run a little longer rather than repeating the formula elsewhere. I think the recent Royal George development also missed a trick with respect to the market. This is looking shabby and a little lost (and has lost its outside area most days of the week). It would be a lot better to make the market into a thoroughfare, i.e. something that people have to walk through to pass between the top and bottom street. You can see a very good example of this in the recent Manchester Arndale Centre market redevelopment, in which the market was placed at a major entrance to the mall (just next to the Apple Store). The resultant footfall has made it a huge success, and independent units are thriving. I’d suggest that exploiting the market’s proximity to the very good restaurants and boutiques in Knutsford, and encouraging a mix of more specialised retailers (perhaps a delicatessen counter and some hand-made crafts, alongside the existing fruit and veg, butcher and baker outfits etc) would produce similarly good results here. The trick is going to be integrating the existing retailers and pushing the overall look slightly upmarket. I think it would be better to spend money on this than resurfacing either the top or bottom street. The current roads are fine, and there’s no need to (as is likely) bleed road and pavement into each other and cause all manner of confusion about where you can and can’t park. The outcome would be windy streets with gangs of rather drunk people wandering through at 11pm, rather than the continental cafe culture fancied by planners.

This statement is obtuse and confusing. Yes to pedestrianisation, more buses, wider pavements, NO to big chain stores if that’s what you mean by "a larger range of convenience goods."

Ginnels between streets, and back-land, are not well maintained - poorly lit at night and poorly surfaced. Narrow and poorly surfaced pavements and roads make for difficult access for the mobility impaired.

Retail development is a really difficult issue and one not confined to Knutsford. Rents are far too high. Any redevelopment needs to be sympathetic to the town, not travesties like Regent Street

There should be much better provision for pedestrians. There are hardly any pedestrian crossings in the whole town. It feels a very dangerous place to walk around with young children.

Shared access is debatable from a safety viewpoint, considering the narrow streets, residential nature of the Town Centre and need for delivery and service vehicles. Development should take into account the age and character of the Town, and ensure shop fronts and any developments reflect this.

Natural England support Objective 3, to promote the town centre in particular encouraging residential use on upper floors in the town centre as this encourages more efficient and more sustainable form of urban living, reducing resource consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

To be kept as a village environment

Not necessary

More car parks - town centre traffic must be reduced. Not safe to walk. Do not know how shared surface will work

The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them

Don't knock any schools down it will be unfair and cost people more money

Yes improve inclusive access. Support for local shops but leave the towns unique heritage
Canute Square was altered before and should not be meddled with again.

Caution should be used as other towns in this area have been ruined with over development.

The town's unique character disappeared years ago and has not been helped by more recent developments.

Retail outside town centre also useful e.g. DIY when parking required.

Tourism and visitor economy already well provided for. Town centre has more of interest for visitors than facilities for residents - ghost town most of the week. Shared surfaces work well where there is plenty of space - King Street and Princess Street are too narrow for this to work.

Can't see point in creating more shop units (e.g. Altrincham) as more people shop online - we need to have different approach to town centres.

Library to King Street? Four lane A50 between, two good roads already link them.

Pedestrianisation of King Street is a must.

Easier access for cyclists - cycle lanes, parking for bikes.

Pedestrianisation and improved parking essential.

Knutsford needs well chosen chains as well as independent shops to draw people in rents are too high!!

Keep Knutsford vibrant and interesting, independent shop owners need to be supported and encouraged not priced out of business by extortionate rates and rents.

Changes made for pedestrians, cyclists and footpaths would be improvement but you are planning to increase traffic.

restrict convenience retail

This will lose its distinctive character

Not sure how retail diversity can be developed/encouraged.

Development and better use of the Sessions House a priority as is car parking and pedestrianisation of town centre streets.

Keep it small. Attractive, different - a visitors place to visit.

Isn't this normal development procedure taking into account the precious identity of a small town with a village atmosphere within existing budget outlay?

Shared surfaces are fine but the real need is pedestrianisation.
Objective and Strategy 4: Housing

Do you agree or disagree with the Housing Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 83% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (18%); Agree (14%); Neither Agree or Disagree (14%); Disagree (17%); Strongly Disagree (38%)

**Comments:**

This would be substantial new housing, and would require additional schools, healthcare provision, etc.

I challenge the call for additional housing. Knutsford is not designed to manage with the levels of traffic that will come with such housing provision. It struggles to manage with existing traffic. There may be increased demand for housing. However, it is up to us to consider whether this demand can and should be met by this unique and historic market town. What sacrifices would need to be made to meet this demand and whether these are in the benefit of those that already leave in the area. It is not possible to design between 500 and 1000 houses to meet the historic and distinctive character of an area, when this very character is based on its role as a small, market town.

Objective should not state provide the opportunity for everyone that is not possible. It should say provide more opportunity for people to live in Knutsford assuming the appropriate investment in infrastructure that is sustainable. There are around 6000 households in Knutsford and an increase of 1,280 is a 20% increase- unsustainable. As the medical, education, open spaces and sports provision in Town is already identified as at capacity even the lower target of 460 houses will require significant infrastructure levy. The target should be revised in line with the Mobberley and Northwich and other surrounding area development plans. These neighbours affect future infrastructure requirements such as schools.

Your figures for this section are misleading as you state: The population of Cheshire East is expected...
to grow from 362,700 to 379,300 by 2026 (Regional Spatial Strategy: Partial Review, Population Forecasts). The number of households is expected to increase by 24% from 154,000 to 191,000 by 2030 (Cheshire East's Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2010). This would mean an increase of 16,000 people and an increase of 37,000 homes; therefore you are creating too many homes for people or creating a buy to rent property market which only benefits the rich... Many attempts have been made to build affordable houses in Knutsford and the surrounding area all have been met with opposition. In fact unaffordable housing schemes have been bit in preference to affordable for example behind the Brick Layers Arms on Mobberley Road. Now you're stating that 64 affordable homes need to be built per year for every year, that many normal homes haven't been built currently.

Hmmm greed will ruin any good ideas with housing; we need social housing that cannot be bought ever, so we can always look after vulnerable people. Building affordable homes then selling them off is short sighted and borders on anti social behaviour; we have a duty as decent people, all of us, to be able to help when the chips are down for people!

I do not think Knutsford should be vastly expanded for some planners dream. It will change the town's character and the proposed invasion of the green belt is unacceptable.

If this proposal is approved, we will lose greenbelt land (this is something that should never happen). Greenbelt land is to ensure that proposals such as this should never even be considered. I do not believe that this falls under "exceptional circumstances". Again, it only serves to create even more problems for the future. I will gladly consent to this plan on the condition that the A50 be widened to FOUR lanes all the way from Holmes Chapel to Warrington, and that J19 of the M6 be closed. I would also expect to be relocated at the expense of the council to a new home overlooking the countryside...

That's why I live here.

So short sighted to build on the precious green belt around Knutsford, Once gone its lost for all future generations and I don't think enough work has been done on developing brownfield sites within the town.

May be not enough. All areas should take some development.

No need for extra housing.

Too many houses will spoil the character of the area.

Such big estates can 't help but spoil the town's charm and character Further the orchard boundaries may sound idyllic but I'd suggest are impractical. Better I'd suggest to have a boundary of allotments. Additionally green open space (village green like) within at the centre of the larger build areas would still give an open green aspect rather than a cramped more urban one.

Encroachment on green belt must be minimised by gradually moving industrial parks out to land near the motorway (which can hardly be considered green) and replacing the vacated land with mixed housing.

There is no underlying business case to support increasing Knutsford population and build on new brown site and greenbelt land. The reasons behind the need for more affordable housing are not driven by a demand for housing from within Knutsford but are external factors. The scale of the proposed new sites is unpalatable and will destroy the community and environment. There is also no direct link to economic gain and the increase in population will put pressure on current resources (school, roads, community services)

Knutsford suffers with traffic congestion as it is. The increase to the population will create more problems. Parking will be even worse Local schools are already over-subscribed and stretched It is a real problem to get a Doctors or Dentist appointment without there being more people to provide for The green belt area will be destroyed House valuation will be adversely affected The beauty and scenic aspect of Knutsford will be lost forever Wildlife will be affected and driven away

Surely you should aim to provide houses that match the existing houses so that the current resident types continue to feel a part of their community. Are we talking council owned/ or private rented properties rather than owner occupied housing? This would have a big impact on the nature of the
population of the town. Do the existing residents really want integrated and mixed community? - I don’t. There seems to be a lot of elderly housing already - are we sure we want a whole lot more? The plans will destroy the look of the towns northern approaches, it will no longer look like a country town, but rather another suburb of Greater Manchester.

I feel that 1280 new residences in Knutsford, which will bring a potential additional 1200+ cars into the town is simply not a viable option for the town’s creaking road infrastructure, until such time as a bypass system exists (first proposed, I believe, way back in the 1960s), to take traffic around Knutsford from the M6, A50, A556 and M56.

I’m sure there is a need for more housing but I’m not sure there is a need for over a 1000 new homes?! Commercially and transport wise Knutsford struggles with parking and traffic as it is. Even if you improve the networks and car parks adding up to say a further 1500 homes to that are going to put things back to square one.

I believe green belt should remain green belt, but understand the need for housing. It is a difficult subject.

If Knutsford really does need expansion on the scale identified, it is hardly credible that this should be concentrated almost solely on the north side of the town, creating imbalance and destroying much of value.

I accept that new housing provision is required for the projected growth in population, but disagree that large amounts of new housing, over and above projected population growth of the town, would be a good idea. People like living in and visiting Knutsford because it is a vibrant town that still manages to retain a small / rural town feel and this needs to be maintained. Large scale building on the green belt land around the town seems likely to destroy this.

As a resident of Knutsford I am deeply concerned at the proposal in Knutsford Town Strategy regarding the proposals to build 1280 houses in the Green Belt area.

Has any consideration been given to the impact on existing property prices this will have. I paid £400k for a modest house in Willow Green. I paid over the odds for fields near my home for clean open living for my 3 children. How much will my house be worth or will the clean living aspect of my home be worth with 400 mews or affordable living homes and their cars pollution filling the current playing sports fields behind my home??????

single story housing for the ageing population; starter homes ( may be same thing)

The housing strategy has not fully involved the local residents: I live on Warren Avenue WA16 0AL, the area which will be the most heavily impacted by this new strategy; however, I’ve only been contacted directly about the impact of this proposal on the 19/09/12. This shows a lack of commitment to communicate and discuss the impact of this strategy with those most directly involved. I would ask that a full meeting is held in Knutsford and each household within 0.5 miles of areas A to C, as defined in the consultation, is invited in writing. Failure to do this minimum would prove to me that this consultation is nothing but lip service when the decisions have already been made. Finally, from a purely practical perspective, I’m extremely concerned of the impact of this huge housing project will have infrastructure, as it can already take me 20 minutes to get through Knutsford at peak times. In addition, I question the conclusion that has been arrived at with regard to the impact on health care and schooling. Can you provide documentary proof of the conclusion that "there are enough spaces built within the primary education sector” please?

The areas identified as possible new housing areas make sense to me, especially the areas around Longridge and Kids Allowed. Just get on with it quickly. I know too many people who want to move to Knutsford who can’t afford it or don’t have any choices because housing stock is so scarce.

Main objection is the quantity of housing proposed. Large developments like Kingsmead in Northwich would be out of keeping with the character of Knutsford. Several small developments would be better than one or two large ones.

Also need to ensure that there is affordable housing for young people to return to the town after going away for further education etc. Need to consider single person units - infilling within the town.
Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

**Objective and Strategy 4: Housing**

centre perhaps.

Though no one can disagree to a need for more housing for first-time buyers and in light of a growing population, etc. a maximum number of 1,280 seems disproportionate (i.e. high) to the size of our current population in Knutsford. I do agree with the need to created housing that reflects the distinct historic characteristics of the town.

Include suitable housing for elderly to downsize.

Importance of suitable external design, also a significant need for housing in the 'lower price' segment of the market.

Housing to replace Green Belt is not a good idea.

We should encourage use of previously developed site not take away our fields and green areas

I don't believe building so many houses in Knutsford makes economic sense. Also protect our Green Belt.

Use of the word sustainable is meaningless. Write what you mean.

Quality, market housing is greatly needed.

The first statement within the strategy of Objective 4 i.e. the provision of 460 to 1280 new homes contradicts the further statement that housing contributes to the sense of place and takes account of the historic and distinctive character of Knutsford. A development or developments totalling 1280 homes would destroy Knutsford’s sense of place as there are few brownfield sites (unless there is a relocation and rebuilding of certain health and educational facilities) that can accommodate this scale of housing which would mean any proposed housing would be on the boundaries of the town on Greenfield and Green Belt sites. The Green Belt on all entry roads to the town is the distinctive character of Knutsford. It not only provides easily accessible green spaces for the community as recommended by the benchmark standards ANGST (Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard but also prevents the coalescence of settlements which was the purpose behind the designation of the Green Belt in this NE corner of the region as it provides a ‘breathing space’ between Cheshire and large urban areas who also derive benefit from the Green Belt. Again by referring to other town strategies it can be seen that the drafters of these plans have had the courage of their convictions to decide upon a definite figure not a range. At the upper figure of 1250 is larger than the 1100 figure proposed for Nantwich which has a population of 17180 and whose jobs figures match that of Knutsford. Similarly Sandbach with a population of 18000 with fewer jobs than Knutsford is proposing a figure of 950.

Ensure any new housing is accessible from main roads and not mainly through existing neighbourhoods - for example - I can't believe there is only 1 route in and out of the Ashworth Park estate and the stress this puts onto Bexton Lane and Bexton Road. New residential neighbourhoods should have amenity and green areas and foot and cycle paths into Knutsford to encourage healthy and environmentally friendly lifestyles and not be built to maximise developer profits

Too many houses for size of town.

Again ... what is a 'sustainable location'?? I agree with developing sites within the town but don't think Knutsford would cope with a possible 1,280 new homes!

Knutsford might need some more housing. I haven't seen any empirical evidence to suggest it does. Knutsford has kept reasonably high house prices because it is a lovely place to live. We should NOT be building houses on GREENBELT because people think housing is unaffordable for young people in Knutsford. We would be ruining the exact thing that makes people want to live here and once it is gone, we can't get it back. What happens if we do this and the population of Knutsford grows...In about 30 years we will then have more young people wanting houses. Will we then build on more Green Belt? It is totally unsustainable. I also think that many people who would build these houses would use employees from outside of Knutsford and the profits would go to the landowners and developers. i.e. nothing would benefit local businesses.

There is not the infrastructure to sustain this. Traffic is already creating a log jam in the town and the
Proposal to build on Site A will have the biggest impact. Knutsford is a small town and not a suburb of Manchester which it is danger of becoming. Green belt areas were designated as such for a reason. In years to come we won't be able to get them back.

The numbers don't seem to add up. Cheshire East growing by 15,000 by 2026 however we need 37,000 homes over a not dissimilar period. Whilst there might be an increase in single \single parent family dwellings this seems to be far too high. In Knutsford this could be between 460 and 1280 but this housing equates to a 20% increase in Knutsford housing which the supporting infrastructure will not support. All the areas looked at or on the edge with not look at infill.

Whether we like it or not, new affordable housing is desperately needed. And much as it is undesirable, in the long run some of our precious green-belt will inevitably have to be sacrificed. This is not a new phenomenon: towns have always had to face the need to grow. Knutsford today is hardly the same place it was when my father was born here, at the start of the 20th Century. It's a fact of life. However, as a born-and-bred Knusfordian myself, I know how hard it is for local people (especially young families) to get a foot on the housing ladder in the town. It should be axiomatic that any new build will comply with modern legislation with regard to sustainability, and be in keeping with the town's character, but beyond that what is vitally important in my view, is that all (and not merely a token proportion of) new build on the identified sites should be affordable. Moreover, it should provide decent generous accommodation with, where possible, a garden. There must be a total moratorium on the development of luxury "mansions" on these sites. All new housing must be adequately supported by public transport links to schools, medical services, shops, etc. I believe it may even be necessary to include at least one new (or possibly re-sited) primary school as part of the longer term plan, as the population's centre of gravity shifts outwards.

Developing housing through fill-in and on certain sites may be acceptable, but not if it damages the nature of the market town, such as building on green-belt. The traffic infrastructure would not allow for the development of this number of homes without the building of a by-pass. The town already cannot cope with the volume of traffic, particularly on Friday evenings and when there are problems on the M6. Building this number of homes, and the destruction of green-belt, would irreversibly damage the character of this market town. Building on zones A & B would exacerbate the problems that already exist on Tabley road relating to a) excessive speed on this road, b) the junction between Manchester Road and Tabley Road, c) the problems with vehicles parking on Tabley Road by the Heath. This volume of housing would overwhelm the town infrastructure relating to schools, local jobs etc.

I do not agree that 1200 homes be built on Green Belt. Think roads, parking and sewage.

I do not agree with large scale development on green belt land. I also have concerns about how the road networks will cope when they are already jammed at many times of the day - particularly Manchester Road and Northwich Road. Building the maximum number of houses proposed will begin to change the feel of Knutsford and its character. I am concerned that most of the proposed development is fixed in one particular area A,B,C,D,E and these areas will greatly impact on residents in these areas (including myself). Of all the sites, G would have the least impact on everyone but would obviously be more expensive to develop owing to the railway lines.

There is too much housing development on the Mere side of Knutsford, which will overload the density and change the character of this side of the town. In contrast, there is little development along Mobberley Road and none along Northwich Road.

I strongly object to the proposal of building houses on the green belt land surrounding Knutsford. The unique and special character of Knutsford will be completely ruined. Lots of people can currently walk not far from their homes and be 'out in the countryside'. We should be looking to keep within Knutsford's current boundary.

No building on Green Belt.

Strongly disagree with the volume of housing and very strong disagreement to building on greenbelt land. the road infrastructure cannot cope with this and it will spoil the look and feel of our town and
adversely affect our community spirit

1280 new homes sounds like an awful lot. I wouldn't want Knutsford to develop like, for instance, Lymm.

The objective is fine but the strategy makes no case for building on the green belt to achieve this. There is no mention in the strategy document as to why the original plans for Knutsford did not allow for future development without building on the green belt.

The green belt should be sacrosanct. Houses should only be built on brown filed sites. We do not have the infrastructure for such an expansion in housing stock and it is unlikely that either government of developers will build the amount of roads necessary. Over the years, housing developed a bit here and a bit there has put a huge strain on the roads and no government has made planners look at the accumulative effect. How will you enforce design policies as design is subjective?

The scale of the proposed development seems reasonable given good road access.

No expansion of Knutsford into Green Belt. Not necessary, sustainable or beneficial to the Environment

See earlier comments as not enough emphasis is being put on the use of brownfield sites and empty housing. There has to be a balance between cost and ensuring that, where possible, Green Field sites are protected for the good of the community. There are too many towns that have expanded outwards and left derelict sites in the centre.

Do not flood the area with housing the infrastructure will not sustain it.

Knutsford is big enough and will lose its character and stretch resources even more than now.

If there is need for housing growth then it should be kept to a minimum need and brownfield sites used and NOT Green Belt.

It’s not a strategy. It does not state why many sites are considered not suitable. It does not state the criteria for assessing and comparing the suitability of sites. It should state what the criteria are and how each site scores against them. At the moment it looks like an arbitrary choice taken by an invisible group of people, who may well have their own personal interests in the decision.

Section 2.8 says there are 6000 dwellings in Knutsford and yet a further 1280 could be built - that’s an additional 21%. What sort of mad thinking is this? This will change the face and character of Knutsford completely. The town will suffer dreadfully if 1200 houses are added to existing facilities. The present infrastructure is crumbling already - there is no way we can cope with a rise of this size. Traffic is awful. We need an improved road network before adding to the volume of traffic by increasing housing/commercial opportunities. Facilities such as medical and schools are stretched beyond capacity now. These must be expanded before increasing the population. The only way to maintain the character of Knutsford is to allow it to grow naturally and by putting the infrastructure improvements in first... then consider how many dwellings are a sensible addition. It seems to me that even an additional 460 would be too many in current circumstances. DO NOT dictate the number to be added until an assessment of the new infrastructure shows how many can be supported. New housing is needed, there is no doubt. I am keen on the provision of affordable and intermediate housing. Also for the specialist housing to cater for an ageing population. Access to the town centre and facilities (medical and cultural) should be a priority when siting this specialist housing. Obviously, young families need to be near schools and recreational facilities (including open and green spaces) but maybe not so near to the town centre as long as there is access. I would also like to see new houses provided with car parking spaces (at least 2 per property) so that residents and visitors can be accommodated. Provide 460 units like this and I might agree.

Cannot see why Knutsford would need nor want additional housing. The current infrastructure, schools, medical facilities and the like struggles to cope with the existing number of houses. Development can only result in further strain. Environmental issues also need to be considered as increased traffic, pollution, noise and the like would be a direct result.
I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

Whilst we agree that it is important that the elderly population in Knutsford are well catered for with housing, we feel that the introduction of up to 1280 new properties on the outskirts of town, without additional school places, doctor's surgeries, etc, would put strain on the existing infrastructure in the town. The town is already bustling and would risk being overcrowded with a 16% increase in properties. Struggle to see how the unique character of the town could be preserved in line with the vision.

OK. we need a lot of new homes... but we need the infrastructure to support this, including somewhere for residents to park, somewhere for them to send their children to school (that doesn’t involve portacabins in the playing fields), that they can come and go from their home by car easily, without getting caught up in the everyday traffic experienced today. Knutsford road network needs an overhaul to cope with the existing population, so the decisions to invest in new housing projects needs to add to the changes already needed. Not sure what good quality access relates to - well tarmaced?? We need better roads, improved one way systems.

Favoured plots too far from town. People will just drive in nullifying the car park improvements. Housing plans seem to be plans for extra school places and extra doctors' surgeries. What if I can’t get my child into my local school due to a thousand new houses? Where’s the school plan, or is that not a money spinner? Traffic from Mere toward Knutsford is treacherous already. Plot B will filter lumps of traffic right into the existing traffic jam. Plots A and B will swamp Tabley Road, Queensway, Sugar Pit Lane and Ladies Mile. These are the roads where my children play; this is where they live. The risks don’t bare thinking about.

an increase in population would lead to yet more congestion in an already busy town centre and increase the pressure on already stretched local services

Please see earlier comments.

Knutsford should not be subjected to a large housing development as this will have an adverse effect on the countryside of the area and will dilute the strength of the community.

I strongly agree with the objectives; however I strongly disagree with the strategy. Start up housing is defiantly needed within the town and surrounding areas. However to up the towns housing and therefore population by over 20% when Cheshire East population is set to increase by 7% is unfair and the town’s infrastructure will be swamped. It is only fair that we as a town increase at the Cheshire East rate, therefore 427 housing units would be needed within the period of the plan.

I believe there is not the infrastructure to sustain this strategy. Traffic jams are a constant problem and the proposal to build on Site A & Site B - Manchester Road/Northwich Road areas would have the largest impact on the roads. Green belt areas were designated as such for a reason, and should remain so - if built upon green belt areas will never be returned

Obviously the areas allocated to new housing will be contentious and I disagree with some of those areas highlighted but I agree with the need for new affordable housing.

I do not consider that we need any more housing at all, let alone the massive increase proposed.

We don’t need more housing, or if we do it should be built on existing brownfield sites not on greenbelt, we could level Longridge and build better housing there. The town need a lot more work before we add to the population.

Difficult to agree with dramatic vision without some evidence base. It states Knutsford required to accommodate between 450 and 1280 homes. Surely more information based upon some proper analysis to justify these numbers is required before these are basis for a vision. Furthermore the range in numbers is too large for sensible comment. I am not against the principle of new housing but greater definition of housing numbers is needed as this hugely affects infrastructure provision and the optimum location of developments. For example if larger number eventually determined to be appropriate during preparation of core strategy then solution and preferred sites could be very different from that with low housing numbers. Basically the cart is being put before the horse. This
strategy should have followed on from your core strategy work not before. At this stage the strategy is meaningless and worse still is based upon limited indeed misleading information. This information will only be provided as part of core strategy development.

I am convinced that there is not the infrastructure in place to sustain this proposal. Traffic jams are a serious cause of gridlock around and about Knutsford. Green belt areas were designated for a reason, and should remain, if built on, the words of green and pleasant land or green green grass of home will never have the same meaning and destroy the countryside forever.

To move the boys club when so much money has been spent is madness. It is pointless building more houses without infrastructure. We need more schools in the right areas together with medical facilities. Already Knutsford is not well supported by clinics away from Macclesfield.

Housing is always going to be a contentious issue however building new houses (particularly on the outskirts) of the town is going to: a) impact the rural community and/or reduce leisure/recreation facilities b) require additional or larger primary schools (the existing ones are already oversubscribed e.g. Egerton Primary school has 17 extra pupils (i.e. 47) in its reception year - the school buildings are designed for class sizes of 30!) These are not discussed in the strategy c) require additional medical (GP) and dentist facilities d) produce additional traffic on the towns roads. None of these are discussed and simply building 1200 new houses will only be part of the "building program" required to support approximately 5000 new residents (4 per house). If building new house, must happen, then 1) It should only occur on brown field sites (i.e. not on farm or recreational land) 2) Any plans for new housing should also show how the additional facilities required by the new town residents will be met.

The proposed housing is concentrated on Green Belts areas. Valuable land which is used by the town’s sports clubs would be lost. The areas include the playing fields and pitches belonging to Knutsford’s football, tennis, cricket, bowling and archery clubs.

Proposed estates of houses far too big which will destroy the character of a country market town and it appears that some amenities e.g. allotments and sports facilities are to be sacrificed.

The housing strategy appears patchy and badly thought out. There is a lot of information on which green belt sites could be ruined by housing, but no information on the implications of this on the already creaking infrastructure in Knutsford. For example, the schools in Knutsford are bursting at the seams with a huge intake this school year. Egerton and Manor Park schools have been forced to add temporary classrooms to squeeze these extra children into the schools, but despite this all children did not get a school place in the town. Adding even 20 new houses would make this problem worse, let alone the proposed 1200 homes. Where will all these extra children go to school? Even if you build an extra school, this would not be enough and would result in even more green belt being lost forever. In addition to the schooling problem, the other infrastructure issues must be considered. The transportation and health systems in Knutsford are also more than full, with ridiculous traffic issues every day. If all of these extra people are to be added to these already overfull infrastructure systems, Knutsford will grind to a complete halt. Brownfield sites need to be developed, for example Caesars Cottages destroyed by Aldi, and the yard site near the Scout Hut on the Moor which was suggested for development years ago. Knutsford is a rural town, and any building on the surrounding greenbelt will significantly alter the character of the town. This makes a mockery of the rest of this document. In essence, Knutsford cannot cope with the influx of 500-1200 new homes, as it cannot cope with the population it already has. Without significant infrastructure investment, the housing strategy outlined above will completely ruin this beautiful town.

I strongly agree, however we should consider the demography of the existing community and ensure a good balance is maintained.

Affordable housing would be beneficial to the area. Any development must be carried out carefully in order to preserve the historic character of Knutsford. 1,280 homes on green belt land is outrageous. Totally arbitrary and without thought. Our infrastructure cannot take the increase you are demanding. Neither does our town want the increases. Why?

I emphasis again that the bias of the preferred development to the north side is very suspicious.
knowing who the landlords are and that there were no reasons given for any development on fields to the south of Knutsford which offer minimal disruption to well established community sport facilities for the town. We do not need block developments as it strains local facilities and puts the onus on the nearest school and medical facility to absorb unreasonable numbers. Our facilities are located around the town and therefore organic growth in each stated development of 20 houses or so would be far more manageable. This plan seems to be driven by developer interest and not Knutsford needs.

- Knutsford is an attractive place to live and new housing provision should be directly related to the local needs arising within the area. The objective of providing everyone who wishes to live in Knutsford with housing opportunities would lead to a disproportion.

People will just drive in nullifying the car park improvements. Housing plans seem to be further ahead than plans for extra school places and extra doctors' surgeries.

I do not agree with or support the strategy that we should be looking to ‘identify and allocate appropriate sites for new housing development to deliver between 460 and 1,280 new homes by 2030’. Knutsford is a small heritage market town and should remain as such. Including this many new housing developments will take Knutsford into a completely different scale. Whilst I want to secure Knutsford’s future and think that we can move into the 21st century with new ideas, this many new housing units is not acceptable.

I agree that there is a shortage of housing in Knutsford but the proposal to build as many as 1,280 new houses on green belt land is worrying. As an owner of a house which backs onto an area favoured for development I am incredibly frustrated by these plans. We have only just bought a house overlooking open fields; somewhere we plan to stay for some time. One of the key factors for buying the house was the open aspect. However, I am also concerned by the number of houses proposed versus the local amenities. The primary schools of Knutsford are already full to bursting and new houses will undoubtedly bring new children to the area. As a mum to be, I do not see why my child’s education should be potentially compromised. I am also concerned by the increase in traffic new houses will bring. The roads into Knutsford in the morning are already incredibly congested. Parking is at a premium.

The absence of a specific distribution of housing requirements within Cheshire East makes it difficult to ascertain exactly what is going to be required for Knutsford. However, given that a large proportion of any requirement would have to involve an adjustment to the Green Belt it may well be that a larger urban extension, rather than smaller losses of existing Green Belt would be appropriate.

The higher figure for proposed new homes could endanger the “distinctive character” of Knutsford. Increased traffic flow would inevitably have an impact on already congested streets. It is naive to assume that residents in new housing developments on the edge of town would access town centre by foot or cycle.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if you developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place i.e. the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis. 4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how this would be used in the small town of Knutsford.
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family.

---

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:  
**Objective and Strategy 4: Housing**
There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced, when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.

6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

The predicted increase in population in Cheshire East by 2026 is 16600. Predicted 24% increase in households by 2030 is 37000. Even given the trend for people to live alone, this forecast increase in households still seems excessive. Knutsford’s roads cannot cope with current levels of traffic. The proposed home building program will only exacerbate this problem.

While I strongly agree that more housing is needed & that wherever it is built will cause disruption I feel that a lot more explanation is needed e.g. areas are deemed as unsuitable with no reason given as to why. Instead of limiting building to a few areas wouldn't it be better to have smaller developments spread over a larger area? I am also concerned about allotments in the town despite assurances. There is already a long waiting list for the existing plots & I assume as more families move to Knutsford there will be an even bigger demand.

1,200 is an excessive number, especially if the houses are on large estates as they usually are these days. The character of Knutsford would be changed considerably by so many more people using the shops, schools and amenities. Change needs to be slower if the community is to evolve happily in line with the ‘Vision’. Knutsford will be different in 2030 and a ‘Vision’ for a much larger town may be appropriate then. Halve this number for now, and spread the development over 5 of the proposed sites.

From your report there are 12,570 residents in Knutsford. Assume your figure of 1280 new houses by 2030. Also assume an average occupancy of 3/dwelling. This means 3840 extra people - a 30% increase. Elsewhere in the report you state that the centre of Knutsford is crowded, with not enough parking. Your report seems to completely ignore the impact of increasing the town’s population by 30%. In addition to other factors how will you cater for the following increases in demand for: health facilities, traffic/parking, schools (there is currently a large increase), sewage handling, and general infrastructure.

This will destroy the character of Knutsford and put unbearable strain on the infrastructure of the town. Knutsford is a small market town and should remain that way.

The provision of so many more homes is worrying, but I recognise that we have a growing population and that there is a need for this housing. I like the objectives as stated, especially “Make sure that housing contributes to the sense of place and takes account of the historic and distinctive character of Knutsford”

I believe the development of the housing stock should surround the town, not just become strip housing to the north.

Do not believe that housing development on the proposed scale can be accommodated without adding to the traffic congestion and pressure on public services already being seen within the town.

Do not agree to any development of housing on Green Belt land

The roads of Knutsford cannot sustain the increase in traffic that the additional housing would inevitably bring.

There are plenty of other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require the expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development. From my experience of the local schools and medical facilities in Knutsford in the past year, these community uses struggle to cope with the current population.

Knutsford cannot cope with its current incumbents.

The projected number of new houses is a very broad range. At the top end an increase of over 20%
will radically alter the character of the town due to impact on highways and demand on the town’s facilities. Need to support the improvement of much of the existing housing stock.

I disagree with the proposal to build on greenbelt and therefore this principle does not co-exist with a sustainable future for Knutsford and its community.

More housing is fine as long as the infrastructure is there to support more housing.

Your strategy pays lip service to the provision of affordable housing but performance in recent years and your short term plans show just how committed to it. With 6,000 homes in the town and a waiting list of 450, the plan to provide 64 affordable homes each year is pathetic especially as none have been provided in the last two years.

Can more housing be sustained? as above traffic chaos.

Housing estates will not add to the appeal of the town for either residents or visitors in what is already a very congested area. Any new build should be in keeping or enhancing the unique character of the town.

1. Bullet 1. Housing numbers built per annum should be limited to the number required to clear the waiting list and numbers of houses suitable for present elderly residents to down-size to - a majority of these should be bungalows or semi-bungalows with at least one double bedroom down stairs.
2. Housing numbers built per annum should also take account of other low cost needs to accommodate young people and couples resident here after leaving school, apprenticeship or university and wishing to work in or close to Knutsford.
3. New housing estates should be mixed type and mixed cost to avoid building ghettos of expensive or low cost housing.

The current infrastructure is unable to cope (especially Adams Hill area) - without more housing to worsen the problem.

I don’t agree with housing being built on greenbelt or prime agricultural land, it should be on brownfield land, where ever that may be in the borough; the existing road infrastructure struggles to support the existing population and using public transportation is not a viable option for many of the commuters in Knutsford as the train service to Manchester is a joke, as the service is ridiculously slow and the frequency of trains is poor. Many people drive to Altrincham and get on the tram there due to the poor train service provided; the same can be said of the bus network.

The upper figure of 1280 is disproportionate to the existing town size.

Too many new houses on greenfield sites. Disproportionately in the Nether Knutsford Ward.

Judgement on this is very difficult without firmer information on what the vision and demand really is. For example we are told (in the draft consultation section 6) that the Cheshire East population is expected to grow by a little over 4% by 2026. On the other hand we are told that that during the same period the number of Cheshire East households will grow by a much higher 24%? Knutsford apparently currently has 6000 dwellings and the strategy calls for 460-1280 more which is actually 7 - 21% (i.e. a wide range). These seem like a rather unconvincing mixed bag of statistics and it’s unclear what does or does not apply to Knutsford in the context of Cheshire East as a whole (also critical for Vision).

Housing only on brownfield sites. Knutsford is a small, market town surrounded by green belt. It should only look to strengthen this. More housing means more traffic, crowded schools and roads.

I agree with the objective but do not accept that the number of new houses proposed is either achievable or necessary and I consider that the proposed incursions into the current green belt are unacceptable. I am also very concerned that the existing ancient woodland in areas G and K must be protected.

Increasing housing by up to 1280 new homes will create additional pressure on the road infrastructure in Knutsford. Traffic congestion was highlighted as a concern in the town plan consultations. Substantial new housing development should not be considered until the issue of traffic congestion is successfully addressed and resolved.
The infrastructure in Knutsford cannot cope with more houses. If we must build houses then we should not destroy areas of green belt. The road network needs to be improved greatly through the town centre before we can begin to think about building more houses. The schools are at capacity so this also needs to be addressed before building even more houses.

See previous comments. Why do you think ‘appropriate sites’ are all on greenbelt land?

There is a huge difference between 460 and 1280 homes - how can that be so vague - what are the figures based on? If the figures based on demographic forecasts how can they be so variant? The impact of the greater figure would be hugely different that the lower one.

An opportunity for everyone to afford a home is just unrealistic objective for a town to meet; this can only be done at a national level. The number of houses required needs to be justified. What is the number based on? It cannot be such a large range.

Do not build on green belt. The clue is in the name.

Agree that there is a need for affordable housing in the town. However the cost (environmentally, loss of leisure facilities, free spaces, overcrowded roads and parking facilities, overcrowded schools, etc) is simply unsustainable. From this perspective the housing strategy is weak and wholly distorted. It will favour developers looking to make "big bucks" in a lucrative catchment and if any "affordable housing" is delivered then it will not be affordable to the people which the strategy pretends to address. The streets, schools, leisure facilities cannot support an increase in population. If the strategy for development were to be re prioritised to address these issues first by investment, then perhaps expansion of housing would be accepted; but the realisation of this plan will result in hundreds of mid to high price range houses (with a token gesture providing a few affordable houses - probably tucked away out of sight in an area which is ripe for such development anyway). Instead of pursuing the greedy route, the developers and council (if they are truly committed to affordable housing) will look to redevelop existing areas by using innovative housing units based on sustainable technologies. In summary, the greed of the land owners, developers and council is transparent. Sure, go ahead and use innovation to develop affordable housing - WITHIN EXISTING BOUNDARIES - and after this, invest in meeting the real needs of the town (schools, street layout, parking, connectivity, leisure facilities). The next step, with the infrastructure to support an expanded population, would be to build more houses.

We agree with low cost/rental housing opposite Longridge, but only minor development on greenbelt land. The town is big enough. It cannot sustain too much more development. It isn't just housing, it is new schools, doctors' facilities, etc.

I absolutely disagree with any development on green belt. Improving current developments has to be wholly sympathetic to our countryside. Over population will suffocate and exhaust our town, roads, schools, resources and employment opportunities.

There is a real need for sustainable housing for the elderly, within easy access of the town. Affordable housing should be kept proportionate, with larger more expensive housing also being allowed.

Agree entirely with the Objective. However, the strategy gives no evidence of how any item will help to meet the Objective.

Large swathes of new housing will choke the town. One of the proposals is to build on the waterlogged fields between Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane. Clearly anyone who thinks this is a good idea has not tried to get onto Manchester Road at 8am on a weekday. Destruction of our beautiful green belt land is a disgraceful betrayal of the town. If more housing is needed it should be built on brownfield sites in the county, and not focused on destroying the wonderful countryside which makes our town and surrounding area so beautiful. Once brownfield sites are used up, then and only then should green field build be considered, NOT BEFORE!

More housing is needed around Knutsford however some of the sites proposed would negatively impact Knutsford, its heritage and the facilities available to those who live here. In particular the proposal for building on/around Egerton boys club is abhorrent bearing in mind the level of usage of that particular parcel of land. Our family agrees that this is the "best used piece of land in the whole of Knutsford" in relation to the rugby, football and other activities that take place there.
Your plans indicate that 16,600 new residents in Cheshire East by 2026, a 4.5% growth. Knutsford has 6,000 homes, 4.5% of 6,000 is 270 extra homes by 2026. We don't have the infrastructure to support the existing number of residents/homes.

As you say, it’s important that new homes are attractive, well built, designed and built to be as environmentally friendly as possible, have community spirit and links to town centre and other amenities, have green spaces.

The objective is utopian and unachievable it is also completely at odds with the other key objectives and statements regarding the town vision. Knutsford currently comprises around 5000 homes, adding another (1600 homes, i.e. 1280 plus the 350 already available at Longridge,) 30% is excessive growth over a 20 year period. The transport, education and healthcare infrastructure is already inadequate. Embarking upon such growth is going to mean a continuous degradation of our infrastructure, no matter how much it is improved. Just to maintain the current standards will demand continuous sustained investment. Housing developments should not be built on green belt. Full use of available brown field sites should be encouraged with housing targeted towards young families as this provides greater stimulus to the economy. The current age profile of the town is not balanced, consequently this places greater demands on health and social care services.

Sounds ideal but it’s not! If we have to have new housing it should be on brown belt sites and absolutely not on green belt. We need more young families. However, infrastructure is already under too much pressure. Roads are consistently blocked, health services stretched. If you keep building, things need to keep being improved and where will it all stop? We need to improve what we've got and not just keep adding to the problem. Building on green belt will ruin the character - you can’t build 'in character', as the green spaces are fundamental to the character!!!

Traffic problems now. Aldi will make it worse. Can't see anything relating to increasing infrastructure e.g. doctors, schools, parks, sports amenities, roads, transport to cope with this extra housing. Also, much of housing is under the rapidly expanding airport flight path and is therefore unsuitable.

Do not agree that any green field sites around Knutsford should be used for more housing.

In order to meet the demands of new housing adequate improvements to the infrastructure must be developed and put in place prior to occupation.

Towns need to grow and attract young people with affordable housing and accommodation for key workers.

Could not disagree more. More housing would detract from the character of the town: the roads cannot take any more traffic: there is no NEED for more housing: any development would take valuable food production land: most of the land is in the Green Belt.

KCHG finds it difficult to agree with the proposed numbers of houses suggested for Knutsford. Knutsford’s character is clearly identified in its status as a small market town which is lucky to have retained its distinctive character, and to increase the size of the town significantly puts that status and identity at risk. Existing green spaces within the town boundary must be protected as part of that character. However, should additional development be required, new construction must be sustainable, i.e. supported by increased infrastructure provision (roads, schools, medical facilities, power/water/sewage/gas/communications, and other community facilities).

While not disputing the need for additional housing, the proposed maximum is out of proportion the size of the town given it’s greenbelt positioning and limited infrastructure. See other comments.

No further development should take place. New homes on the scale of anything like the 460 to 1280 quoted in the plan are certainly not needed. Just because people have a desire to live in Knutsford doesn’t give them a right to have a home built to accommodate them and it is no reason to build on green belt. The existing housing estates on the edges of Knutsford are desolate and isolated and we have already had to accommodate a large, Manchester overspill estate. To build any more housing on the green belt adjacent to the town, as proposed in the plan, would change the character of Knutsford for the worse. A moratorium on new dwellings, as under Macclesfield Borough Council, should be reinstated. Or, use the Aldi site for houses. Knutsford does not require five supermarkets. The existing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:</th>
<th>Objective and Strategy 4: Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New houses are required however building lots of new houses will in its very nature affect the structure of Knutsford also new houses mean that any developer should also produce the necessary medical/ educational and retail needs at their own cost not the cost of the town. All sites should also be thoroughly checked and considered to ensure no detrimental effects to the environment. Any checks and work should use local firms to stimulate local economy and provide jobs to locals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that it is particularly important to secure adequate supplies of the full range of housing in Knutsford. It is important that our children (or in my case grandchildren) who have been born and grown up in the town should at the appropriate time be able to acquire a home here, whether this be owner occupied or social. The number of homes available must increase as people are living longer, the population is increasing and some older houses either reach the end of their lives or are converted to other uses eg business premises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would strongly opposed more than 500 residential properties being created within Knutsford, in particular should such require considerable extension of the town boundary into the 'green belt'. I would be very concerned about any new properties being created in a 'variety of styles', and feel that a design guide or code should be created for the town, in order that its character could be retained. Such development should be of the highest standard whether for affordable or high end housing, such that long term sustainability could be assured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a large number of houses will detract from the character of Knutsford and add to traffic problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford already has a wide range of housing of all categories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is agreed that new development should ensure that it reinforces distinctive local character. This is a particular area where landscape character considerations need to be to the fore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not understand where huge range in housing numbers comes from. Would more be more sustainable and benefit town (i.e. new primary school)? More information needed!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No building on Green Belt or prime agricultural land. Yes to infill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although not directly impinging geographically on the Parish of Nether Alderley, the Parish Council notes that an increase in housing in nearby towns may have an impact upon the volume of traffic passing through the Parish. In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment into Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst housing needs to be added to the need for keeping a 'green gap' between Knutsford and the rural parishes prevents parishes becoming just part of Knutsford’s urban spread.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the character of Knutsford is to be maintained then as few houses as possible should be built and only where they will benefit the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t understand design templates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas A,B,C,D,E are Green Belt and should remain so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New housing development should concentrate on high density housing to minimise green field area required to accommodate increase in population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The aim should be to increase attractive high density affordable housing to encourage a more diverse population demographic - not more executive housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The true development needs for the Knutsford are essential for the identification; planning and timely delivery of water supply and sewerage infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladman note Objective 4 of the Knutsford Town Strategy which is to provide the opportunity for everyone to live in a good quality, well designed, sustainable home, which they can afford, that contributes to the distinctive character of Knutsford. We also note the identification to allocate appropriate sites to accommodate between 460 and 1,280 new homes by 2030, but suggest, as stated in our general comments that this figure should be properly determined through the Core Strategy and should reflect the housing need identified in the SHMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| But . . . Add where appropriate in Paragraph, Will seek to see where the Town needs to renew built
areas which are not fit for purpose whilst retaining any historical character but also to enhance it. To build denser and where appropriate higher rise Buildings as Chester City have done which provides more dwellings but with less land loss.

Where will people park their cars if they live in the town centre? Disagree with the future development sites for housing as they are in the Green Belt, which is a character of the town which your policies seek to destroy, whilst at the same time saying you want to preserve them. Tatton Park’s success is linked to the quaintness and heritage Knutsford attracts.

I do not believe there should be any housing development on Greenbelt or Greenfield sites. Brown field and underutilised land earmarked for other options should be considered first.

New housing would not be supportable by existing infrastructure. This needs to be improved to cope with existing demand and development of green field sites should not be considered.

In recent surveys of attitudes of residents, more residential development is not considered a priority. We are supposed to live in a democracy please listen to the people!! I agree that any further housing (which should not be on the Green Belt) should conform to the highest aesthetic standards and complement the best examples of the existing built environment. Again, define "sustainable" community - and remember that growth (in terms of using up finite resources (land etc) is ultimately UNSUSTAINABLE.

There is no correlation between the vision for Knutsford, the housing objective and the housing strategy. How can this strategy be specific about the numbers of houses required (450-1280) when it bears no relationship to the towns vision?

We strongly disagree with your housing policy for the following reasons:
* All of the identified sites are located within the Green Belt
* The expected population growth for Cheshire is 5% over 14 years (pg 19). However, the vision implies that Cheshire East will increase the housing stock in Knutsford by 21% - this seems a truly unfair distribution of the housing especially when other towns are much more ripe for development
* Increased population without improved and increased facilities may bring more unemployment and crime
* Knutsford's infrastructure currently struggles to cope under the current number of houses, adding more will prove disastrous - the roads are already far too busy, there is not enough parking, there are not enough leisure facilities or health centres and the primary education sector is currently full with Egerton Primary having to install an extra classroom just to cope with the new intake
* There will be a massive impact on local biodiversity and food production
* There are currently around 400,000 housing units in the UK that have planning consent but have not even been started or finished. Surely these should be identified as a priority before considering new options
* If new housing is to be built, it should be built out of the green belt area e.g. site G
* East Cheshire's strategy for housing is in full contradiction with its objectives and strategy for environment (objective 6) - building upon greenbelt decreases green spaces, removes woodland and open countryside, affecting wildlife and biodiversity.
* The introduction of housing will provide a negative impact on the value of properties near, or within, direct contact. Such price fluctuations could place families, already struggling during the UK's and Europe's financial uncertainty to fall into negative equity. This would then have a hugely detrimental effect on, not only the families but the community as a whole. By removing the available equity will reduce spending by theses families or result in families having properties repossessed or force them to move.
* 13 of the sites which were considered, were subsequently not considered suitable for development - for many of these a reason was not given. It is vital for an explanation to be given as to why these were disregarded. Surely for such a major decision all facts should be made available.
* Why has the consultation not been delivered by other means to members of the community and residents that would be affected by your site choices, not all residents have access to computers or the internet or purchase the local Guardian. We spoke to several of our neighbours and they knew nothing of the proposal with less than 48 hours to go until the 1st of October deadline! Without all
residents knowing about the proposal, this results in an unfair reflection.

Knutsford will be swamped if the proposed building takes place.

I'm not sure how the objective of 'affordable' housing can be sustained beyond the initial purchase in an open free marketplace. Some additional population will make some town amenities more sustainable.

I think developing the Longridge end of Knutsford would cause too much traffic to pass through the centre of town. Developing the Sugar Pitt Lane end of town would help this.

This section contains elements of our strongest objections. Knutsford will not benefit from any proposal of housing expansion of at least 460 new homes. Knutsford is a thriving historic town which should be respected. We believe that future housing needs of the area should focus on the sensitive re-development of brownfield sites before destroying precious natural and beautiful greenbelt sites which would surely devalue Knutsford for local inhabitants, businesses and potentially destroy the substantial visitor footfall and economic value that Knutsford enjoys.

Some new housing will always be required, but brownfield sites should be the first consideration. The road system should be fit for purpose prior to development. i.e. Mereheath Lane, Tabley Road and Mobberley Road, would need to be upgraded before any development be started. Tabley Road would be difficult to upgrade, if at all.

This is lunacy. The town is what it is because it has a sustainable population-to-facilities-to-infrastructure ratio; and it is surrounded by wonderful country side where one may pause and watch the birds and rabbits etc. Destroying all this destroys Knutsford forever. We need more open space not less when will this all stop? Please don’t build on green belt, when we are a suburb of Warrington in year to come citizens might be economically better off but they will be more miserable. Humans need space, it is in our genetic makeup.

The provision of 460-1280 houses is massively disproportionate to the number of dwellings currently in the town. It amounts to approximately 22% increase. There is no need, the population of Cheshire East is projected to grow by 4 or 5%. (para 6.2). Large scale building at A and B would be destructive of the distinctive character of Knutsford and impose an additional burden on the local infrastructure. A and B are NOT 'sustainable' locations. Building there is destructive, taking from future generations the advantages enjoyed by this one, and rendering the forbearances of previous generations (in not developing these fields) useless, and running contrary to long-term pro-green-belt government policy.

Knutsford might need new housing but not without additional health care facilities, not to mention school capacity and again improved road schemes. I also do not agree to taking green field land for development - there are enough brown field sites.

If Knutsford is not to become just a town for older and retired people, there should be emphasis on providing affordable housing so that young people can live here and participate in supporting the local community by joining societies and voluntary groups etc.

I believe the current policy allows Knutsford to retain its quality and feel, as more housing is introduced it will increase numbers and will impact on the value of houses in Knutsford and on the community feel as the size increases. The loss of greenbelt will lose it feel and sense of calm.

High priority - needs to be well designed and built, in attractive areas and not just for older people. There is a real need for housing for young professionals.

Far too many houses the whole area would not be able to cope.

The proposed plan will increase the towns housing and therefore population by over 20%. Cheshire East is set to increase in population by just 7%; it is unfair and the town’s infrastructure will not cope with such a disproportionate increase. It is only fair that Knutsford increases at the same rate as the rest of Cheshire East (7%), therefore 427 housing units would be needed within the period of the plan for Knutsford to grow in proportion with the rest of East Cheshire.

This is rhetoric - whilst housing may initially be “affordable” its value would soon increase to make it unaffordable - unless the town is developed to the extent that it is a less desirable place to live.
The proposed plan will increase the towns housing and therefore population by over 20%. Cheshire East is set to increase in population by just 7%, it is unfair and the town’s infrastructure will not cope with such a disproportionate increase. It is only fair that Knutsford increases at the same rate as the rest of Cheshire East (7%), therefore 427 housing units would be needed within the period of the plan for Knutsford to grow in proportion with the rest of East Cheshire.

We have to protect our green belt land and the first choices for development are indicative of a commercial advantage for the council and those connected with developing this land.

I accept a need for a SMALL amount of social and first time buyer housing in Knutsford, however not at the expense of Green belt....you state that a provision of "good quality access from any new residential development to the town centre" is important....those on Parkgate will have great difficulty I feel. Our natural heritage is important so disregarding this is not taking account of the historic and distinctive character of Knutsford.

Whilst the overall objective seems alright, up to 1,280 new homes is too many. - Housing for older people should not be segregated

This is such an obvious objective but it would be extremely difficult to achieve. Maybe infilling on the brownfield sites in the town on a smaller scale would be less ambitious but more likely to happen.

The proposed plan will increase the towns housing and therefore population by over 20%. Cheshire East is set to increase in population by just 7%, it is unfair and the town’s infrastructure will not cope with such a disproportionate increase. It is only fair that Knutsford increases at the same rate as the rest of Cheshire East (7%), therefore 427 housing units would be needed within the period of the plan for Knutsford to grow in proportion with the rest of East Cheshire.

Knutsford does not require substantial residential development. It would be entirely detrimental. Large scale housing developments are a mistake made in the past and should not be repeated.

Far too much development proposed

Area K is subject to serious flooding and at the time of writing is under water due to heavy rain. The vehicular access to the existing housing adjacent to Area K falls well below the current highway design standards in terms of visibility at junctions. In particular, the junction of Thorneyholme Drive and Mobberley Road is totally unsatisfactory to cater for existing traffic flows due to very substandard visibility to the right for traffic turning into Mobberley road. In addition, the junction of Mobberley Road and Chelford Road at the Legh Arms is not capable of safely accommodating an increase of traffic generated by the proposed Area K.

Knutsford is one of the most expensive towns in Cheshire. Does it not strike you that there is a reason for this? Allow me to enlighten you. Houses are worth what people are prepared to pay! The fact that people are prepared to pay higher than average prices underlines the fact that they want to live in a town that has just 12,000 residents. Of the 450 people on the housing waiting list, how many live in Knutsford already? I'm willing to bet not many. I don't believe Knutsford will achieve the economic, cultural or environmental goals if within 18 years, the Knutsford vision has a bias to cater for a growth in social housing needs. Knutsford isn't Northwich or Crewe - just because some people who can't afford to live here want to live here, doesn't mean the council's duty to provide services for "want to be residents" should come before the needs of those residents that already pay taxes and choose to purchase expensive properties away from the towns that have high crime, anti-social problems (indicative of neighbourhoods housing "low income" families).

Is the goal set forth to build between 460 and 1280 new homes to meet the need for 64 affordable homes then the rest not-so-affordable homes like the rest of town? Or to accommodate the 450 people mentioned on the waiting list for Knutsford (where do these people live now)? I am assuming it is a waiting list for affordable housing? We chose to live in Knutsford because it's a small town with very little sprawl. Not to sound like a snob but we don't want Knutsford to become another Northwich. The areas earmarked for new housing developments are a bit worrisome. Yes, we enjoy living on the edge of town with nothing but fields behind us. But, we also put up with the flight-path noise as well as the noise pollution from the M6. This would all only be worse for any development
behind us. This "green belt" is more like a buffer zone between town and the M6. These other objectives and strategies hinge on the amount of housing development that is being considered. As I said above in sustainable community, this town seems to be busting at the seams in its current state. Yes, the town needs to build some new homes but really? At the suggested numbers? There are 100 somewhat affordable properties on the market right now (affordable to people who look to move here). What's wrong with some of those? The knock-on effect feels huge. All very idealistic but not so much realistic.

I am inclined to question the amount of housing that will be necessary but agree there should be a good variety for all ages and sizes of family, for rental as well as for buying. Sites within the town - on brownfield sites, good quality "flats" above existing shops and careful adaptation of sites that have been unused (possibly the Court House area) might be considered. Green Belt land should be a "last resort".

Housing numbers need to be considered in the context of a green belt strategy, not just Knutsford needs. The green belt serves the 3 million people of Manchester as well as Knutsford. Nubes should be reduced to a minimum.

We should protect our green belt and existing sports facilities.

Releasing Green Belt is essential to drive forward the prosperity of Knutsford, however the allocation of site preferences should be more measured and depend on which Landowner's will be prepared to give back the greater benefits to Knutsford from the land enhancement values created. Brooks Family, Bruntwood, Leycester-Roxby Family and Crown Estate (Tabley Estate) for example should be invited to tender for the release of their land with outline proposals which the Town of Knutsford can debate and approve. I want to see greater Car parking provision and Free plus the provision on new/improve sporting club facilities. Knutsford Rugby has no home and whilst providing an important community benefit with its large Junior section and fund raising could for example benefit from this process. Toft Cricket requires a second pitch. Likewise there needs should be cater for too.

not enough information provided

What is the economic justification for the target numbers specified? They reflect national averages and expectations and owe more to what the erstwhile NWDA thought would be needed than to a strict analysis of needs. Affordable housing soon rises to the market level on subsequent sale. Leasehold with covenants would do more to preserve housing stock at affordable rents and for owner occupiers of modest means. Tied cottages had a lot going for them and modern variant could well be helpful rather than wholesale building. The building of a high density estate a la Longridge to the north of the town conflicts with the objective 'to make sure that housing contributes to a sense of place'. What investigations have there been of English and Continental solutions e.g. Garden Cities, Lansbury Estate that would complement existing architecture and Knutsford's USP. Such development that is allowed should be in small closes as far as possible in each area of the town so that all take their share of development but it is on an absorbable scale. Established and new enclaves can then be harmoniously interconnected.

Whilst there appears to be a requirement for some additional domestic housing as is evidenced by the lack of middle range properties for sale for potential buyers, the proposed Housing Development areas appear to greatly exceed the requirement. If the areas now considered not suitable were added, the "overkill" in numbers of properties would be immense and Knutsford would lose its identity of being a small intimate town. Some local employees who currently commute may move into the town but there will still be many who travel in by road. Car parking, long and short term, is a serious failing in the document which should be given priority. Primary schools have been a sore point ever since the closure of St John’s Wood and Crosstown schools. A new school in the Parkgate area would be a definite benefit in the Over Knutsford ward and would stop any possibility of overcrowding at Manor Park school. However traffic lights at the junction of Parkgate Lane and Mobberley Road would be essential - there are already access delays at that junction when the staff in the industrial estate are going home in the late afternoon. Conversely the removal of Egerton School leaving Bexton the only
primary school on the west of the town would cause even greater congestion in the Beggarmans Lane/Blackhill Lane/Bexton Lane. An alternative to Egerton is essential.

We are unhappy at the prospect of site E, right next to Tatton being developed and would prefer that any development was west of the Manchester/Knutsford Road A 50, i.e. not sites C and D either. Sites F and G are also immediately next to the SE boundary of Tatton Park, and would close the gap between the park and the settlement, removing its current buffer. It would be advisable to get expert advice on how much of surrounding landscape is ‘essential setting’ for the Park. This is a nationally significant site, not just a local one, so it should not be compromised for short term gain. There is supposed to be a conservation management plan for Tatton Park but it seems to have gone missing (it was carried out by Parklands Consortium about 10 years ago), and there may be a more recent CMP too. Either way they probably need to be updated and to include a section on setting as there is now so much development pressure. It is in Knutsford’s interest to maintain the quality of the historic landscape. It is also partly Knutsford’s responsibility. The Garden History Society is a statutory consultee for any proposals that would affect the park, garden or setting of a site on the Register. Was it consulted on this Strategy? Site K, which includes Booths Mere is considered a potential site for development. The mere is visually important in views from Booths Hall and any development should include management of the existing edge planting and its enhancement, linking the existing playing field to countryside. Site Q is between Toft Hall (locally significant historic designed landscape) and Bexton Hall. We would not like to see it developed for housing. Toft Hall is an important largely intact parkland landscape, the estate still owned by the family though the hall, which was used by businesses, is now back in single ownership. A Cheshire Gardens Trust report is in progress for Toft Hall. A report has been completed and issued for Bexton Hall. It was formerly a hunting lodge/farm on the Tabley estate with views over the M6 and railway to Tabley. There is no real historic garden remaining but it is important in its visual links with Tabley and Toft. Legh Road Villas - CA - important for buildings and gardens, none of which we have looked into yet, but the historic core is very distinctive and unusual. It could be affected by housing on sites P and O. To the S site N is a large rural area which if developed would affect the setting of Kerfield House which is recommended for local listing. Site T abuts part of Tabley House = areas not on register because cut off by M6 (but of historic interest) A drive from Tabley comes out by Sudlows farm, east of the M6, where there is a lodge and an estate cottage. The M6 lies in dip/cutting here so, despite the service area, there is some visual continuity in the landscape. Sites I and J partly surround Dukenfield hall, which we have no information on at present, but setting could be a consideration.

why more?.... fill the ones that are already vacant and or build low cost housing in an area that can accommodate the spending needs of the people buying/renting them...not high priced shops in Knutsford surely!!

‘Variety’ of housing is key. Extreme caution should be employed where ‘flood risks’ exist.

The green belt should be protected in its entirety. There are small areas within the town boundaries which could provide new starter homes. I do not agree with the number of homes envisaged in the plan unless plans for increased school places and healthcare to support these additional residents are included. The upper and lower school (Academy) could be combined on a new site on the fringe of town and the existing sites used for infill housing or in the case of the lower school light industrial units/offices. This would also relieve the centre of Knutsford of the coaches bringing pupils from other towns and thus ease congestion.

It is unclear why the very wide range of new homes has been suggested. I don’t see the need for anything other than the lower end of the range of new homes. Having just bought a house in Knutsford I am now worried about the potential loss in value if additional houses are built. I do understand the need for some affordable housing as several of our friends have struggled to get onto the property ladder, but the difficulty is getting approval for a mortgage, not availability of houses.

I disagree with the proposal to put housing on Green Belt land, especially near Booths Mere which has designated ecological status.
As I mentioned earlier, there is no need to plan housing for a 20 per cent increase in the town’s population. That many people will not be born before 2030. It would be better to peg housing increase to expected population growth (remember that people will come and go from the town anyway; it’s not like anyone is stuck here). All of this capacity could be achieved from already-developed sites. These developments would be trickier and more expensive, but there’s no obligation to make building easier and more lucrative for property developers. Historic areas such as the Cotswolds don’t allow it, and there’s no reason why we should either. If there really must be some green belt development (e.g. if it’s a requirement for George Osborne’s building mandate) then I’d suggest the area on Longridge opposite the Falcon Bearer and the arcade with the two restaurants and the newsagents. The arcade should be upgraded at the same time, maybe extending across the road (it would be nice to have a community centre up here). This initiative has the potential to improve the entire Longridge estate, if carried through. Further housing capacity could be obtained by building a little bit higher within some parts of Longridge; four story town houses would work fine here (e.g. the ones at the end of the "Longridge" road itself). I’d imagine something similar to the successful redevelopment of Hulme in Manchester. I think it would be possible to meet all the desired increase in dwelling capacity in this way, and it would also substantially improve this part of Knutsford.

1,280 homes is far too many for Knutsford - burden on present schools etc. will be too much

How has the level of housing provision been calculated? The range (460 - 1,280 new homes) is very big and implies the Council doesn’t know the total required. Recommend no more new homes are built than needed - to reduce the changes to the town. There are several sites in the town and buildings suitable for adaptation, which could be used for housing. That would reduce the need for using Green Belt land.

I am not against some building in Knutsford, but to build a large new estate on one end of town or the other is ridiculous. Some expansion of existing estates in small numbers of houses over a longer period of time (perhaps 50 here and there) would be far better. The town’s infrastructure would also be able to cope with a slower population increase and the impact of previous developments could be assessed at various stages.

must consider the impact that any expansion will have upon already over stretched services and also on road systems. The town is frequently brought to a standstill by traffic jams in the morning and evening rush hour.

The housing that has been built in the 70s up until now has been awful and so many houses are a real eyesore. Really poor designs considering how beautiful the town centre is.

Some new housing will always be required, but brownfield sites should be the first consideration. The road system should be fit for purpose prior to development. i.e. Mereheath Lane, Tabley Road and Mobberley Road, would need to be upgraded before any development be started. Tabley Road would be difficult to upgrade, if at all.

Natural England agree with Objective 4, to provide the opportunity for everyone to live in a good quality, well designed, sustainable home, which they can afford and that contributes to the distinctive character of Knutsford. This theme is a reflection of the NPPF core principle of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Must be "Heritage" - esq"Poundbury" good example.

Not necessary

What is projected population in 2030? How was number of new homes requirement arrived at?

The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them

Site G is the only place to build

No more housing the quantity and balance is right now

Green Belt determines housing not swarms of non-resident housing making builders.

New housing will be required in the future but when a good portion of green belt has been built on. community gardens would not be the same
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More housing is needed in the town to meet current need and the needs of future generations of Knutsfordians. However, housing should not be at the expense of other amenities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More housing is needed in the town to meet current need and the needs of future generations of Knutsfordians. However, housing should not be at the expense of other amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware extra housing is needed but numbers calculated seem inflated - area chosen needs to be fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford does not need to expand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford can't support further houses without improved roads, schools, parking facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People need realistic expectations. E.g. should not expect to live in bigger and bigger houses to the detriment of green space around us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why such a big range? Top end is 20% increase. Possibly too much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferably for Knutsford's own needs, not for city/town overspill. Housing/jobs need to balance each other. Too many commuters already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for strain on road system. Consider a ring road running from Manchester Road, north of the housing area, round to Northwich Road, to Toft Road, Chelford Road and Mobberley Road. This would remove through traffic from the town centre. Should be integrated with housing developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although a case for housing, to claim 1280 new houses will be required seems over inflated causing motoring misery and further problems re oversubscribed doctors and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some new housing, but people want to live in Knutsford because it is small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford's population is big enough for the amenities - doctors, schools, social service etc and any increase in population would have a detrimental effect on the character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of houses planned vastly exceeds rate of growth of Knutsford. Traffic. Dislike use Green Belt. Will get worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cannot be implemented before car parking is tackled. We already have gridlock!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280 new homes by 2030 would be massive expansion. Unrealistic and undesirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase population by about 20% I don't believe the town infrastructure can accept this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing needed for the elderly. Distinct lack of affordable family homes £200-300k for those on middle incomes (not supported housing/housing association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we contemplating building on the Green Belt? ideal brownfield sites in Macclesfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to building on green field sites - Knutsford should not link up with nearby villages i.e. Mere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great care needed - demand fluctuates greatly with economy state in the UK not just locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new housing should be restricted to starter homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 homes is more than enough and this could be absorbed in existing areas without impact on green sites!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against provision for housing land in Green Belt. Knutsford does not have transport infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably contentious to build new houses in the Green Belt but I feel that this should be supported by careful management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have enough housing in Knutsford. Please no more estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper infrastructure needed, parking schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such enormous increase in housing completely unnecessary and unsustainable without totally changing and swamping Knutsford. Couldn't disagree more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about 'mixed communities'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective and Strategy 5: Heritage

Do you agree or disagree with the Heritage Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 82% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (34%); Agree (42%); Neither Agree or Disagree (11%); Disagree (4%); Strongly Disagree (9%)

Comments:

Without the strong heritage and cultural links Knutsford would lose its sense of purpose and become just like any other town, it is the heritage that attracts visitors and locals and this history has kept the town developing and attracting people. Also, Tatton Park symbolises Knutsford and its history and one could not survive without the other.

I agree with the importance of heritage and urge the local plan to place this before significantly increasing the housing provision. I would be cautious of a 'design template' as it may lead to a pastiche-approach to new developments. Any template would need to give such risks due consideration.

What is a design template?

Notice how one of the most important things to people living in Knutsford has the shortest list, if you can achieve the items on the list then you will have met your minimum standards for heritage as you have stated them.

Protect.

This is more important than most give it credit. Our past is who we are, without it we are not who we think we are.

Our heritage must be protected, including the green belt.

The heritage of the town should be of paramount importance. As long as proposals are befitting of a quaint country town, I see no cause for alarm.
The green belt is a distinctive feature of Knutsford's heritage style and should be included in the heritage strategy.

Please always allow flow of traffic down King Street and Princess Street e.g. like York City.

Therefore, with this statement why is Cheshire East considering altering the use of Tatton Park with a scheme that will destroy our heritage.

It is vitally important to preserve our heritage

Heritage is a huge contributor to Knutsford's charm and attractiveness to visitors. This should be nurtured and encouraged

Strongly agree that the heritage aspects of the town need to be enhanced and promoted.

Knutsford is an historic town with many strong associations with the past. This character needs to be preserved but not in aspic!

I can't see how the heritage of Knutsford can be preserved while absorbing such a huge influx. I fear Knutsford will lose its unique character and just become another identikit Cheshire town such as Wilmslow.

There is too much bias to preserving everything in aspic which simply creates long planning delays as interested parties argue the toss. New builds in the town are generally bland. Yes, be sensible about preserving what's unique about Knutsford but do it quickly and efficiently.

And yet the town has been able to absorb new, modern designs without losing its character.

A need to rid the town of present '1960s' type developments, e.g. Canture Square.

We would use Tatton Park more if entry was free for Council Tax payers.

Don't understand 'design template' would do to help maintain variable styles already in Knutsford.

"To conserve and enhance Knutsford's heritage assets and buildings and spaces of architectural and cultural importance. Including: the Historic Park and Garden at Tatton" is great, but is being undermined by Cheshire East supporting BeWilderwood.

The green belt which surrounds Knutsford defines the town's character and should be included in the heritage strategy.

We need to preserve all sites in the town.

Support Knutsford Heritage Centre as it aims to promote the town's heritage to visitors.

It is so important especially in the Conservation areas. Knutsford has this Unique heritage and it should be kept unchanged as much as possible. However it should be flexible enough so that in the right circumstances, rules can be bent if it is right for the majority of people in Knutsford.

What is a 'design template'? There are too many vague terms in your draft Plan.

Again, how could one really disagree?

Council tax payers should have access to Tatton free.

I feel very strongly that such large scale housing development will greatly affect the heritage of Knutsford. Part of its charm is its open spaces and I thought the green belt was meant to protect that? Knutsford has already been developed in recent years, so I would argue that another town would benefit much more from the investment.

What Heritage - the plan will have ruined the character of the town in its overall sense so why then get hung up about the pretty buildings? Leave the whole town alone and drop the plans for the Green Belt.

Any development of any size should ensure that the history and heritage of Knutsford does not suffer - conservation areas, green spaces and listed buildings and should and must be protected

It is a good objective but experience shows it is not always implemented.

Only if you have design statements for conservation areas, stop architects genuflecting to Harding Watt's architects and adhere to policies. Some of your policies conflict with economics. You only have to see the present application for Tatton Park, backed by CEC and Councillors on the Tatton Board, that will have an huge detrimental impact not only on the most intact historical Grade 11* Park and
Garden, the Green Belt, wildlife. SSIs and possibly on a RAMSAR. I believe you need to make stringent policies that will protect the natural and historic built environment from economic pressures.

Your concern for Heritage ignores the destruction proposed on the Green Belt. Why protect one when you are determined to ruin the other?

Knutsford is unique and must retain its history and heritage including areas of green belt land for the communities benefit

We already have it

This brings the obvious contradiction with the housing strategy; Filing the town with new housing damages our heritage of beautiful green open spaces. 1,280 new homes, the increased infrastructure required to support it and the resulting chaos does nothing to "compliment the unique character of the town.

I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

Let’s see if this can be done... Regent street is a classic example of what does not work in a market town! By creating the design template though it also cannot be too restrictive, we do need to work with the cultural heritage of the town but not be bound by it. Only the small, individual shop owners actually maximise on the heritage of their retail units - Mallard tea rooms v WH Smith - the latter looks like a store in any town, whereas the former maximised on the heritage and history of the building!

I strongly believe in our heritage, it’s what makes Knutsford and brings in visitors and people like myself and my husband to live here. The document states that it wants to protect our heritage, but we are at the moment facing an onslaught of 'progress' ie our parish church windows are under attack, our streets and pavements may be about to be destroyed for worse materials and a dreadful scheme doomed to failure at the cost of those living here.

As 3 above, we owe it to future generations, to preserve the heritage of Knutsford

The proposed building will spoil the character of Knutsford and will undermine its heritage

Need to review and update all Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings lists to ensure reflect current needs.

You are destroying the heritage with these plans

Today’s society owes it to tomorrows generation to do the right thing and preserve the heritage of Knutsford

The heritage of Knutsford cricket club which is over 100 years old and the land bequeathed by Lord Egerton to the football and youth clubs would be destroyed.

The rich heritage of Knutsford needs to be promoted further, and opportunities are being missed.

Knutsford is its heritage and the last development in Canute Square was totally out of character and the town has seriously lost its charm and appeal in that crucial area and shows clearly when a plan is rough shod by developers and must have of 'progress' ie our parish church windows are under attack, our streets and pavements may be about to be destroyed for worse materials and a dreadful scheme doomed to failure at the cost of those living here.

How can we really believe this won’t happen again? Regent St is a clear example of poor workmanship and materials with the cheap cobbles breaking up and within 20 years will look extremely shoddy.

Much more could be made of Knutsford's heritage. We have a good base, but a very poor marketing and visitor strategy relating to all this. Heritage walks, talks, appropriate and helpful signage, penny farthing town rental (new versions not old obviously) should all be considered. More could be made of the Cranford connection and linkages to Tatton throughout Knutsford should be made.

Each of the points mentioned are of great significance to the town and the maintenance of its character and attraction.

Elected councillors should take a greater interest and maintain a watching brief on the condition and misuse of the buildings which represent our heritage.

The "distinctive character" of Knutsford depends largely on the heritage attraction of a small town surrounded by green belt with a historic location and architectural interest. It is a pleasant town to visit. If it became much larger its distinctiveness could be lost.
1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if you developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender, and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place ie the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford.
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced, when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.
6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

It is important that alongside the conservation of old buildings, some sympathetic contemporary design is encouraged, such as that seen in the Library, acknowledging that we are now in the 21st century.

This means nothing

Need to improve shopfront and signage design and controls. Heritage floorscape needs to be protected. The future of the Sessions House needs to be resolved.

Our heritage is compromised with the developments proposed and the recent BeWILDment - which again is not referenced in the strategy but is a clear principle of Cheshire East.

Again mention should be made of the Area of Archaeological Potential in the town (covering the 3 areas of Nether Knutsford, Cross Town and Over Knutsford). There is a separate heritage Objective in Knutsford, but in Nantwich heritage is considered under Environment. Why this inconsistency in format?

Again can we sustain more traffic not enough parking spaces.

Tatton Park must not be included in the Town Plan. NB why many Grade 2 listed buildings (B) are excluded from town centre.

Heritage and leisure is a strength for Knutsford on which the future of the town could be based. But what is a ‘Design Template for Knutsford’...? A better integrated plan involving both the town and Tatton Park would be good if this is what’s meant.

We should preserve the Moor, the Sessions house should remain for its intended use as a court and we should prevent any further development to Tatton Park.

As many previous developments do not complement the unique character of the town, I do not believe developers will stick to this in the future.

Conservation and Listed buildings are already protected through law. A town plan does not add anything. What is needed is a commitment from Cheshire East that any developer not complying with development rules will lose the right to develop in the county. Recent example being the demolition of cottages as part of the Lidl work which was not enforced by Cheshire East.

What is a "Design Template"? sounds like a meaningless phrase.
I would hope that a design template does not compromise Knutsford's heritage

Heritage is a very important feature of Knutsford and should be preserved

Objective and strategy vague and ill defined.

I agree with conserving our heritage assets and buildings, parks and gardens. I strongly believe in conserving the heritage of our green belt I do not agree that there should be any significant development in the town, therefore the remainder of this objective is irrelevant

The Bewilderwood proposed development does not accord with the heritage proposal - neither does building houses immediately adjacent to Tatton Park. In addition, the Knutsford Mayday organisers face a constant battle with the highways agency, police, etc each year to continue the heritage of maintaining the Mayday procession and each year has to pay many thousands of pounds to the police/council etc for street licensing etc.

Until the council can manage and support the existing buildings with a sympathetic eye and by listening to local needs, what chance for the future. Old town Hall, Sessions Court, Tatton Park, shopping areas etc.....

Preserving the town's heritage is very important, but this must be done in a sympathetic manner to encourage continuous development and growth.

OK, so I want to preserve the heritage and then you sneak in a point about new development being in keeping with the heritage of the town! It's not been done in the past, so why should it be trusted to be done in the future? And who decides what it is? Let's maintain and repair what we've got without building more, more, more.

I consider that it is important to maintain our heritage but Knutsford also needs to move forward and not become a 'museum'.

Heritage sites must find new uses so that they can develop and thrive but maintain their utility and their unique character. Today's buildings need to add to the cultural heritage.

Heritage and the built environment have been shown to be very important to the people of Knutsford, its visitors and businesses, in the 2010 Knutsford Town Plan, which prompted the establishment of KCHG. As such, the group strongly agrees with the principles as identified in the Strategy document. The group would suggest however that the item of "Creating and applying a Design Template for Knutsford" is better in Startegy: Environment. The group would support the protection of the conservation areas, which should be reviewed such that the loss of the Caesars Place cottages at Brook Street, can never happen again. The group would also strongly support the protection of important and historic buildings within the town, together with their surrounding environment, with a view to elevating them to full listed or other protected status in the future.

There should be specific mention of the impact of Manchester Airport on the area particularly relating to night noise and the potential impact of a 3rd runway.

If CEC intends to conserve and enhance Tatton Park and to protect green spaces adjacent to the town, as stated in the plan, it must not permit the BeWilderwood development in Tatton Park. It is, in any case, wrong for CEC to decide on the outcome of this planning application when it has a vested interest in the project.

This can conflict with increased development.

Heritage has been proved to be extremely important to the people of Knutsford as bore out in the Knutsford Town Plan of 2010. Heritage is a big tourism draw to visitors and should be promoted and enhanced for the sustainable future and economy of the town. However, Knutsford is not a museum, and modern advance must also be supported, but within the content of an historic town. Our historic buildings, parks, green spaces and conservation areas should be protected, enhanced and promoted to the community.

Only built heritage is considered here but see Obj. 6 below.

National Trust is pleased to confirm that it supports these Objectives and the strategy set out to deliver them
Agree, but what is a 'design template'?! Not a term normally used - is reference to design guide or code?

Heritage is Knutsford's strong point and should be supported and enhanced as much as possible.

Please respect the site of St Helenas church and St Johns wood.

Air pollution and shaking from heavy vehicles should be taken into consideration when adopting a strategy for ancient buildings.

Tatton Park and Gardens belong to the NT and should be run and maintained accordingly Knutsford is fortunate to have it as a neighbour as we have no parkland of our own.

Redevelopment of the Royal George was a disaster and has had a negative effect on Knutsford as an historic town, likewise Aldi demolished Caesars Palace.

Tatton Park is heritage of National Trust and should not be included in town.

No comments to make at this stage.

Can't improve on heritage. Design template for Knutsford sounds ominous.

Conservation of green field sites a must.

Fine words in the Strategy section but they cut no ice unless carried out to the letter. Knutsford is full of planning blunders - Canute Court (monstrous and ugly building with the developers slipping in an extra storey under the alias of a mansard roof). Regent Street - anodyne and sterile, who enjoys walking through it? The ruination of the area around Caesars Place when ALDI demolished an 18thC row of cottages without permission and where an ugly warehouse will no doubt take their place. The destruction of an ancient arboretum in the grounds of The Old Croft (with a nugatory penalty applied). Shame on Cheshire East Council!

Knutsford needs to retain its exclusivity and the Metrolink would reduce that because it would provide easy access to outsiders.

With the proviso that concerns for sustainable ways of living, e.g. low carbon travel, micro energy generation and individual and community gardens. Allotments should have priority. In addition consideration should be given to good contemporary design with high insulation specification.

Whilst we agree with this objective, the proposed plan will appose the virtues and values contained within objective 5.

Yes, yes, but practice what you preach. Do you define the sports facilities as of cultural importance; and for that matter the fields? I think they are and so do many others I'll wager. Preserve them in situ if you are serious about heritage.

The bullet points should refer also to protecting Knutsfords greenbelt land on its outskirts.

Knutsford has lost heritage due to poor management of developers such as Aldi who supposedly are going to build another supermarket on an unsuitable site. The road access is not sensible particularly attracting additional traffic in that area.

It is important that Knutsford keeps its heritage assets, both to attract tourists and to maintain the 'feel good' aspect of living here.

Heritage should be considered in terms of conserving buildings that are already present and when considering the design of new buildings, but the main focus of the town's budget allocation should not be on heritage development.

I am not from Knutsford like many of the residents, and coming from a large town down south I have see what has become to quaint towns to large concrete subbera, Knutsford has so much local history and pride this will be destroyed.

This is something built into the laws of our land and the council should always promote this. This goes without saying, especially when complying with present planning legislation.

Please could you explain how congesting the town beyond measure will help protect and conserve conservation sites? it is a fact that increasing footfall has a detrimental effect, let alone the damage that extra traffic will create and building on Green open spaces. As to the suggestion of decimating an ancient woodland within the park, Wychcote wood and then concreting open park land for the
parking facility to go with it, in close proximity to Tatton Old Hall. It is outrageous and unnecessary, merely I believe a profit making exercise that will have a damaging effect on people already living in the community. I note that the majority of the traffic for this project will be heading up Broadaok Lane and then no doubt Mobberley Road. There seems to be a major disregard for natural heritage, the site you refer to as site K contains a beautiful piece of historic woodland and was believed by Joan Leach the historian to be where King Canute came into Knutsford, giving it its name. This site also contains a public footpath which Joan informed me was the old grave run across the fields to St Helena’s, a heritage site, not known about by many Knutsfordians, I hope that it doesn’t meet the same fate of becoming a concrete path like the one currently running down the side of Manor Park School, the grave run from that side of Knutsford to the church site. The buildings in the town centre need some care and might I suggest not paying chief executives as much money and using some of the revenue for our historic buildings.

The historic and heritage aspect of Knutsford is a major asset. This does not mean that new build should be bland but it good, imaginative, modern architecture complementing its surroundings would be welcome (as by the Court House).

Surely the surrounding green belt is part of our heritage.

The proposal will spoil the character of Knutsford.

However, developing a "no-one wants it" adventure park in the trees at Tatton Park is contrary to the objectives of this plan. Do us all a favour and preserve the great asset which is Tatton Park and let the tree swinging kids have their fun at Delamere Forrest, which is an ideal location... Shoe horning a Wild Adventure into the woods at Tatton clearly suggests the council’s focus is on revue generation and not protecting the "jewel in the crown" asset this town has to offer. Coupled with this, why is the Heath a town centre space reserved for dog walkers and a fun fair? Perhaps your focus should be on developing this "central park" into a facility fit for an affluent town with a desire to attract visitors and have a prospering town centre.

If housing estates are going to be built on the edge of town (i.e. in my backyard), how much of Knutsford’s character do they really need to have? After a while, the houses all sort of look the same to me - minimal character. It’s sort of like saying"new development is designed to the highest standards and complements the unique character of the town" somehow softens the blow of expanding the town against many people’s wishes. And, what is a design template?

Knutsford has a unique built character, and its listed buildings and Conservation Areas are why many people visit Knutsford and why some have said (in the Town Plan) that they have come to live here. Guided walks by the Heritage Centre have been and are popular. Any new developments should be compatible with these existing buildings and the buildings themselves should not be allowed to deteriorate, or be demolished. A Design Template is a good idea, but this should also include the natural as well as built environment.

The most important point here for me is the development of a design template for the new buildings in Knutsford: Warsaw, Dresden and many small continental towns managed to rebuild to complement the historic architecture. The Georgians provided us with templates for high density urban living as did the more enlightened industrialists of the Victorian era eg Saltaire, Bourneville, Port Sunlight - all could be drawn on to create an eclectic mix of styles that would complement the existing eclecticism of Knutsford’s built environment. If forced, the town should specify the lowest number of houses possible.

Also the Heath, Small Heath and other Heritage Sites and Buildings must be retained. Whilst there appears to be a requirement for some additional domestic housing as is evidenced by the lack of middle range properties for sale for potential buyers, the proposed Housing Development areas appear to greatly exceed the requirement. If the areas now considered not suitable were added, the "overkill" in numbers of properties would be immense and Knutsford would lose its identity of being a small intimate town. Some local employees who currently commute may move into the town but there will still be many who travel in by road. Car parking, long and short term, is a serious failing in the
Document which should be given priority. Primary schools have been a sore point ever since the closure of St Johns Wood and Crosstown schools. A new school in the Parkgate area would be a definite benefit in the Over Knutsford ward and would stop any possibility of over crowding at Manor Park school. However traffic lights at the junction of Parkgate Lane and Mobberley Road would be essential - there are already access delays at that junction when the staff in the industrial estate are going home in the late afternoon. Conversely the removal of Egerton School leaving Bexton the only primary school on the west of the town would cause even greater congestion in the Beggarmans Lane/Blackhill Lane/Bexton Lane. An alternative to Egerton is essential. It is rumoured that Tesco are interested in occupying a site on the west of Manchester Road between Sugar Pit Lane and the Land Rover garage. The town survived with just the Co-op and Booths and the two late shops off Mobberley Road for many years before the arrival of Waitrose and Sainsburys. Now Aldi will probably be the second main supermarket store after Booths. Where is the need for Tescos and also it shouldn’t be directly on the main road to Manchester.

Historic parks and gardens need to be specifically mentioned in the main objective as they are numerous and significant. The main point to make about Knutsford, not mentioned in this strategy, is that it is ringed by historic estates whose parklands give the town such an attractive environment - despite the proximity of the M6 and noise of flight paths. The estates are Tatton (Egerton) to the north, Tabley (Leicester) to the west, Toft (Leycester) to the south and Booths (Legh) to the south east. Historically their boundaries abutted one another and in some cases - between Toft and Booths - still do - marked by a boundary stone. The heritage assets need to include mention of historic parks and gardens. The 3rd bullet point should refer to historic parks and gardens as well as historic buildings as there are a number that are worth adding to the local list. Whilst Tatton is of outstanding importance, don’t forget that Tabley House, which is quite close to Knutsford, is also on the EH Register of parks and gardens. The part cut-off by the M6 needs local protection.

Knutsford is an historic town known for its country feel ...thats what attracts the tourists /day trippers and me ,a resident. I’m sure i wouldn’t come to visit here if it was the same as the rest. knutsford is different ...keep it that way or lose a lot of it’s current residents...

Preserve heritage in a sensible and sustainable way.

I like the character of the town and it is important that it should stay the same.

Agree, but there is no detail so can't comment.

Knutsford's Unique Selling Point for visitors is its high quality architecture and townscape. These need to be conserved and protected from poor quality building and too much building.

Is Green Belt not considered a conservation area? The policy on the Legh Road conservation area only states that the council will endeavor to maintain the character of the place due to its low density housing. I take this to mean that you can't build a block of flats or redevelop a site to have a greater number of properties, but to immediately preclude this area from this discussion screams of double standards.

very important to retain the unique character of the town

Natural England agrees with Objective 5, to conserve and enhance Knutsford's assets.

exceptionally important

Not necessary

To conserve Knutsford Heritage it is vital to reduce motor traffic. Our roads have now become M6 overspill

The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them

Strongly support "STAG"; protect conservation areas and all Grade Listed Buildings

You can't keep the heritage and build on top

Yes we must conserve the local heritage

Heritage will continue to exist as long as that which it sites upon continues to exist.
A design template is a valuable addition.
What is a design template?
Must not become a strait-jacket.
If all plans go ahead unique character of town will be lost
Goes without saying
How can development at the highest standards become affordable housing
Vital - attract tourist without them many facilities are dead
But totally impossible under the proposed hair-brained scheme
Objective and Strategy 6: Environment

Do you agree or disagree with the Environment Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 82% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (34%); Agree (38%); Neither Agree or Disagree (13 %); Disagree (5%); Strongly Disagree (11%)

Comments:

Much more needed on energy conservation and renewable energy generation

Although Knutsford is within the 'industrial north' it stands out as being different. Preserved in time and located between green field adds to its character and profile and attracts visitors from all over

Tree lined streets require preserving and reinstating where losses occur. Small public open spaces need protecting and preserving particularly those on North Downs. The site of special scientific interest at Booths Mere needs enhancing and made more accessible to the public.

I strongly agree. However, I have caution against the creation of renewable energy at the expense of heritage. Retro-fitting historic housing with solar panels for example, undermines the historic quality of the building.

Add that the Moor playarea should have major investment. Somehow the impact of Manchester Airport should feature in the vision and here might be the place for aircraft noise consideration. Any development of Parkgate/ Longridge has to realistically assess the impact of aircraft noise - its not fair to put people in social housing at risk.

Again you contradict your previous statements, for example you say you want to protect green spaces but you also say you want to develop on Green Belt and Brown Field, make up your minds please because you can't have both!

Protect.

Well overdue I could not agree more with this vision!
We support the environment objective and strategy; in particular we are interested in how attractive walking and cycling routes can be created as part of wider plans to improve green infrastructure, enhance green spaces etc.

The environment must be protected, which should prevent any building on the greenbelt.

I worry about the line improving access to Open Countryside.

Protect greenspaces and natural assets in and around the town. Encourage healthy and active lifestyles through improved access to open spaces, woodland and the open countryside in and around Knutsford. These two statements are incompatible with the proposed housing developments.

Also Princess Street car park at back of Waitrose should be accessed off of King Edward Road and takes traffic off of Princess Street.

Protect green spaces i.e. don't build on them!

I believe this is contradictory and I do not think you can propose new development whilst maintaining the commitment to the environment.

I agree that green spaces must be preserved. I do not agree that houses should be built on green spaces.

Don't you already do this? Protect the adjacent green spaces by building houses on them? Again a lot of meaningless buzz words - connectivity, biodiversity....... The bit about sustainable energy sounds good and politically correct, but doesn’t get much of a mention in the main texts.

As stated in my earlier comments, Knutsford already has a traffic problem; a very big traffic problem. The influx of additional vehicles into the town would vastly exacerbate this problem in terms of noise, congestion, litter and pollution. This objective to "protect greenspaces ... in and around the town" seems greatly at odds with the plan to use most of these greenspaces for housing and "mixed" purposes. Surely, this needs clarifying.

I strongly agree that the sense of place and rural location need to be supported - i.e. do not build all over the surrounding green belt! Footpaths in the countryside surrounding the town could definitely be improved to help access to the green spaces.

How can large housing estates removing open fields possibly contribute to any environment strategy. You must re-proportion to other part of Knutsford also to share the massive burden of east Knutsford around Mereheath estates.

Green spaces should be sacrosant - we have already lost a lot; allotments vital; again strong representations to Manchester Airport re noise and pollution (what is their plan to reduce these). Green energy is vital and we need a big push on this.

Can you clarify the apparent double-think, where you claim to "protect greenspaces"(sic), but the favoured sites for development all include green belt land? I can't see the logic here, but I'm more than willing to listen to any explanation.

Very important to maintaining the character of Knutsford.

How do you propose to "improve access to the open countryside and woodland"?? How do you propose to promote renewable energy?? Build eco-friendly houses, subsidize solar panels on new homes and businesses...??

Ensure that 'green' areas within the town are available for children's 'natural' not equipment based play.

If possible, work more closely with Cheshire Wildlife Trust and the Woodlands Trust.

If you build on Green Belt you can not replace it with more of it.

We should not build on any previously undeveloped sites eg area near Longridge

Nothing in here about keeping our surrounding Green Belt.

"Protect greenspaces within and adjacent to the town, such as the Heath, the Little Heath, the Moor, Sanctuary Moor, St John’s Wood and Tatton Park” is great, but is being undermined by Cheshire East supporting BeWildermood. I do not support the sustainable use of energy and other resources and the creation of renewable energy.
"Protect green spaces and natural assets in and around town". Encourage healthy and active lifestyles through improved access to open spaces, woodland and open countryside in and around Knutsford.

How do you reconcile these statements with the proposed housing developments?

SBI's should be identified within the terminology of greenspaces.

We need to protect & enhance our community outdoor spaces.

But how do these objectives fit in with the plans to build on precious green belt land?

Why don't we look to plant a forest in a ring around Knutsford with a path through it so future generations can enjoy the surrounding countryside... It could be done by connecting many existing forests, woods and Tatton park.

St John’s wood requires some major upkeep and is just a rather boggy and unpleasant place. The paths are ok but the amount of piping that passes through is unfortunate. No mention of Booths mere, though privately owned the surrounding fields and woods should still be preserved and protected. Site K has some nice pleasant open areas including fields and playing fields at the junction of Longridge, North Downs and Higher Downs that people regularly use, this should be protected.

Why are the football fields, though not fully green protected. The building of houses on K

If we really want to "encourage healthy and active lifestyles" then somehow we have to reduce the domination of the car within the town. High ideals are fine, but when it seems like every street is choked with parked vehicles (many illegally parked, incidentally), when Manchester Road, Northwich Road and other arteries are in frequent gridlock, and when roads become virtually impassable - even for cyclists on occasions - at school dropping-off and picking-up times ... Well you see where I'm coming from!

The policy states "protect the greenspaces and natural assets in and around town". "Ensure that development supports Knutsford's unique character". This cannot be achieved by building the proposed number of houses nor by building on zones A, B, C, D and E.

The plan does not protect green space and open countryside, it destroys it.

You are not proposing to build houses and industrial units on the green spaces around my home, so how can I support these plans in terms of the environment? The environments around where I live are exceptional and are why I enjoy living in Knutsford. Sites G, H, I, J could do with some improving and would also have the least impact on residents. These should be considered first and would have a good impact on an area of Knutsford which could do with a boost.

Let's protect the natural assets and green spaces in and around THE town BY NOT BUILDING HOUSES ON THEM!!

It is actually pretty distasteful for the plan to extol the benefits of the environment which it then seeks to wantonly vandalise by building in the Green Belt.

Green spaces should all be protected and remain in place for generations to come. These are important areas to all of us and are nice places to go and relax. They are part of the appeal of the town and played a massive role in making the decision to move to Knutsford. Opportunities for more greenspaces would be welcomed.

The photo in the document shows a picture of Moor Pool. The document should recognise that Moor Pool is a separate entity from Tatton Park with different ownership, different management and it has different problems. Surely this is a well known issue within Cheshire East parks department. Over the next 20 years it is important for the future of the town centre that these issues are recognised and dealt with before Moor Pool disappears altogether.

There is a need to protect the Green Belt, Ancient Woodland and the natural environment from the pressure of economic pressures. I have already mentioned the land surrounding Birkin Brook but feel that an inventory should be built up of areas, and those contiguous with them, that cannot be developed under any circumstances. this should include Tatton Park and its environs

Very important that new development is of good character and I strongly support improving the green infrastructure of the town.
regardless of the words - the actual proposals show no respect to the Environment whatsoever.

Nothing wrong with what we have

Knutsford is bordered by many active farms. These provide access to open countryside through rights of way across them but also through their contribution to a feeling of openness simply be being there. The town feels like it is a rural location because we travel through farmland as we approach it. To destroy that agriculture for the development of housing is a serious step. It goes against the principles outlined in House of Commons Library Standard Note SN/SC/934 (April 2012) and I have reproduced the relevant section below : 89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: â buildings for agriculture and forestry; â provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; â the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; â the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; â limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; â limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Sorry to keep going back to the housing issue but how is building on green land consistent with this. Fine to show a lovely picture of the moor but what of the green field to be decimated with new builds?

I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

Again, agree with the vision...but access to open countryside etc is possible and alot more accessible than in many other towns... however areas such as the Moor and the pond need maintaining. Gardens will severely diminish in Knutsford, as the new planning legislation - essentially relaxation of the planning laws, will mean that more and more people will extend into their available garden space as they cannot afford to move to larger properties. this will mean the availability of public areas / allotments etc is critical!

Support is needed to improve the town Green Agenda

Please leave our 'protected' green belt alone. Leave our open and green spaces alone and leave our streets and pavement structure along - just fix the damage and neglect.

I fully agree with this however the plan is set up in such a way that you will be working against both objectives and strategy

The additional burden on the infrastructure including transport, water supply and discharge will be negatively impacted by any expansion

No to creation of renewable energy; wind turbines, solar panels etc hopelessly out of place

Destroying Greenbelt does not help the enviroment

Reasons already stated

But no building on any farm or recreational land!!

The roads running between Tatton and Mereheath are too narrow and winding to sustain heavy traffic.

The introduction of an 'edible town' scheme such as that in Wilmslow and significantly Todmorden would be a huge boost to the area and community. The vision would appear reasonable but at odds with the proposed housing development. How can you protect the greenbelt if you are proposing to build housing all around Knutsford on greenbelt. Greenbelt is meant to be green, hence the name.

Existing greenbelt should be retained.

there has been a lot of local comment to change the green spaces into carparks and yet the charm of knutsford is its unusual amount of green space within sight of the town centre. the car issue is
solvable on existing sites especially around the caledonian house site which is an office development that has very few supporters and could easily be relocated for a sympathetic carpark development like the one in macclesfield.

The Draft Strategy's stated objectives on the environment are laudable but are contradicted by the proposed housing expansion. Knutsford's rural location is actually endangered by a proposed development that would have the effect of reducing proximity to green belt.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope. 2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if you developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender, and as far as I can see are not needed. 3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place ie the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis. 4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford. 5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced, when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with. 6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

PLEASE PLEASE have lots of green spaces for community gardens & orchards in the new developments.

Increase the amount of land allocated for allotments as there is a long waiting list for them. Any road widening schemes or new roads should include cycle lanes.

Again - an optimistic shopping list.

Protecting the green belt land should be a top priority.

I strongly agree with protecting the green spaces around the town, but this seems at odds with allowing green belt development.

The green belt around Knutsford needs to be preserved at all costs.

If the proposed housing occurs the green fields around will disappear. Trying to access Knutsford from Mere, Warrington, Altrincham will be virtually impossible as the local roads (A50) cannot sustain the traffic at the moment (2012).

The plan is to build on green belt and the moor. How is this protecting the environment?????

Better sports and leisure facilities are needed to support healthy lifestyles. Playing fields must be protected from development. Renewable energy options must not be promoted at any cost - visual and social impacts must take precedence.

The following statement from the environment strategy contradicts the housing strategy in that the housing policy relies heavily on the use of green belt and green spaces to enable it to achieve its objectives. "Enhance the greenspaces within and adjacent to the town and the areas of water within them, in terms of their quality, quantity, connectivity, biodiversity, safety and accessibility".

Again can we sustain more traffic not enough parking spaces.

Do not include Tatton Park in Knutsford Town Plan

There should be a 7th Bullet as follows: "Improve community health and well-being by encouraging
Generally agree but proposing to build on greenbelt much of which is in productive agricultural use is hardly consistent.

Please note that proposed development areas A-E would destroy such adjacent greenspace.

How can you protect green spaces by building all over them?

Broadly agree though (this may be herecy) I am less attached to necessarily retaining the whole of the Heath and Little Heath. We have one of the best parks in the country barely 200yds away. It doesn't really fit the requirements at present (stated in section 5 Development Principles) of a multifunctional public green space (it could but this would take some work). It is relatively poorly used apart from dog walkers except when the May Day celebration, fair, or circus takes place, and these don't use the whole of it. The other areas (Moor, Tatton etc) are very important to preserve.

There should be no new development on any current greenfield, green belt, nature conservation or open countryside areas.

I agree with the protection of green spaces including the existing green belt wherever possible.

We should preserve the Green belt as a priority. I dont understand how this vision can talk about protecting the environment whilst taking about destroying acres and acres of farm land and wildlife habitats.

But this objective is the exact opposite of what you plan to do with housing - which is not protecting green space.

Transport infrastructure also needs referencing

This plan is clearly not protecting Green spaces. An environment Objective which does not include noise pollution from Manchester airport and a plan to restrict night time flying can not be supported.

Essential to protect green areas. I was not aware that there was public access to Sanctuary Moor. Public access is desirable. If "renewable energy" means wind generators - don't bother. They generally use more electricity than they produce; are an eyesore and create nuisance by the noise they make.

Agree, but building houses outside of existing boundaries is counter objective.

We particularly agree with tree-lined streets. Start with the desperately drab Regent Street! Example - lowering cherry to add some colour.

The objective and strategy statement is completely hypocritical and in contradiction of its intention. The town plan has identified preferred development sites that destroy green belt and would directly impact the woodland and natural diversity therein. How can we trust a flakey, deceitful objective and strategy?

Objective and strategy vague and ill defined.

Protect our green spaces, INCLUDING our green belt countryside.

We agree with this however the plan to build on/around Tatton and Egerton boys club contradicts this! You cannot protect green spaces by building houses over them.

Renewable energy is only possible by accessing local resources; Knutsford has no water or wind power resources. Solar, anyone? Please do preserve our green spaces.

We need to keep our town as green as possible (in both senses) and maintain the character.

Knutsford is blessed with many great features and these should be protected and enhanced. Cheshire East needs to maintain these areas as they are the county jewels.

What do you mean by ‘improve access’? If you mean building roads across the countryside, that seems a bit counter-productive to me! Absolutely love the dichotomous statement about new development and rural location - rural = countryside, development = town. Stupid and again leading with points we're all in agreement on and then putting in sneaky ridiculous statements like that.

What's a 'design template'?

Due to the ample provision of existing green space in and around Knutsford I consider tree lined streets (and the associated maintenance costs) unnecessary.
Some current green areas may provide better sites for a health and wellbeing centre that would have less impact on traffic and parking and offer better value to tax and rate payers.

"Objective Environment" should include an additional bullet point “Protect long-distance views of significance in Knutsford and Tatton Park. Core Strategy: Environment should include an additional bullet point; Protect long-distance views of significance in Knutsford and Tatton Park, including of:

- Knutsford Town Centre, when viewed along King Street and from the Moor, passing trains and areas in proximity to Mobberley Road; the Harding Watt houses on Legh Road, when viewed from Toft Road; views from Tatton Hall, looking in a south east direction and from the north end of Tatton Mere, looking in a southerly direction. Core Strategy: Environment should include the bullet point. Creating and applying a Design Template for Knutsford. Such a Design Template would be a means of helping ensure new development supports Knutsford’s unique character, its sense of place and rural location (page 16). KCHG has also previously objected to the proposed Theme Park development at Tatton Park, and would wish to see such an exclusion within the Town and Borough Strategies.

This objective directly conflicts with the housing strategy that proposes between 460 and 1280 new dwellings on green belt areas that form wildlife havens and essential environmental corridors. This can conflict with increased development.

‘Ensure new development supports Knutsford’s unique character’ appears to contradict the housing strategy, in that various styles are to be promoted. I would support the premise that a Knutsford Style should be defined in a design guide/code and agreed as the development style of choice for Knutsford. I am however, particularly concerned at the proposed "Theme Park" BeWilderWood development proposed for Tatton Park. Tatton Park is popular due to its tranquil nature, which BeWilderwood would damage irrecoverably. The proposed destruction of Ancient wood land, and agricultural land, key characteristics of the Park cannot be allowed to proceed. I support the idea that Tatton Park should be self sufficient, but as one of the top 10 attractions in the North West if not the country, with huge events attracting thousands of visitors, I cannot understand why this is not already achievable. My personal feeling is that the financial accounts should be brought into order before any such large development is made.

This important objective thoroughly covers all aspects including blue and green infrastructure and is fairly precise in its strategy.

National Trust is pleased to confirm that it supports these Objectives and the strategy set out to deliver them.

Need to mention and address existing air quality issue. Also make reference for the need to minimise run off from new development and highway works - SuDS.

A lot more needs to be to enhanced/tidy all areaes or the town’s suburbs - too many words/over grown trees.

Need to maintain Greenbelt is important as adds to character of town.

Essential that the areas of the Moor and the Heath are not used for Town Centre parking or housing.

No mention of the airport which greatly affects Knutsford’s environment - what is the council’s policy?

Retaining surrounding countryside more important that creating amenity space providing existing areas a re well maintained to maximise recreational value.

The gardens, baskets and green spaces are a valuable asset to the town.

Green; supply water and sewerage infrastructure has an important role in the protection of the environment and the management of the flood risk; surface water and climate change.

Cyclists do well in Knutsford already.

Protect greenspaces Preserve and enhance the green infrastructure

Please address pollution in the town, especially aircraft noise which has a huge detrimental effect on the quality of life of the inhabitants. Airborne pollutants from traffic are an additional hazard. Measures should be proposed to discourage vehicles. The green spaces within the town (the Moor, the Heath and various parks, squares etc) must be protected, as must the Green Belt outwith the...
We are highly supportive of protecting greenspaces and natural assets and fully promote access to the open countryside and woodland. After all we believe this is part of what makes Knutsford such a charming, historical and eco-friendly town. We strongly oppose any development which would impact on this.

Knutsford needs to retain its exclusivity and the Metrolink would reduce that because it would provide easy access to outsiders.

Further to above: low carbon travel, micro energy generation and individual and community gardens. allotments should have priority with a sense of greater urgency. We need more allotments: we had to wait four years for ours.

Whilst we agree with this objective, the proposed plan will appose the virtues and values contained within objective 6.

How will all this be achieved if you build on our precious countryside? I wonder how sincere the sentiments are in this section.

I presume the greenspaces adjacent to the town refer, inter alia, to sites A and B.

Maintaining and expanding the many footpaths that currently exist. These make it possible for many residents to access the town centre without the need to use their cars and thus lessening traffic and consequent air pollution.

Areas such as the moor, St. John’s Wood and Tatton Park are important to Knutsford families and aid their healthy living.

general building, local wild life, extra traffic.

Agree with the objective but the strategy is a DIRECT CONTRADICTION as it will involve destruction of greenbelt and associated wildlife habitats, increased traffic and carbon emissions and increased congestion. Knutsford will become a much less pleasant place to live in and to visit.

Having said this, this contradicts the plan for residential development! I think that the council has lost sight of why people come to live in and around the town centre. It is unique and why try to fix something that is not broken.

I agree that it is necessary to protect green spaces and natural assets however this plan does not allow for this with the parkgate and Longridge developments. This plan involves the systematic removal of a beautiful open area next to an SSSI on site K, and decimation of the wildlife corridor of the Birkin Brook on both sites K and G, the woodland in these areas contains much that is significant. The woodland on site K dates to 1570 and as such is amongst only 2% of the entire countries Ancient woodland. Site K has a public footpath which enables a person to be able to walk through the fields to Mobberley, a wonderful walk. The Governments recent removal of grants for solar power is directly in conflict with the idea to use sustainable energy and to suggest an alternative power site to protect the environment on Green Belt land is hypocrisy itself. Dog wood will be turned into an access road and chunks of beautiful space will disappear for ever if the plans we saw at a recent meeting are those that go ahead, it is disgusting. The Hopi indians have a saying "only when the last tree has been cut down will man realise they cannot live on money alone“ The very thing that sustains our tourist industry is Our beautiful countryside, perhaps it will only be when we have no tourism left that we will recognise our mistakes. We have access to open countryside...its called Green Belt !

Green spaces within and adjacent to the town are particularly important - the Moor has been transformed into a good resource. - sustainable use of energy and other resources should be a top priority and inform other policies such as the standards to which all new build should comply. Please no windmills.

Surely the surrounding green belt is part of our heritage. Far too much development proposed

Green belt should NOT be built on

Preserving Knutsford’s unique character by developing affordable housing en mass as suggested by the housing needs of the town leads me to believe the Housing Plan and the Environment plan were
written by different people with different views...

Okay. The Heath? To me it looks like an unkept expanse of grass where maybe 2 or 3 dogs are running around at one time with the famous fun fair once a year. Why not design it as a park with paved paths and benches throughout? Make it usable for everyone? My son and I wander through (the edge of it) on our way home but I haven't been there since the reports of a man exposing himself. No thanks. It has the potential to be a more usable space like the Moor (which needs a new play area) with minimal cost. Green space is wonderful but unattractive green space (in the centre of town too) is, well, easy to ignore. I would love to see something like the much used and beloved Boston Common here (Massachusetts, USA). We love Tatton and are members of the National Trust but maybe consider Knutsford residents having free or discounted parking. It sort of feels like "our treasured park" but we still have to pay just to get in. It'd be a nice benefit!

It is vital to protect the large green spaces especially the Moor, Heaths, Tatton and St Johns Woodn, both for the wildlife and for the people of Knutsford who appreciate the spaces. Several are SSSIs or SBIs and need special protection. However, smaller green spaces can be valuable to those living near them and their use should be considered too.

How can building 4000+ houses on beautiful green belt land possibly expect anything but a 'strongly disagree' rating.

No mention of aircraft noise, especially night movements. No mention of aircraft pollution now known to be in conflict with the health objectives specified in the Strategy. Without radical traffic re-routing, the same applies to road transport. The addition of 1280 houses would increase pollution hazards. To sustain Knutsford's unique character see Strategy 5 above.

The greenspaces could include historic parks and gardens. Woodland within the open countryside could be an estate origin and this might need to be taken into account if nearby sites are developed. Knutsford's environment would be degraded by large scale development - incremental small scale development would be more appropriate.

what joy!!! more noise pollution and spoiling of our green belt, animal habitats, etc what will happen to the foxes and badgers nesting in my area? ....where will it stop???

Much better use of existing resources is key.

I particularly like the open spaces. Tatton Park, as well as the Heath and the Moor continue to provide places for recreation and it is important that they stay undeveloped.

Protect green spaces = DON'T BUILD ON THEM!

It is important to ensure the amenity of greenspaces is not compromised by development. Good design is vital - examples: new Business Park on Mobberley Road, flats at St John's Vale, and the play area at Longridge.

Protect green spaces as stated in your objective. This does not include building on valued green belt land.

Natural England supports Objective 6, in particular its aim to achieve positive improvements in the quality of the natural environment by protecting and enhancing green spaces. Natural England believes that the Green Infrastructure is an essential component of creating a sustainable community and promoting wildlife corridors.

Green and ancient spaces must be kept at all costs

Not necessary

Yes protect our green spaces but if town is to be pedestrianised we must create car parking - Tatton Park?

The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them

Caution regarding maintaining the towns distinctive character. Leave King St as it is

You can't improve the environment by building on to it

It should be considering 20 mph speed limits
Yes maintain the present green spaces
It's pretty and attractive. You think that roads, houses, people and pollution will make it better.

Protect green spaces definitely
New housing will be required in the future but when a good portion of green belt has been built on. community gardens would not be the same
In agreement but outlook needs to be considered - something as radical as building an estate behind our houses doesn't seem fair.

Nature cannot speak for itself. We must protect ALL open green spaces
Can we assume that there will be no more talk of converting the Moor into a carpark?

Why not try improving the roads (i.e. filling in the numerous potholes) before you develop other areas
Developing on green belt land will obviously affect the environment adversely e.g. food production and wildlife

Manage trees and repair paved/tarmac surfaces on pavements - often very uneven due to root upheaval.

Protect the Green Belt.

Why is Heath protected? Little use other than dogs toilet, not many residents would miss the fair or circus
enhance green space adjacent to town

Better leave a wider green belt in first planning initially do not forget underground fuel pipeline from Ellesmere Port to M/Chr airport
retain green spaces south and east of longridge

how can this development protect green spaces - contradictory- to say the least
Not clear how improved access to open countryside woodland can be achieved.

How?? under proposed scheme
Objective and Strategy 7: Connectivity

Do you agree or disagree with the Connectivity Objectives and Strategy as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 81% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (32%); Agree (39%); Neither Agree or Disagree (13 %); Disagree (6%); Strongly Disagree (10%)

**Comments:**

Support a rail link to Crewe via Northwich and Middlewich. Improved links should include improved frequency.

Knutsford suffers from poor car parking facilities and small window of free parking provision. To improve this would attract more visitors and locals to spend their time and money in the town centre

The potential development of option K and G will lead to increased traffic volumes at three difficult junctions. Particularly the rat run Higher Downs exiting at the junction of Leigh Arms/Brook Street and the junction at the bottom of Hollow Lane. These junctions will require re-modelling should those options be chosen.

My only objection is the priority given to tourist parking over local resident parking.

I disagree with providing more car parking. Any developments that require car parking should include them but all other options of cycle and walking routes and public transport should be upgraded first. I do not at this stage support the metrolink extension. Being a metrolink point would require massive car parking increase as out of towners travel in. A simple increase in frequency to two trains per hour would greatly improve connectivity for less cost. Plus looking at line routing that would mean routes to Manchester Airport and Crewe are improved. A specific strategy (sic) objective for new bus( and rail) routes to be considered not just review existing. How about looking at the bus stops/routes timings. What about getting the Rail and bus station together . A subgroup of Council officers and local residents should be set up to look at this.
Western rail link to airport would be far more profitable and beneficial to the town and would provide an alternative route into Manchester and therefore Birmingham and London. A well designed multi-story car park at the railway station might just work.

No transport or amenities provided for outlying developments.

Brilliant, get the Metro link, it really works, could there be an ice breaker leaflet in the tourist information centre, and probably in shops and by info boards/maps briefly explaining the modes of public transport and how they work, I personally was aware of the Metro but it was just another thing, until I used it, its great, but like most things buses included, people need a little shove, after that they are ok

We very much support the connectivity objective and strategy. We would like to see the following added: - a town wide travel planning project to reduce the number of car journeys to schools - a proposal to monitor and reduce carbon emissions and energy consumption from local transport - a walking/cycling route network plan produced to guide future planning

to be sustainable, the town must have good transport links. CEC should pay for the cost of linking up with the Manchester tram system, and open the old railway link with crewe via Middlewich.

Agree. Frequency is a major problem. A50 to the Gough’s Lane junction to be 30mph max!

Sounds a bit vague

I do not think the strategy reflects the context in relation to the use of cars and transport.

Build a bypass as your top priority. Cycle stands - cycle lanes might be better. metrolink would be good. Again a lot of buzz words - what are cycle and pedestrian networks and where and what are the neighbouring networks?

I have concerns with the car parking in Knutsford, as to increase the available parking spaces would likely mean that greenspace would be need to be used, either in the middles of the town or more likely, in the area between Mereheath Lane and the A50.

Agree that rail services could be enhanced with more services etc. A basic level of road surface maintenance would be appreciated! Also support more cycle paths. Not 100% sure that Metrolink would be a good idea as I fear it could encourage the town down the road of being just another Manchester suburb, though I recognise the economic benefits that might come from the increased connectivity and that I might sound like a resident of "Cranford" in objecting.

Knutsford suffers from poor connections, being on a branch line with infrequent trains. Improved links to Manchester, but also across to the NW mainline would help people to use public transport to get to work

I feel more focus should be placed on public transport especially the railway. Knutsford has poor rail links and relies too heavily on cars as the main means of transport.

Metrolink to Knutsford would be great. A suggestion has been made for a train stop at Parkgate Second road link to ParkGate also essential Well equipped Tourist Information centres with high speed broad band to provide instant information More web sites with more information Fast broadband essential for all of this at least 10mg and better 20

The strategy to "seek to reduce areas of traffic congestion" is frankly an empty sentence. Either you commit to reduce traffic congestion or you don’t. I see this as a key commitment that needs to be addressed urgently, before any other decision is made. As congestion is a serious issue at the moment without an influx of another nine hundred homes and more than a thousand cars.

I think this should be number 1 priority. Commuting to Manchester from Knutsford by car is a nightmare but the train is not a viable alternative as it takes too long and is too expensive. Lobby hard for the Metrolink. It is similarly difficult to connect to London train services at Macclesfield or Wilmslow via public transport - this needs sorting. I think we should be much more creative about car parking at weekends. I saw a village school in Hawkshead that offered its car park and playground for parking at weekends, asking for donations via an honesty box. Egerton Primary School should be encouraged to do this as well as the court. Could we ever envisage a park and ride?
Yes - Metrolink and improved bus services and connectivity

There is terrible congestion on Manchester Road and Northwich Road during rush hour, sometimes as early as 1pm on Fridays. This creates longer commuting times for residents and others passing through. With the proposed new housing development sites in these areas, the traffic congestion will be nothing short of a nightmare. Ideally there should be a by-pass around Knutsford to get to Macclesfield/Holmes Chapel. Also there are serious issues of speeding along Tabley Road as this links the town centre with the M6. Drivers coming from the M6 ignore the 30mph zone and with increased housing and traffic, this needs to be addressed. In terms of providing safe walking routes, having a safer crossway on Northwich Road at the end of Ladies Mile where many children/students walk. Better cycling paths would be wonderful many roads are narrow and vehicular traffic renders them difficult to navigate safely.

Local transport links and pedestrian and cycle links are of key importance to the future of the town. A need for a transport link between Knutsford and Manchester Airport.

A bypass would be a good idea.

We do not need to have much more car parking - just a small amount. We should instead be encouraging car sharing, train and bicycle use.

I support: "Support the extension of the Metrolink to Knutsford; Seek to reduce areas of traffic congestion; Provide safe walking routes and footpaths; Provide a town wide cycle and pedestrian network including links to neighbouring networks; and Promote positive provision for cycling in the design of new developments including appropriate numbers of cycle stands."

Seeking to reduce areas of traffic congestion is a priority objective. As is stated in Cheshire East’s Local Development Framework the M6 between junctions 19 to 20 is running 10 to 30% over capacity. Access to the motorway, through traffic along the main access roads of town at peak times and when there is motorway congestion produces gridlock within the town. Housing and commercial development with the town cannot be contemplated without first considering what infrastructure is required to address this current problem such as a bypass. In his introduction to the town plans the Councillor asks us to be constructive and positive about change this would suggest that there has to be an acceptance of all developments without question and that to prefer the status quo is a negative response however this in not so. The realism that must be brought to all proposals is recognising the imperfections that currently exist and which have to be solved before further development can take place which will only exacerbate the problem to the detriment of the community and it future sustainability.

Metrolink should be made in Knutsford - railway service is appalling. I never have anywhere to park my bike, so I always either a) have to walk for 5 minutes to get to 1 shop or b) park my bike in everybody's way. More town buses would be good.

particularly put in place improvements to allow children and adults alike to safely get to leisure and other facilities on foot and by bike instead of by car - so keeping short distance car journeys to a minimum

Car parking very important.

New car parks are a must! Other aims will come to nothing without them!

Metrolink to Knutsford is a great idea a Trainline to Crewe would also be beneficial for connectivity to London. walking routes, road crossing should also be improved. I think Parking should be improved where possible but this should not be to the detriment of existing green spaces.

I strongly support the extension of the Metrolink to Knutsford.

But it's hard to believe this strategy was drawn up by the same council that has recently announced cuts to the town’s bus services! With regard to the notion of extending the Metrolink: unless my understanding is wrong (and I'm willing to be corrected), the only way we could achieve this would be by becoming part of Greater Manchester. (We don't currently contribute to that authority's coffers.) I'm not at all sure that's what we want! Thus, much as I would love to see it, I suspect it's pie in the

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

**Objective and Strategy 7: Environment**
there is a need to ensure the maintenance of roads and footpaths ---current maintenance is appaling.

There is a pressing need for a multi storey car park possibly on Tatton Street for employees in the town. Northern Rail should be urged to use much more modern trains which would see an increase in rail useage, the present stock is completely out of date. A link with Manchester Airport and a service to Crewe via the Northwich chord is being presently investigated and should be supported. A by pass round the south of the town should be persued.

Good plan, try a multi-storey car park may be.

I agree that we need improved public transport links and parking facilities.

I don't agree with making Knutsford known as a shopping destination. Don't entirely disagree with the metrolink to Knutsford although disagree until more information is provided - ie where will this go? I do think we need safe walking routes however to take away from cars will cause traffic chaos - serious consideration to the road network would need to be given before you can take from the cars to give to the pedestrians

1. Perhaps there is no need to create significant additional parking in the centre of town (how often is Booths car park full?) - people will be a lot healthier if they have to walk a few yards. 2. There are many arguments about extending the metro to Knutsford and not all are immediately obvious. This is not the place (document) to vote on such an important and complex matter.

Should be more cycling and pedestrian ways. Still not sure you would get most residents and workers out of their cars.

I strongly support all elements of this category. A town wide cycle and pedestrian network sounds very interesting. Securing the extension of the Metrolink to our town is an excellent long term ambition.

Providing any new transport links are in keeping with the character of the town

The principle is important, not only ensuring there is adequate connection between the rural villages and the town centre but also between Knutsford are surrounding towns. Currently no thought has gone into ensuring that public services connect. I live in Plumley and to get to Macclesfield hospital by public transport is a nightmare. To meet a 2 pm appointment you have to leave Plumley at 10.45 am and inevitably it is after 5pm before you get home again ....and Macclesfield is where all the essential medical services lie.

Lack of infrastructure is a major problem. No buses, infrequent trains, and poor traffic management.

What we need are better rail and bus services - not cut backs!! As for roads, the very shape of Knutsford and surrounding land precludes it from ever having more local road to ease conjestion. I suggest that you come a look at the town

Extending the tram from Altrincham should be a priority. Section 2.9 of the Plan says there is easy access to the West Coast mainline. It may be easy in terms of distance but such access requires a journey to Wilmslow, Warrington or Crewe none of which are served by public transport. Using your own car is tricky as there is nowhere to leave it. So access requires a taxi or a lift from friends. How is this easy access? Improvement to this link would be good but it won’t happen if it is already thought of as easy access

I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

The town is already well served in terms of connectivity that brings a healthy level of visitors. Extending the Metrolink to Knutsford, whilst perhaps being of benefit for residents wishing to visit Manchester, runs the risk that Knutsford would become an evening destination for an influx of people from further afield. This may alter the character of the town, which currently has very much a "local, friendly" feel. The town does not need this influx because the local bars, restaurants, etc are already well populated in the evenings.

PARKING is key.. increasing the parking availability will mean that the parking on streets may minimise
in some areas, allowing for safer walking and cycling. It is also key to provide safe places for crossing roads - especially near schools, eg a Zebra / pelican crossing near Egerton School. There is also a lot of illegal parking, whether this is on double yellow lines, loading areas etc, especially Sundays and evenings when the traffic wardens are not in the town. Cycling - there have been many occasions when cyclists have been going the wrong way along the one way system (both King street and Princess Street), causing problems for cars and pedestrians, who do not necessarily 'look both ways' before crossing a one way street. pedestrian network?? Is that a pavement. We are not talking about a large city with subways etc, it is a small town. Areas of traffic congestion - again this is due to the road network being severely out of date, we have a very busy town which sees visitors, residents and a significant proportion of through traffic...

Good to see the distant possibility of a Metro Link which will improve links to Manchester

We need better services. In the past we had them, more frequent buses and trains. They were reduced. Re-introduce more frequency and more routes where possible, and yes, the metro-link might help.

I agree with the majority of this, but I must be one of the few people that believe that the town centre does not need extra car parking. This is because Tatton car park is never full, even in the busiest periods, and no one seems to know that the car park across the moor from the town centre becomes a public car park at weekends.

Expansion can only reduce connectivity

Vision simply comprises of two high level objectives, neither of which help in determining how the town will evolve in practice. I am very supportive of helping increase walking, cycling and public transport but delivery is the key. Knutsford is currently very poor in terms of cycle and bus accessibility. The nature of the town makes it difficult to radically improve the situation especially if congestion to be reduced and parking also to be improved. The vision should set out priorities for when different elements of the vision are in conflict. How do you provide greater levels of town centre car parking and reduce areas of traffic congestion whilst encouraging use of cycling and buses. What does improved roads mean? Are we suggesting that we seek to get through traffic out of the centre or are we going to improve roads that could provide easier movement for through traffic etc. As it stands the strategy I consider it pretty meaningless it doesn’t address any key issues, for example it doesn’t distinguish between long stay and short stay parking in town centre. These are two very different sectors. It seems to me the vision should definitely support improved parking provision for short term parking in town centre but whether it should support improved long stay i.e. commuter parking is much more debatable. Indeed providing more long stay parking is probably in conflict with the majority of other elements of the strategy.

Improved public transport - ABSOLUTLEY - including increased frequency and some thought about where people live and where they need to go to. Increased car parking spaces - NO - as a country we are committed to reducing CO2 emissions, one aspect of this car travel - we should not be encouraging it by providing more car parking. In addition car travel is likely to decrease an petrol prices keep increasing

Parking remains an issue due to time limits and availability. Why is the (Bailey?) car park by the Scout Hut on the Moor not utilised at weekends? Transportation links such as bus and train links, entry on and off the M6 and M56, and the link between the two, need to be improved. Trains to Manchester are infrequent and sometimes late. Bus links are appalling and have been recently cutback. There are no links to Macclesfield in the evening. Synchronisation of traffic lights and traffic crossings can be improved to assist traffic flow. A left filter light turning left up Hollow Lane from Adams Hill is needed. A tram is an option but improved trains would be a cheaper and suitable alternative.

There are already a lot of car parks in Knutsford. People should be encouraged to use public transport and to walk into the centre of Knutsford. The metrolink is not needed. The train service should be upgraded to provide a quicker and more frequent service. The footpath on Ladies Mile to name but one is not adequate. The traffic on Northwich Road is too fast. A pedestrian crossing is required
there has been a lot of local comment to change the green spaces into carparks and yet the charm of knutsford is its unusual amount of green space within sight of the town centre. the car issue is solvable on existing sites especially around the caledonian house site which is an office development that has very few supporters and could easily be relocated for a sympathetic carpark development like the one in macclesfield. People do not walk more than 400m from a picnic site and the same logic applies to shopping. These developments will only increase the demand for parking and the type of houses the developer will inevitably build will not be using the bus routes. The main employer for any development will be Manchester and therefore the total lack of frequent train service is unacceptable. Manchester is rapidly becoming a non car place with proposed tolls etc

Car parking should be improved but more car parks should not be built in the centre of Knutsford. Park and Rides from areas outside the centre should be considered, as should 'concealed' car parks in landscaped areas so they don't ruin the aesthetic quality of Knutsford.

I think the extension of the tram to Knutsford would be a brilliant development for the town.

Should consideration be given to park and ride facilities for visitors to the town?

The extension of the Metrolink to Knutsford is highly desirable.

The ambition of a "town wide cycle and pedestrian network" is laudable but how will it be achieved?

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope. 2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if you developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed. 3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place ie the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis. 4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford 5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced, when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with. 6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

I feel that any new office or workplace in the town must be able to provide parking for all its staff.

How are these to be paid for, since it's not an area where private/commercial interests will take anything on.

Public transport should be improved to reduce the congestion on the roads

A metrolink extension would be fantastic and would encourage more people to the town centre, and for better commuter links to Manchester. The road system concerns me though - I think the addition of town centre improvement, a metrolink stop, more parking and more housing will lead to an unmanageable level of traffic on the existing road system. I would want to know how this is going to be addressed.

How will more housing in site A, B, C, D, E, improve the employment in the town? Where is the evidence of large companies re-locating to Knutsford?

Priority !!!!!!!!!! improve this before building any homes
Better pedestrian facilities in the town centre are essential. Car parks must be well designed and managed and affordable.

The traffic situation in Knutsford has been out of control since before I moved here in 1983, and worsens every year. The recent gas pipeline work in the town has highlighted how badly served the town’s residents, workers and visitors are. The road closures have led to chaos on the town centre streets with extended journey times and residential streets on many of Knutsford’s estates turned into “rat-runs” and parking zones. Pedestrianisation of the town centre would certainly help, but only if there is a viable plan to provide vehicular access and parking nearby. There are no viable areas available around the town centre which could provide roads or parking facilities around the town. The situation is particularly bad around the Knutsford entrance to Tatton Park. Any further developments which impinge on the town centre should be carefully examined to ensure that there is no impact on the surrounding roads until the traffic problems have been addressed. Traffic flow on the M6 has reduced considerably during the recession, but we (meaning you!) have to assume that it will pick up, that congestion and blockages on the M6 in the Knutsford area will return and that Knutsford will once again become the link route between the M6, the M56 and the Cheshire area. This can bring Knutsford grinding to a halt on its own; add it to any roadworks or other congestion (e.g. tourists) and the town again becomes a nightmare for residents and tourists alike. Movement must be made on the M6/M56 link as a priority.

Knutsford contains one Air Quality Management Area (A50 Manchester Road) and a number of areas where levels of pollution are close to the Air Quality Objective. Transport: Improve and safeguard air quality in the town (particularly on the A50 Manchester Road) Car Parking: Develop low carbon incentivised parking / Infrastructure within the Town Centre

These are objectives which Knutsford has needed for the past thirty years and what has been achieved, absolutely nothing. It is not sensible to have a policy which we all know is unachievable. Please let’s live in the real world. Knutsford residents are fed up with unrealistic objectives.

Again can we sustain more traffic not enough parking spaces.

The 2012 Transport Consultation focussed solely on cost reduction of bus services. A much deeper and more meaningful and more productive study is urgently needed to identify REAL and likely FUTURE transport needs of the Knutsford residential and working populations (including those who live outside Knutsford but work or could work in the town). The study should start from a clean sheet of paper and work out an integrated transport needs system (routes, frequency of service and numbers of passengers at various times of the day) by means of a well constructed and meaningful consultation probably lasting at least 2 months.

I have lived in Knutsford for twenty years, for much of that time there has been a shortage of car parking and nothing has been done. Why will the next 18 be any different? There is a substantial shortage now with town centre workers parking further and further out - e.g. down Tabley Road. Any realistic increase in parking spaces will be taken up by existing demand creating more demand is asking for trouble.

Seek to reduce areas of traffic congestion.

There should also be more cycle routes to allow people to commute by bike...my husband cycles to Manchester because it is faster and more effective than getting a train or bus! Identifying the key routes for cycling would be a start, such as Knutsford to Wilmslow, Macclesfield, Hale, Altrincham etc. A more efficient and faster train service is required to Manchester, better linkages to other towns such as Warrington, Chester etc are required to reduce the number commuters using the road.

This definitely needs to be improved - particularly rail. The rail link into Manchester is slow and poor considering how relatively close we are to Manchester city centre - the Metrolink proposal sounds promising. A link to the west coast line at Crewe would also be a significant improvement.

I agree with the general objective but do not agree with the suggestion that a Metrolink extension is appropriate or necessary.
Knutsford is often at capacity in coping with the number of cars and lorries on the roads through the town. The roads are often congested and parking is limited. This issue has been highlighted previously through consultation and was also commented on in the strategy as an issue. The road system and parking issues need to be addressed as a priority before any new development takes place or is even considered. My concern is that the town will become gridlocked and grind to a halt rather than prosper and thrive if new development is encouraged to take place on a large scale before these issues are addressed.

A public transport network which provides a better service for Knutsford to Manchester and the surrounding towns is a priority before starting an proposed developments. we need to reduce the number of cars travelling through the town centre before thinking about and further developments. Your two objectives appear to counteract each other - making it easier for car usage hardly encourages the use of sustainable transport

Lacks any credibility to deliver this, there is no group with accountability to integrate transport.

Yes please to Metrolink. Improve buses to it is possible to commute to Warrington, Macclesfield, Wilmslow and Northwich by bus. The current bus serviceto Macclesfield runs about hourly and takes about an hour, so is unreasonable for people trying to get to work there. The last bus back for Warrington leaves mis afternoon, so is useless for people working. Do not build a multi story car park anywhere, especially do not ruin the Moor.

Invest in connectivity first - only then allow housing developments outside the boundary

You need to develop a regular, frequent bus service to help people in all areas of the town, and establish regular, frequent connections with Macclesfield, Northwich, Wilmslow, and Altrincham.

I agree in principal if it is sympathetic to Knutsford's heart, heritage and environment.

As 50% or so of people served by the town are outside the town itself, this has to be a high priority

Objective and strategy vague and ill defined.

Building 1000 new houses will detrimentally affect the traffic in our town. Lets start by not doing that. We already have good rail links.

The public transport links are a joke. Buses to Macclesfield do not run in the evening, how to use facilities there? We lost half hourly trains some years ago, bring that back, as linking to other routes via Stockport or Picadilly is daft with 50 min waits.

Metro link would be fabulous and safe and abundant cycle routes - not just within the town but to link to other areas.

Need to add a railway station at Parkgate. Need to bring the Metrolink connection to the airport and thus the rest of the tram network. Parking in the town does not need to be greatly increased, improve signage, greater enforcement of double yellow zones, especially on Princess St at the the top of Silk Mill St.

Agree with most of the points but don’t see the need for more car parking. I never have a problem finding somewhere to park in Knutsford. I believe there is a perceived need created by the huge elderly population of the town who seem to want to park within a couple of metres of wherever they want to go - that is a need that will never be satisfied. The use of double yellow lines for disabled parking in Knutsford creates inconvenience and danger for everyone else.

The two 'Objectives' here seem mutually exclusive to me. If you improve car parking people will drive.

I consider the current parking provision to be satisfactory and would strongly wish to see cycling and walking encouraged. Improvements to local public transport services are much needed.

The traffic and parking arrangements are key to the town's development and to the development of health and wellbeing services in and outside the town. What ever decisions are made on health and well-being centre there is a need for connectivity from residential areas to local services and access to major hospitals elsewhere. This is particularly important for older people, patients and carers and those who don't have cars.

This item is in essence outside the remit of the group, however, we would like to stress the
importance of transport connections to allow people to visit and enjoy our "Historic Market Town", while avoiding damage to that which we all hold dear, namely the character and appearance of the town.

All issues of connectivity should be related to all user groups not just those specifically mentioned. There is a great need for new road safety measures as many roads into Knutsford are already used as speedy rat runs putting residents at risk. Reducing speed and traffic calming should be a major issue.

There is no need for further car parking. People should be encouraged to walk, rather than expecting to park in the immediate vicinity of their destination. The Metrolink should only be extended if it does not jeopardise the mainline service to and from Chester.

When plans for airport development were issued some years ago they contained a proposal that Manchester Airport should have a western railway connection by means of a short spur to the mid Cheshire line near to Mobberley. This was not just a local connectivity matter. A service from the airport to Chester would also provide a direct connection into the heart of the airport from North Wales and the Wirral and could be expected to result in many fewer road journeys in the roads around our area. If such trains were to stop at Knutsford, this could alter the present situation where all journeys from the Knutsford area to the airport are by road. Extension of the Metrolink to Knutsford would present a problem for those of us over 60 and other groups who qualify for one or other of the Railcards. These can be used on the trains to Manchester but are not recognised in any way on Metrolink.

Transport connectivity for Knutsford is highly controversial for the residents. The document expresses improved connectivity, yet CEC choose to reduce and take away various transport services, while moving more services out of town. This is not SUSTAINABLE! Knutsford has one of if not the highest aging populations of any town in Cheshire East, yet transport connections remain poor. I would implore CEC to support and invest in improved transport connections, not least the possibility of bringing the Manchester Metro to Knutsford and further along the Mid Cheshire and Middlewich Branch line in the form of Train-Trams, as being trialled in Sheffield, and used for many years on the continent. For those services needing to be outside of the town, good public transport connections are essential, and should not be cut any further, whether at the hands of the Borough council or private companies. I agree with the sentiment of the statements made, but wish to see evidence of CEC also supporting them.

in addition to the matters identified here it is considered that this Objective also needs to deliver the Vision to improve access to the open countryside.

Connectivity; the possible extension of Metrolink to Knutsford is flagged up. Although this would be an ambitious proposition for Knutsford in its role as a relatively small market town, it is agreed that in the much longer term this could be a key consideration in further developing the town’s vitality. Also, this would serve to expand connections between Greater Manchester and its hinterland.

Emphasis seems to be on more car parking which encourages more trips (and people then complain about traffic- doh!). Is Metrolink a realistic prospect or red herring - have there actually been any discussions with TfGM? Interesting idea, but should this even be mentioned in strategy?

Too many empty seats on the buses - already good train service to Chester/Manchester. Local areas or congestion need resolving by slight changes to white lining.

Buses and transport links between rural parished need to be maintained for mutual benefit of town and rural economies.

Bringing the Metrolink to Knutsford, if it can be achieved, will be wonderful and allow a far better service to Manchester than currently exists.

Cycleways should not be produced to the detriment of pedestrians, particularly the elderly; nor should the recreation areas on the Moor be reduced to accommodate them.

Extension of metrolink must utilise current track route

Metro link to Knutsford could prove detrimental in that the town might get swallowed up into
Manchester instead of being a Cheshire Town

Improved bus links to the South and better service integration to be encouraged. Extension of metrolink should be prevented. Trams do not offer standard of comfort for 40 mile journey to Manchester. Introduction would be to detriment of rail services and suburbanise Knutsford and Mobberley. More frequent service between Northwich and Altrincham preferable.

It should not be a priority to focus on town centre parking. Make provision for out of town sites and encourage use of 300 circular or cycling/walking.

Connectivity of supply water and sewerage infrastructure is an important consider in any future visions and policies for development.

But . . . Add after 'car parking', by use of RACK CARPARKING SYSTEMS MAIN PARK SYSTEM. This is more sustainable and less land take.

More effort should be made to improve public transport, particularly in the outlying rural areas. There is little point having a bus service, if one still has to walk a mile to catch it. I want a bus service that will pick up and drop off on demand on its route.

parking not a priority already enough.

The emphasis should be placed on improving public transport, which is poor, and discouraging use of the car. The train service is sub-standard and infrequent. The bus service is limited, and deteriorating (the service to Macclesfield is about to be reduced in frequency). The prospect of a Metrolink connection is seductive, but if Knutsford is the terminus may exacerbate parking problems.

We agree with improving connectivity but would like to raise the concern that an increased housing stock and therefore an increased population would be to the detriment of this objective.

Knutsford needs to retain its exclusivity and the Metrolink would reduce that because it would provide easy access to outsiders.

Careful monitoring of train use and the increase of services at peak times - in evenings and Sundays particularly.

Encouraging and improving sustainable transport including bus, rail, walking and cycling routes are all positive aspirations. As an historic town, Knutsford would not be improved through the provision of further parking facilities.

Parking has always been a problem, and will increase if the proposed developments go ahead. Parking should be 'pay on exit', which would retain people in the town and therefore be a help to traders. A Metro link would be welcomed, but improved bus services are essential. A connection to the Airport is necessary as it is currently difficult unless by own transport, thus missing out on employment opportunities. k would be

All good, but don’t build more car parks: you need to work towards getting people out of their cars.

BUT where is improving the ROADS!

Extension of Metrolink to Knutsford, or better still to Northwich would really improve connectivity

I would favour further development of the rail network over an extension of the metrolink - the current rail network is unreliable in many weather conditions and trains are in very poor condition, as well as being too small and infrequent for the demand.

There is ample car parking already. Improved connectivity is already needed for the present population. Our roads are already a mess; if they cannot be adequately maintained now, I think things will only get worse with the proposed development.

We need to resolve some issues, but the plan here would surely contribute to our current traffic congestion. We live in the country and sometimes there has to be a balance between this and what a city suburb would offer.

Forgive me if I shout Hypocrisy when this council is currently reducing the number of buses, has cut bus routes to out of town schools. The current railway links are poor and inadequate, metrolink provided it uses the current railway lines as in Altrincham would perhaps work however not at the cost of Green Belt land. The car parking in town is too expensive currently and actively discourages
people from shopping in the town. You suggest that the plan will reduce areas of traffic congestion, these proposals should they go ahead will create it...more cars on the road. It's not rocket science! This end of Knutsford will be congested beyond belief especially if the medical centre is plonked here, along with another school. As to suggesting that more people will be able to cycle and walk in Knutsford, it is already congested enough. Cyclists will be taking their lives in their hands if they plan to cycle on the town centre streets and on Mobberley road they will risk being run over by the sheer volume of traffic and HGVs, I'm sure adequate cycle stands will make up for a few squashed cyclists!!

- The only problem with car parking is for those employed in the town centre who commute in by car and will not pay to park their vehicles for the day - better rail services might reduce this pressure - Metro-link would be a huge asset to the town - A hal

But we have been waiting for this to happen in the 30 years we have lived here. Fine words no parsnips as they say!!

Road access to Area K is totally unsatisfactory to cope with any additional traffic flow.

We ave broadband and mobile coverage in spades. We don't need any more.

Yes! Connect Knutsford to Manchester (this actually sounds feasible and sensible!!). Yes! Reduce traffic congestion. But how?? Town centre is an insane throughway. And when there's an accident on the M6 as there was last week? Quicker to walk.

As someone who does not drive, I am particularly concerned with improved links, by rail and bus, within and outside Knutsford and provision of good safe pedestrian and cyclist access. Improved car parking is neccessary and a multistorey, in the appropriate place, would be helpful..

Agree in long term upto 2017 services may need to shrink as money will not be available for subsidised transport. After that should be possible to expand.

No business case for why we need excessive new housing

A shortage of parking is not the major issue it is often described as; people frequently park in front of my house to use Tatton Park, work or shop in Knutsford when spaces are available at the carpark on Tatton Street, this is a conscious decision to avoid paying for carparking rather than something necessitated by no parking available in the carparks or Tatton.

Another wish list. What is meant by 'sustainable transport choices'? That they make a profit? Where will the extra parking be? Do we want it to be visible? How are the links between areas to be achieved? Will Metrolink leave Knutsford even more of a dormitory town than it is already? No mention of how the existing traffic chaos is to be solved at peak times, when the M6 and soon the A556 relief road are closed.

Whilst there appears to be a requirement for some additional domestic housing as is evidenced by the lack of middle range properties for sale for potential buyers, the proposed Housing Development areas appear to greatly exceed the requirement. If the areas now considered not suitable were added, the "overkill" in numbers of properties would be immense and Knutsford would lose its identity of being a small intimate town. Some local employees who currently commute may move into the town but there will still be many who travel in by road. Car parking, long and short term, is a serious failing in the document which should be given priority. Primary schools have been a sore point ever since the closure of St Johns Wood and Crosstown schools. A new school in the Parkgate area would be a definite benefit in the Over Knutsford ward and would stop any possibility of over crowding at Manor Park school. However traffic lights at the junction of Parkgate Lane and Mobberley Road would be essential - there are already access delays at that junction when the staff in the industrial estate are going home in the late afternoon. Conversely the removal of Egerton School leaving Bexton the only primary school on the west of the town would cause even greater congestion in the Beggarmans Lane/Blackhill Lane/Bexton Lane. An alternative to Egerton is essential. It is rumoured that Tesco are interested in occupying a site on the west of Manchester Road between Sugar Pit Lane and the Land Rover garage. The town survived with just the Co-op and Booths and the two late shops off Mobberley Road for many years before the arrival of Waitrose and Sainsburys. Now Aldi will probably be the second main supermarket store after Booths. Where is the need for Tescos and also it shouldn't be
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>directly on the main road to Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snarl up the motorways even more in an already congested area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This whole area is fundamental to the success of the local economy and there is massive scope for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking should be free of charge in Knutsford. Improve the rail links - the Chester to Manchester Northern Rail line is a diabolical service. I recently worked in Manchester and was appalled by the train service. I had to give up the job as a result of the train cost and poor frequency of the trains. A Metrolink extension to Knutsford is not the answer, as Metrolink is for urban journeys. Bus services must be improved as they may as well not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree. Note that &quot;protecting green spaces&quot; would not include building on the green belt, as discussed earlier. So, it's going to be difficult to meet this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good. Forget Aldi - put a new car park there instead - this would have been a much better plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe walking would be encouraged by the adoption of a pedestrianisation or similar scheme for parts of the town centre. Contrary to popular belief, car parking provision is underused except at peak shopping times. Important low-cost improvements can be made to traffic flows - example: making Cranford Avenue one-way (Stanley Road is already one-way, and could be the other part of the system). The loading bay on Princess Street (outside Waitrose) is dangerous for pedestrians. A vehicle access should be made from King Edward Road into the car park at the back of Waitrose. The existing driving over the Princess Street pavement to the car park could then be stopped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some contradictory statements here - &quot;protect greenspaces ... adjacent to the town&quot;. Isn't that what you are trying to do?&quot;Improve access to the open countryside and woodland&quot; - by building on it and making it further away!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What a strange jargon word to use. We need much better public transport facilities. A Metrolink would be great, but it is highly unlikely that it will happen. Unrealistic to assume that it will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking has always been a problem, and will increase if the proposed developments go ahead. Parking should be 'pay on exit', which would retain people in the town and therefore be a help to traders. A Metro link would be welcomed, but improved bus services are essential. A connection to the Airport is necessary as it is currently difficult unless by own transport, thus missing out on employment opportunities. k would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England supports the overall theme of Objective 7 to encourage the use of sustainable transport and improve car parking provision. However, Natural England would suggest further links to open space and green space in order to promote physical activity and better health are encouraged within this strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to tram train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want tram train. Don't want to be part of Greater Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking if we are to protect town centre. It is hardly safe to use pavements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you've put in the book doesn't make sense - building more roads will not connect people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes improve rail, including metrolink and bus links; Strongley disagree re: No cycles are not to increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue prints need to be shown to Knutsford residents so as to get a clear idea of plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with objective. By-pass not mentioned in strategy. What is the strategy to reduce traffic congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More car parks result in more green spaces lost + more people will drive to Knutsford! Local people need to be encouraged to walk/cycle into town if they are able to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booths car park is rarely full. Look at free parking, like Northwich - our preferred shopping town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure about facilitating car use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knutsford seems well connected at the moment

If the land adjoining Tabley Road is built on will there be a bus service available to enable people without cars to visit the local cemetery?

Especially car parks.

Have you done survey as to how many people in Knutsford do not have any transport? I suspect it is quite low.

Rail connection to Crewe is needed for travel south. Not aware of any bus routes to Holmes Chapel, Sandbach and Congleton. Not sure I agree with expansion of car parking in town centre.

Improves public transport essential.

need better bus service, new rolling stock. Metrolink - make another Manchester suburb?

The development will cause more congestion - totally agree with metrolink. Rail link is very poor

Strategy contradicts previous elements of plan which focus on tram's expansion. We do not want a multi-storey carpark.

metrolink extension - yes but unlikely I think.

Knutsford people are car users - need to improve local transportation, use of public transport and links to airport - is a cultural problem

How?? under proposed scheme

You could encourage the Metrolink by creating a town tram to connect all parts.

we set out our overall concern with the process of producing town strategies in advance of the Core Strategy. We note that the purpose of the town strategies is to inform the emerging Local Plan. Whilst we agree that the Council needs to know that it has a range of deliverable housing sites that is the purpose of the SHLAA. Therefore, what is the purpose of the town strategies? It is clear that they do not provide a further assessment in addition to the SHLAA on the suitability of the sites, as paragraph 5.8 of the approved Alsager Town Strategy states: â€œIt should be noted that these sites would be subject to further appraisal before being taken forward in the Cheshire East Local Planâ€œ.
Q3 Development Principles

Do you agree or disagree with the Development Principles as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

- 82% of respondents answered this question
- Strongly Agree (23%); Agree (31%); Neither Agree or Disagree (16 %); Disagree (9%); Strongly Disagree (21%)

Comments:

It is vital that existing public open spaces are not lost. Particularly those on North Downs as these provide exactly what the development principals enthuse.

Use of 'empty signifiers' makes it difficult to offer detailed response.

The statement re walkable neighbourhoods is excellent. All the 5.2 statement are great but just no follow as to how it will be achieved. 5.1/5.2 is nearly a better short Vision statement than the one earlier.

In principle yes, but the list is limited and needs to have more detail on how those points can be achieved.

Infrastructure needs planning first.

On behalf of the members of the club, we disagree and would ask planners to re-consider ripping up green fields and removing local amenities in and around the town.

We should not be despoiling further greenbelt with housing estates or any other development. Greenbelt should remain greenbelt.

The principles appear to be from the realms of fantasy. It all sounds nice, but the practicalities are such that it simply wouldn't work. You can't widen the streets in the town centre without moving buildings. You can't build more houses when the existing infrastructure is already unable to cope.
Just stamps all over what we have now, that works.

Promotion of sustainable lifestyles through access to open spaces, recreational facilities and activities and leisure services. This statement is incompatible with developing area D

Principle site of cinema / civic centre / petrol station and shop in front of Marcliffe Road is land mark site, this should be re-developed to mixed use re-site Tatton Street. Both provide underground car parking. Cars out of sight.

The green spaces to be included in the new build larger areas and not just focused on the town’s existing ones

Nice words which could be applied to any town but fails to convincingly address the two major problems which have long dogged Knutsford, namely parking and traffic congestion. More of the same is not a vision. If the town centre is to support more office and retail business it needs more and cheaper car parking. A multistory car park would be acceptable if it could be designed with imagination. One with Italian style embellishments say. Much traffic congestion is caused by the industrial estate being at Parkgate which is isolated via Adams Hill/Mobberley Road from the main road infrastructures M6, A50 etc. Time to have a supplementary business park at a more suitable location. There is plenty of land near the motorway west of the Knutsford High school. Access would be in to Northwich road. The Parkgate estate could gradually be phased out and given over to housing, relieving the town of much HGV traffic and at the same time minimising the encroachment on green belt. (If like me you don’t consider land adjacent to the motorway to be green belt)

I do not agree with the scale of the new developments proposed. Therefore do not think that the principles as detailed fairly reflect the intentions as proposed.

Where I agree with some principles, as indicated, I cannot agree with the intention of the favoured sites to build houses

what is a vibrant park? What does green spaces linked to the wider environment mean? Sounds very PC but it seems what you’re talking about is a few trees and footpaths with hundreds more houses.

I agree in principle to the Development Principles, although I have reservations that it can be achieved, because, as pointed out previously, most of the surrounding greenspaces are earmarked for development.

Local people cooperating with developers in delivering great places, that reflect this town strategy. - WOULD RATHER IT WAS DEVELOPERS COOPERATING WITH LOCAL PEOPLE. ITS US THAT LIVE WITH WHAT THEY HAVE DONE FOR YEARS AFTER THEY HAVE MOVED ON. Consideration given to the social, economic and environmental performance of a place as well as physical characteristics. - OK Promotion of sustainable lifestyles through access to open spaces, recreational facilities and activities and leisure services. - YES A vibrant and accessible town centre. - YES All new developments linking sustainably with the rest of the town. - YES Generous green spaces linked to the wider natural environment, including a mix of public and private networks of well managed, high quality gardens, tree lined streets and open spaces, including green infrastructure to bind and link places in the town together and improve the overall environment. - YES Multi-functional public green spaces that can be used for play, recreation, walking and cycling, and to support wildlife, urban cooling and water management.- YES High quality design that is sustainable, desirable and durable. - YES The creation of low carbon communities and the promotion of eco-developments. - SEE PREVIOUS COMMENTS RE DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING

Agree with the focus on sustainability, which to me means focus on infrastructure and quality of development as opposed to quantity of new housing.

New housing to grow the town will need to include its own facilities, so large areas of housing are not left without any retail or catering outlets close by.

How can this provide multi functional sports and recreation facilities when you plan to bulldoze excellent and well used facilities to provide homes.

Although I accept there will be winners and losers in the new developments, where existing residents are affected they should be given the opportunity to influence the development to ensure the
minimum impact on local resident is achieved.

Yes but again what will actually be done!

I believe not enough has been done to engage local people to address their concerns or ideas. Especially when it comes to: 1) The use of green belt land. 2) The impact on traffic congestion. 3) The impact on the use and access to local health and education.

Why have some sites been declared not suitable without any explanation as to why within the document (sites H-T with the exception of K). Also on page 20 it says no decisions have been made by Cheshire East as to their suitability but on pages 31 and 32 certain sites already seem to have been ruled out.

In general, the principles are sound however, they state having "generous green spaces linking to a wider natural environment" and "multi-functional green spaces", yet the preferred housing development sites are on green belt land! How do you propose creating a "low carbon community"??

There will be fewer open spaces if you build on them

Needs to mention 'a small amount only' of development.

I do not support:"The creation of low carbon communities and the promotion of eco-developments."

"promotion of sustainable life styles though access to open spaces, recreational facilities and activities and leisure services" is incompatible with housing developments on area D

We already have public green spaces. How can more 'high quality gardens, tree lined streets and open spaces, be developed without building on the green spaces we already have around the perimeter of the town?

We should NOT be building in GREEN BELT. It fundamentally goes against the reason that Knutsford has been, and still is a desirable place to live and why WE, the people who grew up here continue to want to live here. It is land that can never be recovered and will increase Knutsford's population who will then, in turn, need houses. I don't agree that we need affordable homes, although Bungalows for elderly residents are needed. I hold the Council Responsible for the fact that Not one bungalow has been built in Knutsford since the 1980's!! Y The NPPF states "Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" I don't believe that this plan is exceptional circumstances One massive gap in the Town Strategy is that nobody explained why the majority of the potential Development sites were ruled out. It just states that "this site was not considered Suitable....?? Why?

This is good but contradicts the building development options.

All the principles are worthy and I can't imagine that many people would disagree.

This seems to be pretty much a rewriting of the Vision. And my response is much the same: how could you really disagree?!

The KTS makes no mention of the potential sites for the much talked about enhanced Knutsford Hospital /Health Centre. It does talk of 'mixed use' but doesn't go any further than that. When the site off the Mobberley Road area was under discussion for at the new hospital site, the reason for the choice of land to be used in that area was given as that area was close to many homes..particularly housing people of more limited means..perhaps with no access to a car. The KTS indicates many affordable homes are scheduled to be built in Knutsford....one could assume that the sites of these home will be taken into account should the Hospital /Health Centre be built, but this is not alluded to in KTS One of the sites for the enhanced health provision being talked about (from the Knutsford Guardian's articles on the subject) is the present hospital site near Stanley Road/Bexton Lane The vehicular access from Stanley Road to the Hospital is notoriously bad. There are often holds ups..the road has a stretch of yellow lines, then it allows parking, all this just before the entrance to the hospital. There is no right turn lane for the hospital for cars and other vehicles..there are quite a lot of small buses taking elderly patients to/from the hospital..juggle to get in and out of the hospital entrance. The number of car parking spaces in front of the hospital is inadequate and the rear parking is fine but it is quite a walk round to the main entrance. I would like to feel confident that the hospital /health issue is to be reviewed and taken into account in the KTS but I seen no reason to believe that
it is going to be. Most of the residents of the villages surrounding Knutsford use Knutsford for GP and other health needs. Most of them arrive by car...there is no other practical way to arrive in good time for appointments...so these issues are extremely relevant for these CEC residents.

The principles cannot be achieved with the proposal of building 460 to 1,280 new homes, particularly with the development of green belt in zones A, B, C, D and E.

I do not agree that Knutsford needs 1200 homes - a huge population increase. Problems with traffic, infrastructure and facilities.

How can I agree with this when you are proposing to take away large areas of green belt land surrounding my home? I would argue that Knutsford is already thriving and other towns would benefit more from the investment. Large scale development will change the unique selling point of Knutsford.

I disagree with the principles because we have not been allowed to say what development we would accept. We are told there is to be housing in the areas surrounding where we live

Building on the Green Belt around Knutsford is unacceptable. The Council have approached the whole process in a disingenuous + underhand secretive way. The Stakeholder Panel was full of vested private interests and hence the Plan has been corrupted and skewed from the outset. Were these interests balanced by asking CPRE / Natural England / NFU to attend ? Completely unrepresentative and non-inclusive troika of the great and the good cooking up development solutions + proposals that haven’t evolved since the 60’s.

Knutsford needs to be a safe place to walk - agree with the use of green spaces and high quality gardens. need to consider wildlife and the environment

1. Local people cooperating with developers? It doesn’t seem to have happened too often with town centre developments but let us hope that it happens in the future. 2. We must be careful about allowing cyclists to share paths/recreational areas etc with pedestrians. That just moves the problem of potential incidents from the roads to the footpaths and from the cyclists to pedestrians and children. Cycling can only be made safe when we properly plan cycle lanes into the highways infrastructure

Too much housing in Green Belt, not stringent protection of heritage and natural environment. I believe that latter to be of great importance as there is a rapid decline in wildlife, you only have to look at the red lists. Tatton Park planning application wants to build a gigantic car park on farmland that attracts rapidly declining farmland birds like peewits (red listed). We cannot allow economic imperatives to override protection of the environment.

Cooked up in workshops attended by developers and egged on by Cheshire East planners. Totally unacceptable building on Green Belt when so many other towns can take the expansion.

The Club supports its landlord’s (Mr Henry Brooks) vision for the Town in respect to Areas C,D,E,G

Theres nothing wrong with them. There is just no evidence of these principles - or any principles or criteria - having been applied to the subsequent discussion of which areas are considered unsuitable for development. Hence the principles are irrelevant.

The principle that local people cooperate with developers empowered without consultation with those same local people is somewhat fanciful. For this to have the support of local people, local people need to feel they have been consulted and had the opportunity to have their say. A couple of posters in the library, some articles in The Gaurdian and a stand in Booths just doesn’t cut it

I have commented at Qu 1 only. Unfortunately this questionnaire is too time consuming to comment in every box

I Agree, but these are very broad, generic and could be applied to any strategy. It will be difficult to benchmark against these to prove that they have been delivered as expected.

I agree on the proviso that 'local developers' (the first point) doesn't mean ruthless house builders. Although I agree on the whole, I'd prefer to see who these developers are.

Are these the development principles I've already commented upon? Please refer to pervious answers.

The development of the town needs to be focused around it's current quality of life for the residents
and visitors, focusing on areas of connectivity and not on increased housing by way of housing estates.

Though I do not believe the plan as set out will deliver this.

For the reasons already provided

Why develop? There is no driver to do so, even your figures for population growth are modest - don't try to fix something that isn't broken. Knutsford is currently a lovely place to live - don't spoil it.

See above for reviewing CA and LB lists

Again, reasons already provided

The proposed building is in the wrong areas with little thought given to ancillary facilities. The town centre is not built for today's traffic and must be closed to vehicular traffic, similar to Macclesfield where access is available as required.

Development will only be welcomed in brown field areas. The principles detailed conflict with your objectives! How can increased car parking be acceptable if you want to have a low-carbon community? It seems to me that the "strategy" is designed to promote whatever the council wants to promote at some random time in the future

The plans will decimate the green Belt areas and playing fields of Knutsford.

Housing seems to be taking precedence over other uses and commercial development and road improvements seems to be neglected

I agree with the development principles, but not how they are being implemented is in not in line with these principles.

It is questionable whether the retention of the historic character of Knutsford is compatible with extensive development.

But without the increases in housing

I agree knutsford as all towns in the UK has to develop as it had to in the 70's. Unlike other towns it has many distinct features and development has to be much more careful to add to these facilities and not by vested interests intent on satisfying their own needs and not the town.

Manchester decision to make us an over flow site for their social needs produced a ghetto for many years with little connection with the town. Crosby homes in the 80's used every available space within the town for their developments with minimal return to the town. The heritage of the town is paid lip service with recent developments. The use of very standard wording in the document implies all cheshire towns will get a 'one size fits all' approach to development. Grow the town organically not in big blocks. Single affordable developments don't work as do gated properties that take no part in community life.

Destroying the town sport facilities near to the town will mean the youth will not use them unless driven there as they chose to do the simpler option of social media and computers at home. Persuading people to exercise will be one of the greatest challenges for the next 20 years.

Knutsford has minimal people between the ages 20-30 because of house prices and lack of higher education. The sports club particularly show this. Didsbury with its flats and bars is their chosen location. We need to get a better population balance.

In theory I agree, although I am sceptical that the principles will be adhered to. I suspect that once underway, residents of Knutsford will have very little say in how the town is developed especially once green belt areas are sold to developers who will have no interest in anything other than money.

There is no requirement to expand the size of Knutsford and certainly no necessity to deprive land from agricultural use.

It is difficult not to agree - the statements are so broad in nature and have the character of an aspirational 'wish list'.

I don't consider it necessary to develop further a small country town such as Knutsford, and certainly not to build on Green Belt land.

"Local people cooperating with developers" - need to be safeguards to ensure that developers actually listen to the views of local people.

Once again this wish list is unremittingly optimistic - Knutsford becomes a utopian paradise - without
any money being spent!

I agree in principle, but I would like more details on how the traffic will be managed.

**AGAIN MY MAIN CONCERN IS THE DETAIL OF WHEN/HOW/QUALITY IN DELIVERING OF THE PLAN**

The development principles fail to provide the necessary protection for our valuable Green Belt. In addition given that our already congested main arterial route through town, the A50 / Manchester Road runs through the conservation area I have not seen any proposals for how the town could accommodate the extra traffic generated by more development without damaging the historic centre which the Development Principles state they would uphold.

Loaded question. The whole statement is a contradiction.

Development guidance and both type generic and site specific briefs need to be prepared and subjected to public consultation before adoption and in place before any development sites are promoted.

I do not agree with new developments. I do not agree with building on greenbelt and existing recreational facilities. I do not think that local people can work effectively with developers and the proposal is not viable. It therefore seems opaque and idealistic in order to ease the communities concerns.

Concentrate on improving our existing facilities before moving out and developing green belt land. Impove the view and feel of Knutsford as people travel in and out. Don't agree with taking out B and including C. How about developers co-operating with local people?

The trick is how to make Development Options and Decisions / Policy reflect the Development Principles stated.

Do not see any evidence that such principles will be delivered

I agree with the majority of what the strategy is proposing except for the provision of additional housing and employment sites because the existing infrastructre would not be able to cope with the addition population and traffic congestion; the public transport facilities need to be improved as well as leisure and town centre facilities before that is considered. Again, I state my objection to building on greenbelt land...it is important to think of future generations... we are looking at it from the wrong perspective as we need to curb population growth, not provide for it.

To note that as commented previously, the Heath does not fit the definition of a public green space which is being used for play, recreation, walking and cycling etc at present. No further comment.

I understand a town needs to have development and growth but I believe that this should not be to the detriment of the green belt. Knutsford is a beautiful town surrounded by areas of fertile farmland and has a diverse wildlife The residents all enjoy this and it helps make Knutsford what it is. Once you start expanding the town further we are in danger of becoming yet another suburb of Manchester with no separate identity. we should preserve the green belt and restrict development to brown field sites only.

But get real! Once planning permission is bulldozed through, other considerations will be forgotten or ignored. Let's see what proportion of affordable housing is delivered against what was promised.

Good to see mention of low carbon communities - but the use of the word vision under the title Principles is again confusing

All too bland. 'Local people co-operating with developers' is the wrong way around. Local people live in the town and have long term interests for the community whilst developers have a need to make profit in the short term for each project. To protect the town developers need to know they will have to win over the support of local people and that the Council will take strong action if they fail to complyfully.

Although your suggestion of "urban cooling" seems a bit ironic lately.

Mostly OK. However "... support urban cooling..." Knutsford is a market town; it is not urban and it certainly does not need cooling. Be careful that "vibrant & accessible town centre" does not mean pubs & clubs open late at night, disturbing the residents.
Difficult to disagree with this, but also difficult to believe that the Council would have the vision to carry it through.

I think the draft is flawed. It has not taken into account the inherent problems it would create in over population. This fact alone will destroy Knutsford's core beauty and attraction. Our quaint, historic town would suffocate in conglomerate consumerism.

Agree with all the principles but need to stress that the overall character of the town should not be detrimentally changed. These principles could equally apply to a "New Town"

The presumption that development has to take place and on the scale suggested seems incompatible with the notion of ensuring Knutsford is preserved as an historic market town. The suggestion that all new developments will be linked sustainably with the rest of town seems at odds with the favoured locations. The already congested Manchester Road runs through the Conservation area and yet will be subject to the bulk of the traffic that would accompany the proposed development. How will that be accommodated and what does that do for the pollution that comes with the queues of stationary traffic that are an all too common sight within Knutsford already. Lots of well meaning ideas that simply don't hang together when subject to scrutiny. If there is a clear plan for how this is to be handled then surely that has to be presented before the plans for the houses, hotel and golf course already being showcased despite this exercise being positioned by local politicians as "just a consultation exercise at this stage"

Again, vague and ill defined.

I do not agree wit the proposed developments. The development principles are a sop to trying to push the development through. Our council is not capable of managing quality development in Knutsford so should not even try. Current developments are a disgrace, please don't embark on larger scale projects.

LEAVE THE GREEN BELT ALONE. I came to Knutsford as a country Market town, please retain that. It is what attracts tourists and visitors to Knutsford, it needs enhancing not reducing.

But no change or loss of Green Belt and no Green Belt swap.

No development on green belt.

Don't agree with the proposed Housing sites and therefore don't agree with the development principles.

Agree, but the wish to remain a small, historic town in the Green Belt would preclude any further development on the fringes. There are traffic and utility implications as well as parking issues in the town centre.

A sequential approach being applied so that brownfield sites are considered before green belt and greenfield sites. The group agree that the town "wishes to remain an historic market town", and that character should be protected. The group would like the statement "a complete mix of housing" to be carefully defined however. Eco developments although favoured must not be the preserve of the rich, nor afford the ability to negate the need for other protection such as for the green belt and character of the town. KCHG would wish for such groups as ours to be included in the development process with developers, rather than only being consulted at an early planning stage, and this should be promoted by both the Town and Borough Councils.

I see no reason to increase housing when the infrastructure is already beyond its capacity (e.g. primary school places, traffic - particularly HGV travelling through town, medical services in GP surgeries)

5.2 1st bullet. 'Great places' - what on earth does this mean? 5.2 6th bullet. The aim of tree-lined streets conflicts with current policy whereby trees in Cranford Avenue were removed and Aldi has been permitted to remove trees on the site of its development off Brook St.

It must be a prerequisite for any developer to actively work with the community on any and all development proposals. Development cannot be about making money, but improving the quality of living within the community. If developers cannot make a development work financially due to requests from the community, this cannot be accepted as reasoning for ignoring community comments. If a conforming project cannot work financially, it must not be forced through.
Development principles (page 18) include welcome references to: - Biodiversity and nature - Green spaces including Green Infrastructure (GI) - Ecosystem services - Low carbon communities and eco-developments. Here it would be helpful to have a map showing the existing settlement boundary and existing natural assets such as Local Wildlife Sites, parks and public open spaces. Mapped assets would help to identify gaps in the GI network, and opportunities for making connections.

Not sure if these principles are really specific to Knutsford or simply wider CEC policy. I would encourage an urban morphology study to be undertaken to further develop the principles so they are specific to Knutsford and given more weight perhaps through a SPD.

Although the areas that are not used for recreation at present would be preferable as there is a concern once playing fields, bowling greens and other leisure facilities are lost it will be difficult to reinstate them.

Housing should only take place where it will be of benefit to the town and the infrastructure is in place to cope with the increase, schools, doctors, roads etc.

Apple Pie statements

- Desire for generous green spaces suggest encouraging sprawling development. Knutsford a small town, most residents have access to countryside and it is important this is retained.
- The route of the 300 circular bus extended to take in whatever and wherever new residential development takes place. Priority to be given to developers with plans for maximising use of development sites rather than low density, expensive housing.
- Development must not only have sustainable link with the rest of the town but also the neighbouring communities and councils for it to be considered as truly sustainable plan.
- Development principles NEEDS to be predicated on health and social care needs
- Cannot preserve heritage by changing it.
- There are many areas in cheshire that have already been developed and are not is use these must used.
- So Knutsford's legacy to the fantastic 2012 Olympic Games is to build over Knutsford's best sporting facilities. Could you please post in-line a list showing which of the committee members lives adjacent to one of the proposed building sites?
- All so-called "development" is ultimately unsustainable if based on consumption of finite resources. The Sustainable Development Commission would have us believe that "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" which sounds laudable until you think about it - nobody can foresee what these future needs will be, but it is almost certain that population will increase considerably, if not exponentially, with a concomitant rapacious appetite for land and resources. This requires unpalatable and inconvenient debate which politicians so far have refused to initiate.
- This principle is contradictory as it talks about generous green spaces, access to open spaces, multi-functional green spaces and the creation of low carbon communities and the promotion of eco-developments. Yet, the principle also focuses on development which is at the cost of the very things you are trying to promote! All Locals should be in possession of ALL facts prior to cooperation with developers in order to make a knowledgebale informed decision.
- Affordable housing means in essence, accommodation for people mainly on benefits - not acceptable.
- The development principles described are generally positive and ideal. However, many of the points contained within the development principles will be violated through the proposals listed within the town strategy consultation.
- This is all planning drivel, but the character of the town must be maintained, and the green belt protected for future generations. Please remember we are only custodians for future generations.
- Knutsford will not be knutsford if you build on the green belt. It is a small town and benefits from this in its sense of community - unlike Warrington for example. Develop brown field sites, like the one Aldi have now got, and save our green space. We do not have to chase economic development at the
expense of citizen-happiness. The strategy talks of preserving green space one minute and of the importance of culturally important features. The next it proposes to hike up the town’s population, build on the fields and destroy the sports clubs. Please do not pursue economic aims by building and demolishing use what we have and enhance it. Knutsford is a small charming town, I fear that will be lost.

The building of housing at sites A and B would not promote a walkable environment, these locations are too far for most people to walk to the town centre, which are the local facilities (unlike Longridge which has its own shops)

I don't see why Knutsford is targetted for additional housing - the document already supports the view that Knutsford serves a wider community without necessarily having been given additional services or facilities

Co-operation with local people is important.

Absolutely ruin town centre and drive away tourism

While I agree with development principles. I do not believe the plan will deliver what it proposes to.

This isn't development; it's already in place. it just needs to be cared for.

While I agree with development principles. I do not believe the plan will deliver what it proposes to.

This would be good, but it has only been words. There has been limited opportunity and for something so important, I would have expected more according to the spirit of these. I fear that the truth will be something different!

Please could you explain how local people can co operate with developers when they have not been consulted correctly, this consultation should have been six weeks according to your own rules, this was stated publicly by a member of the stakeholder panel at a meeting and as such people should have an additional two weeks to object and comment, the suggestion that a public meeting at the end of two weeks in place of these extra two weeks to object is not acceptable !!! The same person also stated that she was the only resident from Knutsford on the panel that was not representing another agency or had a vested interest other than on a personal level,so how is this representative? Again I would state that we have Green spaces for play, recreation, walking, cycling etc...its call Green Belt! Just how will the town be accessible when it is full of traffic? This plan actively depriciates the lifestyle of people at this Mobberly end of Knutsford and actively denies access to Green spaces by building all over them. Area K is currently used by a large number of people for recreational purposes and is a wonderful and bio diverse resource for the community.

Co-operation is two-way - developers must also co-operate with the wishes of local people

While I agree with development principles. I do not believe the plan will deliver what it proposes to.

Knutsford is a small town that should be protected by its greenbelt. It will not benefit from sprawl.

Regardless of David Cameron’s latest edicts, to most of us Green Belt land is sacrosanct; once build on it’s gone forever, together with all the wildlife it sustains.

Curious as to how serious / close to happening some of the housing/mixed use development is (areas A, B, C, D).

The accent should be on developing/adapting buildings and areas within the town first, and only then to areas adjacent to settlement boundaries. Green Field and Green Belt should be only be considered as last resorts, and if there is, or is the potential for, easy access to services and provision of opportunities to communities

Do not believe significant new development is appropriate

Subject to a greater transparency and more measured selection process which enables potential benefiting Landlord’s the opportunity to win the public vote. Releasing Green Belt is essential for Knutsford’s growth but this must not be done without allowing a fully knowledge of what is being proposed and what kick back benefits will result.

The limited information provided does not enable me to make a judgement on this. Impact of development on green belt is a highly sensitive issue at present.
These are all laudable and non contentious but they lack any bite or precision. This word ‘sustainable’ is bandied about but not defined. How will local people co-operate with developers? By saying ‘yes’ to what they want? Development will reduce green spaces. This is a road of good intentions without specifying the criteria, timescale or resources required by which the community could judge their successful success or failure. How do you link all new developments ‘sustainably’ with the rest of the town. I am sceptical that the levy on developers will generate any cash for essential improvements to the infrastructure BEFORE development takes place. No statutory requirements exist for this to be used for specific purposes after development. CEC should insist on developers putting bonds in place for such infrastructure or community purposes (a la coal extraction bonds to restore the environment) so that the money is forthcoming even if the developers become bankrupt.

Whilst there appears to be a requirement for some additional domestic housing as is evidenced by the lack of middle range properties for sale for potential buyers, the proposed Housing Development areas appear to greatly exceed the requirement. If the areas now considered not suitable were added, the "overkill" in numbers of properties would be immense and Knutsford would lose its identity of being a small intimate town. Some local employees who currently commute may move into the town but there will still be many who travel in by road. Car parking, long and short term, is a serious failing in the document which should be given priority. Primary schools have been a sore point ever since the closure of St Johns Wood and Crosstown schools. A new school in the Parkgate area would be a definite benefit in the Over Knutsford ward and would stop any possibility of over crowding at Manor Park school. However traffic lights at the junction of Parkgate Lane and Mobberley Road would be essential - there are already access delays at that junction when the staff in the industrial estate are going home in the late afternoon. Conversely the removal of Egerton School leaving Bexton the only primary school on the west of the town would cause even greater congestion in the Beggarman's Lane/Blackhill Lane/Bexton Lane. An alternative to Egerton is essential. It is rumoured that Tesco are interested in occupying a site on the west of Manchester Road between Sugar Pit Lane and the Land Rover garage. The town survived with just the Co-op and Booths and the two late shops off Mobberley Road for many years before the arrival of Waitrose and Sainsburys. Now Aldi will probably be the second main supermarket store after Booths. Where is the need for Tesco's and also it should'n't be directly on the main road to Manchester.

Mention historic parks and gardens which have a strong influence on the setting of the town, and which should also be sustained. Incremental small scale development would be more in keeping with the historic pattern of growth of the town. Surroundings are very sensitive.

i think i have said it all in my previous comments...how sad.

Very good list of aspirations.

This should say something about developing in the town centre and elsewhere, and on brown field sites - rather than on greenbelt which should be preserved.

No, for reasons given earlier.

What does "cooperating with developers in delivering great places" mean?

Why is there no reference here to brownfield sites before greenfield, and to sites within the town before considering Green Belt sites?

All good stuff, particularly the traffic congestion. Painting some dotted lines down the side of the road doesn't make a cycle path though. traffic calming measures are also a bad idea. Speed bumps etc. do not deter motorists and only make them race and break between them. Fix the traffic issues getting across town with two lanes all the way between the Adams Hill lights and the Canute Square roundabout. The pavements could easily be narrowed to accommodate this.

wonderful in theory!

This is all planning drivel, but the character of the town must be maintained, and the green belt protected for future generations. Please remember we are only custodians for future generations.

Natural England agrees that the development principles all represent a positive approach for the future of Knutsford. In particular Natural England note the importance given to linking all new...
Developments with the rest of the town and the aspiration to create generous green spaces that are linked to the wider natural environment

Wouldn’t it have been better if CEC had engaged with town more effectively and longer

Severe and usual lack of engagement with town by CEC

Not necessary

Vibrant town centre will only be achieved when we can eliminate empty shop premises. Less out of town shopping and less internet sales. We have good cafes, pubs and restaurants. Make it easy for out of town shoppers

The objectives are good but the strategy would work against them

It would make a quaint market town far too big and the present infrastructure is nowhere near being able to cope.

Local people need kept informed at every stage of all new developments with plenty of notice. This is most important

You can’t make a town better by building on top of it

So many cars and no parking places. We are almost grid locked at times. With 1260 extra houses and cars. Where will they go?

Yes to generous green spaces to support recreation and support wildlife

Would double size of Knutsford. Roads, schools would not cope. Loss of Green Belt.

Tree lined streets are attractive if the trees are suitable. Issues with lime trees that make a mess on cars, in gardens and roots damage to properties.

Building in areas A to E misses opportunities to ensure generous green spaces. This should be higher in the development principles.

We already have green space around Knutsford. When more housing is built green space will be lost and relatively easy access to open countryside will become more restricted for Knutsford people.

Concerned that local schools already over-subscribed will be unable to expand to cope with extra pupils from large numbers of new homes.

Too many people living here will spoil the small market town. Soon Knutsford will join Mobberley then Wilmslow, as has happened in Manchester.

Brochure says same thing again and again only using different words.

I am very skeptical about environmental issues i.e. low carbon and Eco-developments. They are very costly and often ineffective.

4/6 objectives refer to leisure facilities and spaces, as does development principles but at least 3/6 preferred dev sites involved land used extensively for leisure of all age groups

Agree with principles in general though are short on specific achievable ideas

Would contradict development principles if plans come to pass

Question strongly new development (type of location - large supermarket e.g. Tesco megastore, quality of any housing)

Improve footpath access to Tatton Park to increase accessibility and safety

This is over development and will take a large chunk of green field and nature away. The town would lose its character - we do need to develop the town and some infrastructure. However, better than what’s presently put forward.

Overambitious. Too many objectives for the limited size of the town centre. No means whereby local people can co-operate with developers who only want to build on Green Belt and maximise profits.

More extensive causes more infrastructure problems. Agree about affordable housing and selective upmarket estates - small yet desirable. Attracts quality jobs.

Unsustainable - under present proposals

the housing requirement for Knutsford should be at the upper end of the range identified. Housing need in Knutsford is acute, as demonstrated in the 2010 SHMA and the severe affordability pressures
in the town.
Q4 Potential Development Options
Do you agree or disagree with the potential areas for future development in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

Overall responses:
Site A: Land between Northwich Road and Tabley Road

Do you agree or disagree with site A as a potential area for future development

- 81% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (30%); Disagree (70%)

Comments:

Perfect site with excellent dual access, existing allotments could easily be retained or even enhanced.

This site has more environment that needs looking after than stated. The allotments need protecting and more could be added in the plan for development. Compensation for house owners affected should be considered. The minor road with Tabley cemetery on from A556 to Town will need upgrading as increased traffic flow on Northwich road is unsustainable. Walking route ways to Town Centre may be at limit of peoples capacity. New primary school and GP practice required. Assessment of Academy places required. Increased facilities for sports and play and open space required.

This is Green Belt so cannot be built on.

Amenities (shops etc) and transport required.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

My house overlooks this site, and I’m paying a premium for enjoying the view of the countryside.

Land used for crops. Edge of Knutsford boundary.

This land is currently green belt land and is farmed. It also back onto a number of properties that would be financially affected by the loss of view and light and loss of privacy.

A bit near the motorway.

A SMALLER VERSION MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE - thinks this extends too far into green belt.

Is a natural dip (Crown Estate Land?).

A lot of houses with extra people and cars.

Although it is stated that build here may not all happen at once. I'd suggest that build here must not happen at once so as to avoid the huge estate feel experienced e.g. near Northwich @ Kingsmead. good location with minimal visual impact yet good access to Northwich Road.

I agree but only if we consider a fair distribution of preferred locations across Knutsford - at the
moment the preference focus inappropriately on the North and East of the town.

This is working farmland and would cause farming communities to lose their livelihood and we would lose part of our farming heritage. The farmer has farmed the land for 43 years and this must not be taken away from him, his family and his employees. I bought my property to allow my mother the opportunity to look across the field to the cemetery where her husband (my father) is buried. Not only that, I have spent a considerable sum improving the property and one of the features of the property is the open space outlook - I know the value of my property would be affected detrimentally. There is much wildlife in the fields - which would be destroyed if the area was developed There are many children who live in Tabley Close, Freshfields and Queensway who enjoy playing in the fields - this gives them the opportunity to safely play in a way we all did when we were young. The traffic coming into Knutsford is heavily congested and this would add to the problem The area separates other areas from Knutsford It would spoil the unique open countryside It would add to traffic congestion coming into Knutsford.

Ruins one of the last country style approaches to the town.

The development of this area for housing will not only disastrously impact on the green area/lung which the town needs but also affect the local wildlife which is already threatened. It will make the area one huge housing estate and completely change the character of the town There are plenty of sites in the town which are near industrial sites and not agricultural land. Which could better be used.

The blocking of the view from the residences bordering this area will cause house prices to drop and insurance premiums to rise.

Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.

With a strong proviso that this should be a last resort.

Not sure we need more development on the green belt land around an area which has a fairly high population density already and where the roads are already quite stressed.

Would blight the landscape as rural area. Not close to schools therefore increased traffic/pedestrians. Would increase traffic on side roads.

Too large and 'green belt'.

I live on Warren Avenue adjacent to this site. I’m extremely concerned of the impact of building 650-950 homes on this plot: 1) The long term impact on traffic congestion on Northwich Road, which is already bad at peak times. 2) The detrimental effect of turning the land around the back of my home into a building site for month/years on end. 3) The loss of this green belt land, which was one of the main reasons I bought my home here, would have a huge impact on the enjoyment I have of my home and garden, which is not currently overlooked. 4) The effect that such a huge single development would have on the town and the neighbouring existing communities. 5) Instead of overdeveloping one area, it would better serve the community as a whole to develop a number of sites across Knutsford. Involving sites B,C,D,E,G & K. Thus limiting the pernicious impact on any one existing estate.

A small development of housing along the Northwich road area could be acceptable however any large scale development or a road that links Northwich road to Tabley road would be wholly unacceptable. A footpath linking the two roads allowing easier access to the cemetery would be an improvement.

Was part of the stakeholder group so will agree with all suggestions for favoured sites. Sites A to E particularly favoured because of proposed new access to the town south along the A50.

I agree that more housing needs to be built however the presentation of the development sites left me disappointed. We are first introduced to several options represented by A - T and then on page 27 onwards we are then told that the Stakeholders have already identified their favoured sites with "Other Development Options" deemed "not considered suitable for development" (F, H-T) - WHY? Why were these areas rejected? Reasons should have been provided. Areas A - D will directly affect our family as they are adjacent to our street. As these areas link to the M6 and A556, there are already concerns about speeding on Tabley Road and with the an increased number of housing there
will be, of course, more traffic to contend with and a need for speed calming measures. Ideally, it would seem that the housing development sites should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

Agreement conditional on retention of existing allotments.

Green Belt should not be built on.

But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.

As a resident who would be extremely affected by this potential development, I strongly disagree (vehemently). There is a pond on this site.

refer to general comment at end of survey

Accessible from 2 existing through routes, although Tabley Road more minor than Northwich Road. Would expect improvements to access roads from the A50 to cope with volume of traffic caused by new homes. Would expect remedial work (earth moving and tree planting) to minimise noise from motorway for new homes.

Traffic is already a major issue on Manchester road, so mass building around his area would make it worse.

I suppose this would be the lesser of several evils as it is not currently used by the community.

This is greenbelt land & should not be considered for building development.

Traffic along Northwich Road is already amongst the busiest in Knutsford and forces drivers to use rat runs through residential areas which creates a risk to children. An increase will create a complete bottleneck causing frustration and danger. What is the actual need for this housing? Destroying green belt so the government can cause the economy to move? Who is going to buy these houses when there are at present 150 properties for sale in the Knutsford area

This site appears suitable for housing.

This land not suitable for housing. There is a pond on this site and a well - also very marshy in wet weather.

Building on any of the sites will be controversial but I think, given the options, this is one which could be developed with reasonably low environmental impact. It is also not too far from the town centre, which is an advantage. As I commented in the earlier section on housing, any development MUST be affordable, and adequately serviced. This of course needs to apply to all other sites being considered.

Yes provided sufficient consideration is given to development of roads in the area to avoid yet more congestion.

Building on this land would destroy the unique character of Knutsford as a market town. The town cannot absorb the proposed number of houses given the traffic problems that exist. The Environment would be irreversibly damaged and this area is key for local wildlife - bats, lapwings, badgers pond life. Tabley Road already has a traffic problem relating to

a) excessive speed,
b) the junction with Manchester Road,
c) the volume of parked cars using the Heath,
d) it is already used as a rat-run to avoid the traffic problems in the town centre.

This area is grade 1 farmland. This would be a damaging loss of green open spaces. The town infrastructure would not cope with the increased volume of the town (jobs, schools etc.)

Fertile arable farmland and Green Belt.

This is green belt land and the road network already struggles.

No - vehemently opposed. Green Belt development. Good quality well farmed agricultural land.

Secondary access and traffic issues on Green Lane. Environmental and wildlife issues loss of ponds and hedgerows. What is the point of losing this land and then saying that Knutsford is a Sustainable Community with access to green spaces? Completely bonkers.

would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - 650 to 950 homes will dramatically affect the look of the landscape.
If we have to build on the green belt then options A & B are probably the best as they allow for all the foreseen development to be in one area as well as providing for any future development.

**Green Belt.**

Any road link onto Northwich Road needs to be carefully designed with refuges for right turning vehicles. A simple T-junction will not do. Consideration in any junction design needs to be given to vehicles turning into and out of Acacia and Lilac Avenues. The latter road has become a significant commuter route for vehicles seeking to avoid hold-ups at Canute Square. Further out the exit from Sudlow Lane onto Northwich Road is difficult. Any road changes need to take account of this junction and, if possible render it safer.

**Disagree** - destroying perfectly good farmland and Green Belt. Lazy sloppy thinking.

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of 'mixed use' is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

I do not want to comment on these sites until I am provided with a similar list of brownfield sites within the towns boundaries that could be made available for development, what process will be put in place to keep this site listing up to date and what the Town Plans strategy will be to fill empty properties. These 2 issues are requirements of the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework. Cost might be seen as an issue, but it should not be the only consideration if the town's character is to be maintained. There are too many examples of words about the use of brownfield sites and empty properties which are just ignored when it comes to housing developments. Green Belt development always seems to take priority at the community's expense.

The development of green belt in an already highly congested area is not feasible. Traffic build up on Northwich Road is already at a ridiculous height. The whole of Knutsford is often in gridlock. There would no doubt be at least 2 cars per household- that is another 2400 cars on the road.

**Prime Agricultural Green Belt.**

This will devastate green belt land and is totally unnecessary. Valuable farmland will be wiped away. We must retain open green spaces Knutsford should remain the size that it is or we will lose the uniqueness of the town, its heritage and character. Traffic is horrendous as it is and this will only add to the problem. Schools are already over-subscribed. Medical centres are stretched. There are other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

This area includes farmland and allotments. The allotments should be preserved. Farmland must be preserved. I believe both mandates are covered by House of Commons Library Standard Note SN/SC/934 (April 2012) and I have reproduced the relevant section below : 89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: buildings for agriculture and forestry; provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. There may be potential for some affordable housing with access from Northwich Road to link up with housing in nearby streets, but certainly not for housing over the complete Site. My main concern is the northern end of the Site. I believe Tabley Hill Lane is too small to support a general increase in traffic and would need to be widened. With a large housing development, traffic down the lane would...
be increased; just as it often is when there is a problem on the motorway. Separately, but related: previous proposals for widening the M6 at junction 19 included the demolition of the Tabley Hill Lane bridge. How would this affect any development only having access via Tabley Hill Lane? Finally, as to the farmer whose fields these are - what of his future? Take away substantial parts of Sites A & B and his livelihood is destroyed.

This is top grade farm land and Green Belt that should not be destroyed to build housing. Current infrastructure cannot support this. Wildlife and other environmental issues exist with this site.

1. Too far to walk to town. People will drive, undoing any town centre accessibility improvements. 2. The existing minor roads are where my children play. The though of 1000 or so extra cars thundering up and down beggars belief. There’s no mention of new roads. 3. Destruction of greenbelt. Surrounding green space is part of the very essence of Knutsford. 4. If bungalows are being encouraged, it would indicate an older person. Would they walk into town, or drive?

Traffic congestion and the risk of accidents is the concern.

No development needed.

This site has a set of 30 full and part allotments, as there is a waiting list this would be taking a community asset away. You have not done a full environmental review of this site as you have ignored the pond on site. The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and Red deer (possible escapes from Tatton park) have been seen on the site. The site is close to a badger set and is used as a feeding area. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed Added congestion of up to 2,000 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Northwich Road is already amongst the busiest in Knutsford. When an accident occurs on the M6, there is total chaos and gridlock, drivers are seeking alternative routes through residential areas to get to the other side of Knutsford, creating a strong risk of accidents as there are three schools, this causes frustration and a bottleneck. There are already many properties for sale in this area, so why and who would be interested. We abut the proposed site Northwich Road to Tabley Road, when the field floods it actually flows into our property, at the present moment we have a pool of water in our garden which is almost 10 inches deep. I don’t believe this site is suitable for housing.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment

There are already many properties for sale in this area of Knutsford. Northwich Road is amongst the busiest route through Knutsford, when there is an accident on the M6 this area is chaotic; drivers seek alternative routes through the residential side streets, causing obstruction and danger. There are three schools in the vicinity. Further evidence of potential development of this site, is ridiculous in the extreme, the field is directly behind my home, floods often causing water seepage into my garden, it has been agricultural land and should remain so.

Any building done in the Knutsford area must take account of present traffic loading. Firstly address the infrastructure. 1) Build a bye pass to relieve the town of through traffic. 2) Consider our existing facilities - schools, medical and facilities for leisure and sport. 3) Determine what are the minimum and desirable levels that can be afforded.

Farmland should NOT be built upon

There is potential to produce a proper master planned urban extension, here, given a single, responsible landowner, if the Council is proactive and produces a proper development brief. This may result in a better development than would otherwise be the case in most other locations.

Main roads in this area already congested development too big

Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brown site
development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

The number of houses suggested would cause a massive impact on the already congested Northwich Road and Manchester Road. To maintain Knutsford's character it would be better to have any development spread over the whole town rather than a high concentration in one area as is suggested with the development on Site A. Any development on Site A would need to preserve the Red Cross Building, which is part of Knutsford's history. I query whether the Red Cross Building should be listed if not already.

The traffic and existing housing outlook

This is an open field and 2 further row of houses would not be unreasonable although a potential rat run would appear between Northwich Road and Tabley Road. However a large scale development there would real put pressure on Egerton and Bexton school and the medical centres on toft and Manchester Rd.

This site, in whole or in part, viewed with Sites B, C and D could form a comprehensive urban extension capable of providing for most of the residential and some other employment uses required through, and possibly beyond the Plan period. The site is quite sustainably located in relation to the town centre and its facilities, schools and recreational opportunities.

The character of the Tabley Road area will change as this rural edge of town becomes 'suburbanised'. Tabley Road will take much more traffic than at present. The proximity of fields to the town's residents will be lessened. It is essential to retain allotment provision at Warren Avenue (see my comments in section 9 below).

The site should be smaller

This has potential for Mixed Use (light industry and other employment), rather than just housing, due to its proximity to the A556 and the M6 and the fact that there is no need for lorries to go through the town. The housing estate should be on a small scale, and planned alongside small scale developments in areas B, C, D, K and possibly F to meet future housing needs.

This is green belt land and should be protected

The town should develop in the "round" rather than the strip effect of A /BC/D

Green Belt land should be maintained and no additional traffic should be pushed into the roads surrounding the Heath Conservation area.

The infrastructure of Knutsford cannot cope with the additional 950 homes.

Its Prime farmland and GREENBELT land! The roads are poor and inappropriate for development. More traffic will be pushed through conservation areas and through rat runs in residential areas. The schools in this area can not cope already how can it cope with more.

But this site is to far from the town centre for affordable housing. Allotments are mentioned in the stakeholder comments but not in the comments under 6.8 - why were they ignored?

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, e.g. retail development in site k. if the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. these would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities.

Only problem again is extra traffic.
Concentrate on improving our existing facilities before moving out a developing green belt land.

There is a large pond in site A which is not mentioned and there has also been flooding of low lying area occasionally. Traffic into town along Northwich road is already very congested and very busy on T Tabley road. The plan proposes business expansion south and east of the centre so building here will create more cross town traffic. The land is prime agricultural in continuous use hardly a green policy to build on it

As it’s on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

Why are 'favoured sites' so disproportionally located in the Nether Ward? Totally obliterating the Green Belt. Traffic cutting through Sugar Pit Lane is bad enough now. At times we can not get out of our drive due to traffic. Why the need to increase volume of traffic here?

Too much traffic on Northwich Road as it is.

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Northwich Road which is already an issue of concern.

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land, will create traffic bottlenecks.

Retention or replacement of allotments is noted as key. I fully support that.

This site will be out on a limb, with no amenities close by and no natural connection with nearby developments.

It is green belt.

Should avoid sites of productive agricultural land Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Deep concerns, but it is for the folk who live on that side of town to make the right decisions.

Green belt.

Good access to The Heath. Quite a big plot. Would need to be developed sympathetically with low density to make sure that it did not become a "sink estate".

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county Traffic problems likely to be caused.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

This is a large site, which alone would provide enough space for up to 950 homes - so meeting the target of 460-1,280 homes. If this area were developed there would be no need for development elsewhere (other than zone G - already ear-marked for business use). Therefore - as this is not an area of outstanding beauty etc it would be the most ideal for development.

This area of Green Belt should not be lost at all. It provides a buffer to the outskirts of the town and is a clearly visible area of green belt. Development on this site will cause visual pollution in addition to increased pollution from the buildings established. It will greatly increase traffic flow along an already congested route.

Airport plans massive expansion. Are you seriously suggesting building underneath the flight paths.
Absolutely disagree. The land is in the Green Belt and there are traffic, parking and utility issues.

Thriving farmland and first impression entering our community, a view held by my family and many of our friends and neighbours.

Greenbelt land should be preserved. Access to a development on this land would create traffic issues regarding volume and safety.

There is no space provided in this questionnaire for a general comment on these sites. What is the housing waiting list? Is it social housing? Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

This is a considerable sized plot, which cannot be considered in its entirety for development. However, smaller plots may be considered (A1, A2, A3 for example) Greater information on the current use, character and ownership of the land must also be made available.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

The full list of possible sites is supported by fairly detailed comments on each and, similarly, the responses of the Stakeholder Panel supporting their selection of favoured sites are given in some detail, making the selection much more credible.

Questions over suitability.

Conditional on design and layout and that a suitable edge to settlement is created.

Near town centre.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Site A not suitable because of (1) proximity to the Ambulance station (2) narrow access from large area to Northwich Road and (3) access onto Tabley Road, an unsuitable minor road to the north of the site.

This is a large site which has limited relationship with the existing built up area. Furthermore, no reasons have been provided why this site should be so favoured over and above other sites such as Q and O which have been dismissed by stakeholders.

Development of Site A could help meet future housing needs of the town. The plan at Appendix 2 shows how this can be achieved A sympathetic approach to respecting the unique character of Knutsford the plan shows approximately 500 units rather than the Council’s assessment of between 650 and 950 houses. This lower housing target presented on the attached masterplans is considered more sympathetic to the local character, providing a suitable transition from urban to rural areas. This approach also aligns with the proposed Housing Strategy set out on page 14, and Environment Strategy on page 15 of the consultation document by providing essential new market and affordable homes and retaining / improving important links to the open countryside.

Doing nothing is not an option. Development needs to happen. Of those areas identified, I feel that Areas A, B, C and D to the north of Knutsford are worthy of development although infrastructure will need to be considered carefully, particularly roads, given the pressure that exists already on the A50 Manchester Road going into Knutsford from the north, especially at peak times. If areas A and B are developed, could that provide the opportunity for a form of ‘relief road’/by-pass from the A50 Manchester Road to the A5033 Northwich Road to be built, thus relieving the Canute Place roundabout of some traffic?

The effect such a large estate of houses would be too much for the infrastructure. Loss of countryside

Green Belt area and should remain so.

In part. Good quality agricultural land and visible from Tabley Road. Rural feel would be lost if site was developed. Would be reasonable to develop eastern edge.

No objection to the development of any of the sites outlined.

This land next to our war memorial hospital NEEDS to be earmarked for public health and social care
facilities.

The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option.

Pond in low area. Another in adjoining field (now filled in), ground becomes waterlogged.

This is green belt land and those living in surrounding areas will have live disrupted views walks destroyed house values reduced and nobody wants a building site next door.

The site plan provided is too small to give precise detail but it appears to include the land currently used for allotment gardens. There is a gap between the current housing and the proposed development site. Several plot holders live in Warren Avenue, others walk or cycle to the site and to relocate elsewhere would detract from the ease of access, involve more vehicles and add to environmental pollution. The allotments are a point of social gatherings, encourage a healthy environment for the self production of organic food and provide outdoor physical activity. Several plot holders are maintained by families with young children who are included in activities and they benefit educationally from understanding how their food is grown. This has to be an advantage when we have children of school age who do not know that chips come from potatoes grown in the ground. Some children saw onions growing and did not have any idea what they were. That was locally!

This site is Green Belt. It conflicts with Knutsford’s Environment objective to protect green spaces around the town.

Strongly disagree with development in this area.

*It is green belt
* It is arable land which is fully utilised year on year
* There is an abundance of wildlife - foxes, bats, pheasants, hedgehogs
* It is home to bluebell woods - an area of beauty and undisturbed wildlife
* It is prone to flooding and development would only increase this problem
* The allotments in the area have been lovingly looked after and developed for many years
* Homeowners have developed their properties to take advantage of the open aspect. Development would cause a high level of intrusion and decrease house values
* Of all the sites referred to, this site is NOT the closest to the local amenities
* Northwich Road which is adjacent to this site suffers with extreme traffic congestion, congestion which would be made worse by further development
* Residents in this area already struggle for parking.

I can not believe that farmed, green belt land is being considered for development! Outraged. Wrong for so many reasons. How our town looks. Impact on the farm. Wild life. So sad.

This area could be mixed because of proximity to the motorway - avoiding additional traffic through the town.

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. The site is Green Belt and should not be developed.

Good site for avoiding for traffic congestion through town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Green belt land should be retained. If overruled the southern part would be more suitable for housing.

Green belt, which should mean something - it was designated as such because planners realised the importance of green space to the community.

See previous answers. This is greenbelt. Building on it is contrary to the Vision and Environment Strategies. Such development is not ‘sustainable’. Developing this would destroy the aesthetic of the woods on Tabley Hill and their use for shooting. It is mainly too far to walk to the local shops. This provides a barrier with Mere and a general south Manchester urban corridor. It would increase traffic on what is a quiet road (Tabley Road) which is much used by cyclists and pedestrians to the cemetery.
650-950 homes implies a very dense estate, the creation of a new neighbourhood - quite contrary to the housing strategy. It would swamp Tabley Road and impose massively on local Drs, roads, schools etc. It would be vastly greater in size than any other estate in Knutsford. It is currently used as active farmland (dairy) by a local tenant farmer, whose interests are to maintain his land. The Crown Estate/Knight Frankley who were on the Stakeholder Panel are the landowners and seek profit. They are not Knutsford residents and care not. Building on the proposed scale is not appropriate for Knutsford which relies upon its ambience to attract people in for the economic activities.

I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites developed.

This would effect traffic in the morning and evenings and school’s entering onto the A50/A556.

This site has a set of 30 full and part allotments, as there is a waiting list this would be taking a community asset away. A full environmental review of this site has clearly not been carried out as you have ignored the pond on the site. The pond on site A should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat. The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and Red deer (possible escapes from Tatton park) have been seen on the site. The site is close to a badger set and is used as a feeding area. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 2,000 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Destruction of an area of beauty.

A full environmental review of this site has clearly not been carried out as you have ignored the pond on the site. The pond on site A should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat. The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and Red deer (possible escapes from Tatton park) have been seen on the site. The site is close to a badger set and is used as a feeding area. This site has a set of 30 full and part allotments, for which there is a waiting list, this would be taking a community asset away. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 2,000 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Green Belt. Leave it alone

Allotments should be retained - Flats with balconies and outside green areas suitable for all age groups could be in the housing mix.

A full environmental review of this site has clearly not been carried out as you have ignored the pond on the site. The pond on site A should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat. The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and Red deer (possible escapes from Tatton park) have been seen on the site. The site is close to a badger set and is used as a feeding area. This site has a set of 30 full and part allotments, for which there is a waiting list, this would be taking a community asset away. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 2,000 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and it’s already busy enough!
Disastrous for the town as it is. Utterly misplaced, vastly over-scale proposals. The view of the woods and the use of the woods on Tabley Hill would be lost (being too near the new houses). Knutsford wuld become an identikit town and lose its special small town character with such an influx.

It was always understood that this land was subject to a covenant preventing building development. Certainly that was the argument used when the Memorial Hospital was sold by the health authority in the 1980s - too small for hospital needs at that time, they were prevented by covenant from building on adjacent land.

Personally, I purchased and live in a property with a view overlooking Site A. The open rear-view aspect adds value to the property. Building on the land behind it will only devalue my house and ruin the reason why I moved to this property. Assuming that access roads would be from Northwich Road then already this is a heavily congested road.

This will spoil the environment, increase traffic on already busy roads, spoil the character of Knutsford.

Flight path? Would probably end up having to be more affordable housing, which I'm okay with meeting the town’s requirement but to build for the 450 on the waiting list? Not to sound snobby but there must be other affordable places to live than Knutsford. I'm afraid the reason why we and probably many others wanted (and paid through the nose) to be in Knutsford will change. Are many of these families who want good schools? Well, there seems to barely be room in the schools as is for current residents.

Good agricultural land but it would be acceptable to allow limited development here if the Knutsford Academy moved onto one site and released the Lower School site for complimentary development on the other side of Northwich Road.

Tabley Road already has traffic speeding up it over the limit getting to the motorway...I’m sure this would become more congested and dangerous with more housing and more families walking up it. It is a green area, exactly why I moved here to get away from the congestion and traffic a semi rural location, with lots of wildlife.

For this and all the other sites for which I agree to development, it is only on the basis that I prefer no development on the greenbelt, and concentrate on affordable housing provision with the lowest possible number of new homes.

I believe we should preserve this open space.

Agree - but only to the least possible house building.

Green Belt!

The town centre and schools can barely cope with the amount of people just now. Your strategy doesn’t make it clear how everything will work once the houses are built.

Green belt land should be retained. If overruled the southern part would be more suitable for housing.

All three sites are located on land with an agricultural land grade of 2 and therefore represent some of the best agricultural land quality within the area. Additionally as stated within the SA, site A lies adjacent to an identified Site of Biological Importance, therefore the proposed use could have a negative effect on the natural environment.

Not necessary.

Will not affect existing dwelling houses.

All the approaches into Knutsford are pleasant with Green Belt on every side. Do you consider it fair to take the whole of the Green Belt on the north west side of the town? This is most unfair. Most of the development sites are one side of Knutsford - almost joining Knutsford to Mere and taking all the Green Belt on this side of town. It would make this area one large housing estate. I also feel the land is so water logged it is not suitable.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the...
Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: - What empty homes can be used? - What brownfield sites can be developed? - What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: - are the roads able to cope? - are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

I like looking over the field on my back roof at sunset.

Maintain green space.

Don't destroy Green Belt, or you destroy the countryside and everything living there.

Loss of Green Belt, woods, wildlife, view, light, more noise.

Will lead to greater congestion on an extremely busy road (Northwich Road).

If expansion needed better to be near Manor Park as under-utilised school.

Wildlife will be seriously affected.

I have recently moved here for the quiet location and do not want to be swallowed up in a housing estate. Site A’s access would have to be onto Tabley Rd. This is a country lane. Traffic would destroy this area by using Sugar Pit Lane, Queensway and Tabley Rd as access. Its just not big enough.

Inappropriate development on the green belt.

Concerned about the potential loss of the allotments. Lapwings nest in the filed behind as the number of these birds is ever declining, maintaining their environment is imperative.

Subject to retention of the Warren Avenue allotments in their entirety.

Northwich Road is frequently very congested i.e. incidents on the M6 and A556 diverts traffic into Knutsford. Tabley Road a through route to the M6 - busy. Cemetery needs to be peaceful area.

A local bus service to access the cemetery.

Already too many cars on Northwich Road, speed limits ignored, dangerous.

Green Belt, good agricultural land.

Why pit one part of town against the other? Ultimately would be bad news for town. Try to understand what it is that attracts people to come here to spend time and money in the town. Knutsford in unique - your plans may reverse this. Once it is done its done for good.

Impact on environment and traffic.

Good food producing farmland.

Against development of sites A TO E as they are located in the Green Belt.

Excellent links to motorway - only encourages out of town Knutsford workers.

Who on earth are the stakeholder panel? Do you dislike Knutsford and Knutsfordians?

By a process that is far from transparent, of the sites identified around the outskirts of the town for potential development (sites A to T), only a very few have been suggested as suitable, namely to the north west (sites A to E), around Parkgate (site G) and at Longridge (site K).

In paragraph 2.8 it states that there is a need for 64 affordable homes to be provided each year, which I take to mean each year of the 20 year period. Also it states that the total of dwellings of all types required in this same period is 1280. As this number equates to the number of affordable homes it is assumed will be required over this period, will other types of housing not be considered for planning approval? This projected requirement would be met from any combination of areas A to D so what is your strategy for the development of this side of Knutsford? Is all this greenbelt land, which is identified for development, to be released at the same time or will it be phased over the twenty year
period and if so in what order?

Sites A & B - These sites are both classified as grade II agricultural land in the MAFF/DEFRA Agricultural Land Classification.
Site B: Land between Tabley Road and Manchester Road

Do you agree or disagree with site B as a potential area for future development (suggested use: employment)

- 81% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (31%); Disagree (69%)

![Pie chart showing agreement and disagreement]

Comments:

Perfect site with excellent dual access.

Possible for housing but not commercial. This site has more environment that needs looking after than stated. Allotments more could be added in the plan for development. Compensation for house owners affected should be considered. The minor road with Tabley cemetery on from A556 to Town will need upgrading as increased traffic flow on Manchester road is unsustainable. It couldn’t take commercial traffic. Walking route ways to Town Centre may be at limit of people’s capacity. New primary school and GP practice required. Academy places assessment required. Increased facilities for sports and play and open space required.

This is Green Belt so cannot be built on.

Some open space required.

This all agricultural and grazing land that contains fishing ponds used by Knutsford residents of all ages and sex. This would have a big impact especially on the older ones who find it easy to travel to and from and were they feel save with others of a similar age and like minded people enjoying their sport.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

My house overlooks this site, and I'm paying a premium for enjoying the view of the countryside.

I totally disagree with this plot as it is currently green belt land and should be protected from any any development at all costs. It would have a detrimental environmental impact in the area and destroy a place of outstanding peace and tranquillity. It would mean that Knutsford would expand right up the Manchester Road towards Mere almost creating one plot of urban sprawl from Mere to Knutsford. The Town would lose its unique rural identity. The Land Rover Garage, Cottons and the Garden centre are the absolute maximum level of development along this road and allow the town to maintain its independence from Mere. Residents in the houses around this field have moved here for the very reason that it is adjacent to the green belt and the price of their homes reflected this. Any loss of this would seriously impact on the investments many home owners have made in Knutsford.

A bit near the motorway.
A SMALLER VERSION MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE - thinks this extends too far into green belt.

Keep landmarks like ponds.

The A50 approach into Knutsford from both directions is quite attractive at present and adds to the ambience of the town. A modern housing estate on this road should be avoided.

Provides linkage problems into town and access via Manchester road. (Combine A, B, C, D, E and you are building an expansive and inappropriate level of housing in one area of the town and unfair distribution to North East Knutsford Residents to withstand the impact of additional housing/traffic).

This is working farmland and would cause farming communities to lose their livelihood and we would lose part of our farming heritage. The farmer has farmed the land for 43 years and this must not be taken away from him, his family and his employees. I bought my property to allow my mother the opportunity to look across the field to the cemetery where her husband (my father) is buried. not only that, I have spent a considerable sum improving the property and one of the features of the property is the open space outlook - I know the value of my property would be affected detrimentally. There is much wildlife in the fields - which would be destroyed if the area was developed There are many children who live in Tabley Close, Freshfields and Queensway who enjoy playing in the fields - this gives them the opportunity to safely play in a way we all did when we were young. The traffic coming into Knutsford is heavily congested and this would add to the problem The area separates other areas from Knutsford It would spoil the unique open countryside It would add to traffic congestion coming into Knutsford

Ruins the other of the last country style approaches to the town.

The development of this area for housing will not only disastrously impact on the green area/lung which the town needs but also affect the local wildlife which is already threatened. It will make the area one huge housing estate and completely change the character of the town There are plenty of sites in the town which are near industrial sites and not agricultural land. Which could better be used.

For the houses at the end of Tabley Close (No.s 16 to 22), the loss of the view across Cheshire, from the back, would be a death knell for the equity built up in those properties. In fact, the very threat of this plan is likely to mean that we may very soon experience a reduction in the saleable value of our homes. We would therefore expect adequate and swift compensation for such a loss, if it happens, and will pursue such compensation aggressively. If area B were to be used for community orchards or gardens, that would be a preferable alternative but we would likely experience a greater insurance premium for buildings, contents and vehicles, as the influx of people into that area would represent a risk increase to insurance companies.

Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.

With a strong proviso that this should be a last resort.

Should protect the clubs fisheries on this site.

Would blight the landscape as rural area. Not close to schools therefore increased traffic/pedestrians. Would fill in existing housing and commercial premises.

This land has ponds and an extensive variety of wildlife. It can get very waterlogged any development should be kept to along the Manchester road area and kept very small. Also I think that any development should be housing only as we have plenty of shop/office units and industrial units that are vacant within the town.

I agree that more housing needs to be built however the presentation of the development sites left me disappointed. We are first introduced to several options represented by A - T and then on page 27 onwards we are then told that the Stakeholders have already identified their favoured sites with "Other Development Options" deemed "not considered suitable for development" (F, H-T) - WHY? Why were these areas rejected? Reasons should have been provided. Areas A - D will directly affect our family as they are adjacent to our street. As these areas link to the M6 and A556, there are already concerns about speeding on Tabley Road and with the an increased number of housing there will be, of course, more traffic to contend with and a need for speed calming measures. Ideally, it
would seem that the housing development sites should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

This belongs to Tabley Parish and is Green Belt.

But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.

I would be only slightly less affected by this potential development and strongly disagree.

Strongly disagree refer to general comment at the end of the survey

Accessible from 2 existing through routes, although Tabley Road more minor than Manchester Road. Would not expect vehicular access to new homes from Freshfields. Would want green area separating the Tabley Close / Freshfields homes any new development. Make the ponds a feature, not a problem. Would want cycle paths separated from busy Manchester Road. Please - no traffic lights - roundabouts into any large development

This is Greenbelt land & should not be considered for building development

This site seems suitable for mixed use.

The site is perhaps a little far from the centre, but this is probably not a major concern. I do have a concern about the ponds identified, however. Are these wildlife ponds? If so, could they be re-located? As I understand it, the country’s wildlife ponds are disappearing at an alarming rate and it would be a great pity if we were to contribute to this process if it could be avoided. Allied to the above: is there a danger that the land is boggy or prone to flooding?

Building on this land would destroy the unique character of Knutsford as a market town. The town cannot absorb the proposed number of houses given the traffic problems that exist. The Environment would be irreversibly damaged and this area is key for local wildlife - bats, lapwings, badgers pond life. Tabley Road already has a traffic problem relating to
a) excessive speed,
b) the junction with Manchester Road,
c) the volume of parked cars using the Heath;
d) it is already used as a rat-run to avoid the traffic problems in the town centre.
This area is grade 1 farmland. This would be a damaging loss of green open spaces. The town infrastructure would not cope with the increased volume of the town (jobs, schools etc.)
Fertile arable farmland and Green Belt. Should be used to produce food.

This is green belt land and the road network already struggles.

As a home owner on Tabley close I am outraged at the proposal to build at the rear of my property. I bought this house because of its outlook onto the fields and do not wish to look out onto buildings. If I had wanted to live in the middle of a housing estate then I would have bought there!

No massively object. Reasons above. This is no legacy to leave the children of Knutsford. The Crown Estate has enough money and does not need Cheshire east shovelling more money into their coffers by allocating this - or is there a Knighthood in it for someone at the Council?

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - would involve the removal of ponds.

If we have to build on the green belt then options A & B are probably the best as they allow for all the foreseen development to be in one area as well as providing for any future development

Green Belt

NO - Disagree - decent farmland with mature hedgerows and ponds diverse wildlife and a great amenity. Green Lane would become much busier and is inappropriate as a secondary access which would be required by building and highway regulations for a scheme of this size.

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of ‘mixed use’ is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

For the reasons as in site A- I object. We cannot accommodate any more road traffic in Knutsford- never mind 2400 more cars the houses being built would result in. The building on green belt is abhorrent - especially rum when you now have to apply for planning permission if you want to pave
over your front garden for parking purposes.

Prime Agricultural Green Belt. Both these areas are farmed by the same farm and you would be taking approximately 50% of his land thereby putting him out of business and home.

This will devastate green belt land and is totally unnecessary. Valuable farmland will be wiped away. We must retain open green spaces Knutsford should remain the size that it is or we will lose the uniqueness of the town, its heritage and character. Traffic is horrendous as it is and this will only add to the problem. Schools are already over-subscribed. Medical centres are stretched. There are other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

This area includes farmland and ponds. The ponds and farmland must be preserved. I believe the farmland mandate is covered by House of Commons Library Standard Note SN/SC/934 (April 2012) as reproduced in my response to Site A. There may be potential for some affordable housing with access from Manchester Road to link up with housing in nearby streets. My concern is the southern end of the Site. I believe Tabley Hill Lane is too small to support a general increase in traffic and would need to be widened. With a large housing development, traffic down the lane would be increased; just as it often is when there is a problem on the motorway. Separately, but related: previous proposals for widening the M6 at junction 19 included the demolition of the Tabley Hill Lane bridge. How would this affect any development only having access via Tabley Hill Lane? but Tabley Hill Lane is too small to support much increased traffic. Finally, as with Site A, consider the farmer. Would his farm be sustainable if he lost a substantial part of Site B?

Again, working farm land and Green Belt. Ponds should not be disturbed. Unsure why we would want to build employment properties here. No infrastructure to support this. Also, who would take it up? Too far from town centre to be attractive. Could be left with vacant properties

1. The far end of the development would be 2 miles from town. These people would technically have a WA16 postcode, but no nearer to walking/cycling into town than someone living in Northwich. Why overload the roads with these extra short journeys? 2. Traffic onto Tabley Road - this is a minor road. Traffic onto Manchester Road - massively overloaded. I’d have thought traffic reduction would be an aim.

Traffic congestion on Manchester Road would be a tremendous threat. This in turn would cause grid lock in Freshfields, Queensway and Sugar Pit Lane. It would then not take much to back this traffic up into Tabley Road. The potential for accidents involving school children and normal pedestrians especially at peak times is also a worrying threat.

No development needed.

The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn. And is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. There is at present a set of fishing ponds on this site that not only acts as a local facility, but also brings in visitors to Knutsford. Along with the fishing ponds there are two non fish supporting marl pits that have high biodiversity value, and are recognised as an endangered habitat

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment

This should be retained as green belt

Farmland should NOT be built upon

There is potential to produce a proper master planned urban extension, here, given a single,
responsible landowner, if the Council is proactive and produces a proper development brief. This may result in a better development than would otherwise be the case in most other locations.

Main roads in this area already congested development too big

Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

See comments above in relation to Manchester Road congestion. [The number of houses suggested would cause a massive impact on the already congested Northwich Road and Manchester Road.]

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is

Again a further road would be acceptable and could be affordable housing in keeping with the existing housing.

This site should be considered, in whole or in part, as part of a comprehensive urban extension comprising Sites A, B, C and D to provide the majority, if not all, of the housing and employment requirements, other than those to be provided on Site G, for the Local Plan period and, potentially, beyond.

The character of the Tabley Road area will change as this rural edge of town becomes 'suburbanised'. Tabley Road will take much more traffic than at present. The proximity of fields to the town’s residents will be lessened. It is essential to retain allotment provision at Warren Avenue (see my comments in section 9 below).

I agree with all the comments in the Draft Strategy, but feel that the development should be on a small scale, planned together with A, C, D, K and possibly F to meet future housing needs. Access should be from Northwich Road.

This is green belt land and should be protected

WHAT DOES EMPLOYMENT 4 HA MEAN IN ACTUAL DETAIL....RETAIL OR MANUFACTURING?

Green Belt land should be maintained and no additional traffic should be pushed onto the already congested Manchester Road where regular traffic queues contribute to air pollution around one of our main open spaces. Tackling this issue was one of the stated aims of the Town Plan on which this document is said to be based so development in this area can only exacerbate the problem Recommended Action (Ref. EH 7) Air pollution levels in Manchester Road to be reduced, and consideration given to the taking of measurements at more sites.

Tabley Road and the sugar pit road would be ruined by an additional 400 homes.

Totally inappropriate road links, Good farm land, GREEN BELT and full of wildlife in diverse habitats. This area is poor choice for any kind of development especially areas of employment. Mere may merge into Knutsford. (see also transport problems above)

The biodiversity of the site needs to be protected. This is probably the northern limit for development. Any employment uses need to be compatible with residential development.

I do not agree with a mass of building across this land. It ruins the approach into knutsford. Development should be spread out.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, e.g. retail development in site k. if the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this
could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. These would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities.

Only problem again is extra traffic.

Concentrate on improving our existing facilities before moving out on a developing green belt land.

Traffic into town along Northwich road is already very congested and very busy on tabley road. The plan proposes business expansion south and east of the centre so building here will create more cross town traffic. The land is prime agricultural in continuous use hardly a green policy to build on it.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Manchester Road which is already an issue of concern.

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen. Developing this area also pushes the boundaries of Knutsford further towards Mere losing the distinction between the two. I have heard this maybe the site for a large supermarket and I really hope this is not true. It is something that would destroy precious farmland for something we really don’t need.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

Retention or replacement of allotments is noted as key. I fully support that. But I don’t understand why it is considered important to retain the clear and separate identities of Knutsford and Mere. Mere has no identity other than exclusive housing for millionaires. There are no facilities there, only houses.

This will elongate the town along the A50, joining up to the garages, hotel and garden centre. It is green belt.

Should avoid sites of productive agricultural land Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Deep concerns, but it is for the folk who live on that side of town to make the right decisions.

Green belt.

Taking A & B together make a very big area. Care needs to be taken in planning this area so as to retain the Knutsford character.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land - In addition this would drive traffic onto the already congested Manchester Road.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

When site A has been developed this could be the next area to be used - perhaps after 2030.

The A50 into Knutsford provides a key part of the green entrance into the town, this section of green belt is also a fundamental part of the green belt that protects the town. Development on this site means that Knutsford is creeping toward Mere. There needs to be a clear boundary at the edge of town that is already currently provided.

Airport plans massive expansion. Are you seriously suggesting building underneath the flight paths.

Absolutely disagree. The land is in the Green Belt and there are traffic, parking and utility issues.

Thriving farmland and first impression entering our community, a view held by my family and many of
our friends and neighbours

Greenbelt should be preserved. Filling in the gap between the houses on the boundary of Knutsford and the Land Rover dealership will serve only to create an unsightly urban sprawl, ruining the very distinct town boundaries that sets Knutsford apart from locations in south Manchester which now blend into one another without any sense of space or openness.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

Houses further away from the town centre will lead to more cars and more people driving into and through the town - the roads can't cope and it will be even more difficult for pedestrians.

if this is preferred it should be Housing only

The full list of possible sites is supported by fairly detailed comments on each and, similarly, the responses of the Stakeholder Panel supporting their selection of favoured sites are given in some detail, making the selection much more credible.

Questions over suitability

Conditional on design and layout and that a suitable edge to settlement is created. Approach to town would also need to be carefully considered. Further retail/employment along A50 inappropriate.

Prime agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Development sites B & C are preferable because of the access to Manchester Road, a main road

The view is taken that the land between the existing built up area and car dealerships further to the north fronting Manchester Road on it's western side is an important approach to the town. The view is taken that the development of the site in that area would narrow the gap between Knutsford and Mere which is important and should be resisted.

Development of Site B would provide a mix of employment and residential opportunities which would integrate into the existing entrance into Knutsford with minimal landscape impacts. It would also

Doing nothing is not an option. Development needs to happen. Of those areas identified, I feel that Areas A, B, C and D to the north of Knutsford are worthy of development although infrastructure will need to be considered carefully, particularly roads, given the pressure that exists already on the A50 Manchester Road going into Knutsford from the north, especially at peak times. If areas A and B are developed, could that provide the opportunity for a form of 'relief road'/by-pass from the A50 Manchester Road to the A5033 Northwich Road to be built, thus relieving the Canute Place roundabout of some traffic?

Greenfield, farmland.

Green Belt area and should remain so.

6.5 - this seems to have a double meaning - what do you mean 'to review Green Belt boundaries?'

Manchester Rd, Green Lane and Tabley Rd form a popular circular walk into the country - important asset for local residents, needs to stay rural.

Site B is constrained by the fact it is classified as an Area of Search for Minerals. The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option.

This is green belt land and those living in surrounding areas will have live disrupted views walks destroyed house values reduced and nobody wants a building site next door.

Why build on green belt? The same question arises for all green belt sites.

This site is Green Belt. It conflicts with Knutsford’s Environment objective to protect green spaces around the town.

Any development would impact on the green belt
I can not believe that farmed, green belt land is being considered for development! Outraged. Wrong for so many reasons. How our town looks. Impact on the farm. Wild life. So sad.

Access should be along the Northwich or Manchester Roads not Mereheath Lane. Priority given to open areas alongside the present built up areas.

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, the land is Green Belt and it serves the purpose of contributing towards the separation of Knutsford with Mere to the north.

Good site for avoiding for traffic congestion through town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed

Encroaching on the green belt.

Green belt, which should mean something - it was designated as such because planners realised the importance of green space to the community.

Again this is greenbelt - and contrary to the Vision and Environment Strategies. It is not realistic walking distance from the town centre, which are the local facilities. The land is currently actively farmed, allowing residents to walk out along a quiet Tabley Road to the Cemetery, to the fishing at the two ponds on site B. This is a decent and historic community activity which cannot be recreated elsewhere. Its destruction would be contrary to the Sustainable Community strategy. The ponds permit the active use of the countryside by Knutsford residents. The proposed development is outlandish in scale, having regard to the size of the town. It creates a barrier between Mere and Knutsford that could not be regained in future. The effect on traffic on Tabley Road would be excessive to the point of ridiculous. As it happens it is right under the flight path for planes from as they turn north from the end of the airport runway and would be accordingly deliberately noisy for the proposed residents - so environmentally unfriendly as a place to develop. It is prime farmland. It provides great aesthetic advantage to local residents and those who use Tabley Road and Manchester Road. Its development simply would add to the south Manchester urban corridor. Tabley Road is currently hugely popular with cyclists because it is a quiet egress from the town - massive housing would destroy this. There are numerous accidents each year in the wet and frozen weather on Tabley Hill, most of which probably go unreported. There is an S bend, and further down which causes many accidents with commuters who use it as a rat run. Increasing the traffic as site B inevitably would will only increase the number of accidents unless the whole road were very substantially up-graded - which would spoil the environment. Tabley Road is simply not big enough to take the extra burden of sites A or B.

I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites identified and developed

A lot of families live around here with children playing outside Queensway is used as a cut through to traffic already

The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn. And is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. There are fishing ponds on this site that not only acts as a local facility, but also bring visitors to Knutsford. Along with the fishing ponds there are two non fish supporting marl pits that have high biodiversity value, and are recognised as an endangered habitat

Destruction of an area of beauty at a key point of entry to the town. Manchester Rd cannot cope with current traffic - adding to that would be criminal

The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn. and is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is
prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. There are fishing ponds on this site that not only acts as a local facility, but also bring visitors to Knutsford. Along with the fishing ponds there are two non fish supporting marl pits that have high biodiversity value, and are recognised as an endangered habitat.

Green Belt Leave it alone

The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year as well as a small yellow hammer colony nesting within the site. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn. And is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. There are fishing ponds on this site that not only acts as a local facility, but also bring visitors to Knutsford. Along with the fishing ponds there are two non fish supporting marl pits that have high biodiversity value, and are recognised as an endangered habitat.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Utterly misplaced and out of all proportion. Unduly large development for the town spoiling one of the great quiet portals to the town along Tabley Road. Traffic would be chaotic. The nature of the area would change substantially. The fishing ponds would be lost.

Green belt land with a wealth of well established wild life.

Manchester road is already busy especially if there has been an incident on the motorway - Knutsford would become even busier, Also people enjoy the fact that they are a short walk from the countryside!!!

Flight path, M6 noise pollution? Comments in Housing section as to this area feeling more like a buffer between town the the M6. Would probably end up having to be more affordable housing, which I’m okay with meeting the town’s requirement but to build for the 450 on the waiting list? Not to sound snobby but there must be other affordable places to live than Knutsford. I’m afraid the reason why we probably many others wanted (and paid through the nose) to be in Knutsford will change. Are many of these families who want good schools? Well, there seems to barely be room in the schools as is for current residents.

Mere and Knutsford should not be "merged"

I agree with a small plot of housing, but the suggestion of huge expanse of housing on rural lead into Knutsford is outrageous

leisure

It allows walkers quick access to the countryside and development would impinge detrimentally on the cemetery. Ensures creeping ribbon development and invasion of a defined green space separating Knutsford from Mere

Tabley road already has traffic speeding up it over the limit getting to the motorway...I’m sure this would become more congested and dangerous with more housing and more families walking up it. it is a green area, exactly why i moved here to get away from the congestion and traffic a semi rural location, with lots of wildlife

There is no basis for this site being other than for housing. In any event, there should be a gap between the existing housing and the car showroom.

Preserve this open space

Agree - but only for housing, and only for the least possible house building.
Green Belt!

Encroaching on the green belt.

All three sites are located on land with an agricultural land grade of 2 and therefore represent some of the best agricultural land quality within the area.

Not light industrial

No light industrial

Not necessary

Will not affect existing dwelling houses

All the approaches into Knutsford are pleasant with Green Belt on every side. Do you consider it fair to take the whole of the Green Belt on the north west side of the town? This is most unfair. Most of the development sites are one side of Knutsford - almost joining Knutsford to Mere and taking all the Green Belt on this side of town. It would make this area one large housing estate. I also feel the land is so water logged it is not suitable.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? - What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Maintain present green space.

Don't destroy Green Belt, or you destroy the countryside and everything living there.

More traffic congestion and less countryside.

Potential for stores with parking, new school and mixed housing with better access to A556 and A50.

Already empty businesses in town - don't need more

This is green belt - should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. There are empty office blocks in the locale so could fill those first before creating new ones. The far end of the housing estate would be too far to walk into town. People would drive - this can't be good.

Can be busy route for M6 and pedestrians, especially pedestrians for cemetery, narrow footpaths.

Housing only.

Does Green Belt not mean anything anymore?

Suitable for dairy farming - also contains recreational fishing ponds.

negative impact on farming and traffic

traffic impact

Against development of sites A TO E as they are located in the Green Belt.

Commercial use only - excellent transport links.

Have they ever experienced the log jams which already exist and haven't improved over years?

The document comments on the various sites (pages 22 to 28 inclusive) and its features but does not mention the overhead transmission lines over site or that it floods. What is the proposal with regard to these two items in paragraph 2.8 it states that there is a need for 64 affordable homes to be provided each year, which I take to mean each year of the 20 year period. Also it states that the total of dwellings of all types required in this same period is 1280. As this number equates to the number of
affordable homes it is assumed will be required over this period, will other types of housing not be considered for planning approval? This projected requirement would be met from any combination of areas A to D so what is your strategy for the development of this side of Knutsford? Is all this greenbelt land, which is identified for development, to be released at the same time or will it be phased over the twenty year period and if so in what order?
Site C: Land between Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane (northern parcel)

Do you agree or disagree with site C as a potential area for future development (suggested use: employment)

- 81% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (31%); Disagree (69%)

Comments:
Perfect site with excellent dual access.
Site is off major A50 road and any additional traffic coming from housing site will need consideration. Not suitable for commercial dev with lorry delivery. May require upgrade of Mereheath lane road alongside park to provide alternative. Impact of Tatton Park vision traffic needs consideration. Houses opposite require compensation. Opportunity to increase allotments. Walk, cycle, public transport route ways need building in as this is beyond walking capacity into town centre. New primary school and GP practice required. Academy demand needs assessing. Increased facilities for sports and play and open space required. However site C is further from town and will increase number of local journeys compared to site D.
This is Green Belt so cannot be built on.
Some open space required.
NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.
I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.
Knutsford Sports Club and Egerton Youth and Football clubs crucial aspect of community relations and well being.
This might be further explored if any proposed development kept the houses within the current line of houses already along Manchester Road. However it is still green belt land and therefore under the current plans I have to disagree
A much smaller version might be acceptable - thinks this extends too far into green belt.
Valuable open vista play field / sports / skate board / bmx maybe.
Same comment as site B
Leaves the impression of joining with Mere and contradicts the principles of retaining sense of countryside and balance. Provides linkage problems into town and access via Manchester road and Mereheath Lane. This is insufficient. Finally there is preference to solely rely on the North and East of
the town. (Combine A, B, C, D, E and you are building an expansive and inappropriate level of housing in one area of the town and unfair distribution to North East Knutsford Residents to withstand the impact of additional housing/traffic). The stakeholder Group identified no benefits in this proposal.

This is open countryside that should be preserved

No strong thoughts about this one.

The development of this area for housing will not only disastrously impact on the green area/lung which the town needs but also affect the local wildlife which is already threatened. It will make the area one huge housing estate and completely change the character of the town. There are plenty of sites in the town which are near industrial sites and not agricultural land. Which could better be used.

Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.

With a strong proviso that this should be a last resort.

Playing fields and other recreational facilities should be protected.

Subject to the retention of sports facilities.

Would blight the landscape as rural area. Not close to schools therefore increased traffic/pedestrians.

Could be with same arguments as for B.

I think a small development of housing would be appropriate along the Manchester road area.

I agree that more housing needs to be built however the presentation of the development sites left me disappointed. We are first introduced to several options represented by A - T and then on page 27 onwards we are then told that the Stakeholders have already identified their favoured sites with "Other Development Options" deemed "not considered suitable for development" (F, H-T) - WHY? Why were these areas rejected? Reasons should have been provided. Areas A - D will directly affect our family as they are adjacent to our street. As these areas link to the M6 and A556, there are already concerns about speeding on Tabley Road and with the increased number of housing there will be, of course, more traffic to contend with and a need for speed calming measures. Ideally, it would seem that the housing development sites should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated one direction.

Farmland and Green Belt.

But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.

Traffic egress onto A50 - bad news!! Mereheath Lane is also a principal traffic access to Knutsford and parking area.

Strongly disagree refer to general comment at the end of the survey

I would not want to see any vehicular access to any housing development from Mereheath Lane. This road is already busy enough with through traffic, traffic for the sports clubs and traffic for the Knutsford entrance to Tatton Park. Make the ponds a feature, not a problem. Footpaths and cycle paths along boundaries with the town football club, Egerton Youth Club and Knutsford Tennis/Sports Club.

Building on playing fields defeats the objectives of other parts of the plan.

This is greenbelt land & should not be considered for development. Playing fields should not be considered for development. Land swap! That's only good for the developers not for the public

I strongly disagree. These playing fields must be kept.

Although I have similar concerns about the pond as expressed for Site B. Loss of assets such as the playing fields would be regrettable unless they can be re-located. Given the overall strategy's aim of improving the town's health and well-being, however, I am sure this will be taken into account. :-)

Building on this land would destroy the unique character of Knutsford as a market town. The town cannot absorb the proposed number of houses given the traffic problems that exist. The Environment would be irreversibly damaged and this area is key for local wildlife - bats, lapwings, badgers pond life. This area is grade 1 farmland. This would be a damaging loss of green open spaces. The town infrastructure would not cope with the increased volume of the town (jobs, schools etc.)
Fertile arable farm land.

This is green belt land and the road network already struggles.

NO. Playing fields and leisure uses already there. These should not be relocated to then light pollute other parts of the town. They are where they are leave them alone. Relocating any leisure uses will simply be used by Tatton Estates in 20 years time to get those areas re-allocated for development thus marching Knutsford further out into the countryside.

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - strongly oppose building so many houses so close to the town centre. the road network cannot cope and will spoil the countryside.

Don't build on playing fields.

Green Belt

NO

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of 'mixed use' is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

I think this site is contradictory to the statement re excellent sporting facilities as it impacts extremely important and well utilised sports facilities in the town, namely Egerton Youth Club, Knutsford Sports Club and Knutsford FC. I would only support housing that protected this space.

Create claustrophobic area and destroy the rural aspects of Knutsford.

As for parcel A and B sites I object. There are insufficient road links as it is to Knutsford.

This will devastate green belt land and is totally unnecessary. Valuable farmland will be wiped away. We must retain open green spaces Knutsford should remain the size that it is or we will lose the uniqueness of the town, its heritage and character. Traffic is horrendous as it is and this will only add to the problem. Schools are already over-subscribed. Medical centres are stretched. There are other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

There may be potential for infill between existing housing and the Brookdale Centre with access on to Manchester Road. I have reservations with regard to the farmland and they relate to the House of Commons Library Standard Note SN/SC/934 (April 2012) as stated for Sites A and B. Additionally, surely Mereheath Lane is too narrow to support increased traffic to/from a development at the north-eastern end of this Site?

Unsure of current use but suggest all reasons above apply.

No development needed.

The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn. And is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat.

Pretty much the same observations as Site A above but will add there is a provision of sporting amenities that give added value to Knutsford and to those who utilise the facilities.

Strongly disagree - this area should be developed as an area of sporting excellence.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Development of site wont assist with providing strategic infrastructure improvements that need to be associated with development Accessibility of site overstated in assessment within Environmental Appraisal Report. Bus service provision to north of town the poorest of any approach into the town.
How this is classified in Table 5.3 as good i cannot understand. There are only a handful of buses per day. Site of this scale will not transform this accessibility. No primary school to north of town, High school to west of town. Hence difficult to see why this site considered a favourable location.

This area is the sporting hub of our town - many sporting amenities and allotments would be taken away should this development proceed.

Could possible be used but there are no schools in this area and you would only be adding to the 4x4 school run with more traffic chaos.

Farmland should NOT be built upon

A small and prominent 'gateway' site - not convinced that development here is a great idea. Likely to merge the edge of town with the ribbon of development which characterises Manchester Road, one side or the other.

Loss of football ground when public being encouraged to take more exercise as well as youth club facilities being limited. New residents would be entitled to complain about noise and lighting.

Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

This is already a developed area of Knutsford.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is

This is clearly leisure land that totally satisfies the social principles of any development of the town. Housing this area really sends the wrong message to the community. Is the stakeholder the current landlord of all this land? Why not be done with this and build a new town at over Peover Hall. It is an area that with more development could sustain a shop etc. and only upset 2 people the landlord and his son. shame you have not got the courage of your words.

I do not think that this area can accommodate new housing in respect of the numbers of cars etc.

This site should be considered with Sites A, B and D as a potential urban extension to provide the mixed facilities required for Knutsford in the Plan Period and, potentially, beyond.

How will more concrete and tarmac "offer opportunities to increase access to the countryside" if the green belt is reduced and pushed farther away from the town's residents? Increased traffic flow along a rural route (Mereheath Lane) would change the character of this rural edge of town.

There may be scope for housing on this site but I think that priority should be given to improving the existing sporting facilities.

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if you developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place ie the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford.
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced ,when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from
Manchester airport which we have now come to live with. 6.Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

I agree with all the comments in the Draft Strategy, but feel that the development should be on a small scale, planned together with A, B, D, K and possibly F to meet future housing needs. Access should be from Northwich Road.

This is green belt land and should be protected.

Green Belt land should be maintained and no further traffic should be pushed onto the Manchester Road.

400 homes would put a strain on the A50 - every Friday from midday onwards traffic backs from the roundabout in Knutsford town centre to Mere due to accidents and traffic problems on the M6. Additional homes would add further chaos.

Farmland.

This is an important 'green finger' into the town and relates closely to site D. The only development that should be considered is of a sports, leisure or new school type.

I do not believe in mass development and this will create a massive housing estate on green belt land. Access into Knutsford will be compromised.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, e.g. retail development in site k. If the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. These would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities.

Only problem again is extra traffic.

Concentrate on improving our existing facilities before moving out a developing green belt land.

Keep leisure facilities for youth of today.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

It may be possible that there could be building on some of this site. However it would have to be considered alongside how to develop sporting usage of sites D and E in my view (see below).

Established Sports and recreational facilities should remain.

Established Sports Areas and recreation areas should all stay.

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Manchester Road which is already an issue of concern.

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

It is essential to maintain the well used and excellent sports facilities in this area.

This seems sensible.
It is green belt.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Deep concerns, but it is for the folk who live on that side of town to make the right decisions.

Green belt.

Taking C, D & E together make a very big area. Care needs to be taken in planning this area so as to retain the Knutsford character.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county.

This would negatively impact on the football club.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

If site A is developed none of these other areas should need to be spoiled.

The same comments apply here as those for site B, C and E. The North West of the town is the closest area to other settlements. Any loss of green belt on this side of town will mean that the other settlements are much closer and in time, there will be nothing to really separate Knutsford from Mere, Bucklow Hill, Altrincham and thus Manchester. It is imperative that Knutsford's open spaces are preserved and that the green belt to the North West of the town is not eroded at all. The main access routes along Northwich Road and Manchester Road begin to define the character of the town, as traffic passes through the green fields. If these are lost, it will irreparably damage the town's character. These areas are also home to much wildlife, in particular, bats, newts, badgers, foxes, wild pheasants, buzzards and other birds of prey. If the land is lost this essentially English wildlife will be lost too.

Airport plans massive expansion. Are you seriously suggesting building underneath the flight paths.

Absolutely disagree. The land is in the Green Belt and there are traffic, parking and utility issues.

Thriving farmland and first impression entering our community Additional traffic near to children's sports facilities.

There is no option here to agree but with provisos. In principle Greenbelt land should be maintained as much as possible but if evidence proved that some development was needed on GB land then there is potential in Sites C, D & E so long as it not at the detriment of town boundaries and existing facilities which contribute much to the community already.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

The amount of housing agreed should not stifle the sporting/youth club needs.

I would prefer if this land could be used for enhancing the towns sports facilities rather than being used for housing or employment.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

If this is preferred it should be Housing only.

The full list of possible sites is supported by fairly detailed comments on each and, similarly, the responses of the Stakeholder Panel supporting their selection of favoured sites are given in some detail, making the selection much more credible.

Questions over suitability.
Conditional on design and layout and that a suitable edge to settlement is created. Assume mixed use refers to housing/leisure, not retail/employment which would be unsuitable.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Development sites B & C are preferable because of the access to Manchester Road, a main road

The development of this site cannot be justified unless sites B and D are developed because at present is has very little relationship with the existing built-up area of Knutsford. Like site B, that part of the site which fronts Manchester Road on its eastern side has an important role in protecting the gap between Mere and Knutsford and should therefore not be developed.

Parcel C currently provides good quality sporting facilities. Given the aspirations of the Draft Town Strategy it would make sense to retain and maximise the use of these facilities and develop the ‘leisure hub’ around this area rather than relocating quality sporting facilities to create development for alternative uses.

Improvements would have to be made to Mereheath Lane as well given how it narrows currently beyond the Egerton Youth Club. Careful consideration would have to be given to entrances to any development undertaken onto both Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane to avoid, if possible, this becoming a ‘rat run’ between the two.

Green belt, sports facilities.

Preserve and extend to playing fields.

Green Belt area and should remain so Significant loss of sports and leisure facilities on Manchester Rd/Mereheath Lane.

6.5 - this seems to have a double meaning - what do you mean ‘to review Green Belt boundaries? Where do the future go for leisure?

In part. Development should be restricted to the southern half of site. Could be used for employment in lieu of site B to take advantage of its access to the A50/A566.

The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option.

This is green belt land and those living in surrounding areas will have life disrupted views walks destroyed house values reduced and nobody wants a building site next door.

This site is Green Belt. It conflicts with Knutsford’s Environment objective to protect green spaces around the town.

Any development would impact on the green belt

Access should be along the Northwich or Manchester Roads not Mereheath Lane. Priority given to open areas alongside the present built up areas.

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, the land is Green Belt and it serves the purpose of contributing towards the separation of Knutsford with Mere to the north and avoiding the unrestricted sprawl of the town northwards along the A50.

Good site for avoiding for traffic congestion through town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Encroaching on the green belt.

Green belt, which should mean something - it was designated as such because planners realised the importance of green space to the community. This area is also important recreationally - it is easily reached on foot.

I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites identified and developed.

this impact on sports facilities in the area which is what you are trying to promote.
The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of an area of beauty ay a key point of entry to the town. Manchester Rd cannot cope with current traffic - adding to that would be criminal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt Leave it alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - current leisure and sports facilities should remain in D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any new development here would be directly under the flight path. Mereheath Lane is used as a short cut to the Altrincham Road and many drivers do not observe the speed limit. There is nose to tail parking up one side of it at all times and it is particularly dangerous at the weekends when families are setting off to walk in the park. It becomes a traffic jam when there is any sort of holdup in the town centre. How is the traffic problem to be addressed? It will only be aggravated by developing this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is a feeding site for at least 4 species of bats. The site has a growing number of lapwings nesting year on year. It is a gleaning area for three species of geese in the Autumn, and is used for badgers as a feeding site. The land is prime agricultural land that is well farmed. Added congestion of up to 800 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan. The pond on site should now be protected as the Cheshire marl pits are a recognised endangered habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green belt land, already accommodating well used community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester road is already busy especially if there has been an incident on the motorway - Knutsford would become even busier, Also people enjoy the fact that they are a short walk from the countryside!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of suitable sports facilities will become an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with a small plot of housing, but the suggestion of huge expanse of housing on rural lead into Knutsford is outrageous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain and improve Leisure offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value greatly the openness of the area adjacent to the park and would hate to see developments which would be detrimental; to this characteristics of Tatton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good agricultural land. It helps to define the rural approaches to Knutsford as well as protecting Tatton Park from urban sprawl up to its wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain green buffer around Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve this open space and the youth club, playing fields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree - but only for housing, and only for the least possible house building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Encroaching on the green belt.

All three sites are located on land with an agricultural land grade of 2 and therefore represent some of the best agricultural land quality within the area.

### Sports/housing. No supermarket.

Not necessary.

This area contains many of the sporting activities of Knutsford. It is an attraction to the town and provides sport to young and old and is used by schools. Now contains cricket, tennis, squash, East Cheshire archery, rugby juniors. Don’t spoil it.

Sites C and D have subsidence - in fact the whole area does ie Willow Green built on rafts and the fact that the Holdings on Manchester Road had to be underpinned only supports this. Mereheath Lane on the other side of these plots is a country lane already used as a 'rat run'. All the approaches into Knutsford are pleasant with Green Belt on every side. Do you consider it fair to take the whole of the Green Belt on the north west side of the town? This is most unfair. Most of the development sites are one side of Knutsford - almost joining Knutsford to Mere and taking all the Green Belt on this side of town. It would make this area one large housing estate. I also feel the land is so water logged it is not suitable.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

A less grand affordable type Cotton Spa hotel is needed. No large shops/stores.

Maintain present usage.

Don't destroy Green Belt, or you destroy the countryside and everything living there.

There are excellent sporting facilities already in these areas. They should be retained in their present form. The A50 and Mereheath Lane would require major work. Almost to become dual carriage roads if the amount of housing proposed were to be built here.

As long as existing facilities, particularly sports, are maintained or improved.

As long as existing facilities, particularly sports, are maintained or improved.

More traffic congestion and less countryside.

Easier to relocate football club out of town as most people drive there. Children walk/cycle to tennis, which should be encouraged. Potential to link traffic away from town centre.

Lots of sports facilities would be affected.

Knutsford has many well established popular sporting and leisure facilities in these sections, it would be ridiculous to destroy or change these well liked sites.

Traffic on Mereheath Lane needs calming NOW. If there is any more development along the lane, calming will be essential.

This land is sports amenity for the town.

Would lose important sports facilities.

the sports grounds are well established and serve Knutsford well - don't see why we should change this to deliver houses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing brilliant sports facilities on this site and should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected from any development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of this site would entail loss of playing fields and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open aspect on approach to Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Road frequently very congested by traffic diverted off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 and A556 through Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing only. Football field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Green Belt not mean anything anymore?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuitable for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutely not, currently one of few established sites for leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities in Knutsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas C, D &amp; E are very important to the local community, are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by large number of children and adults and offer activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unavailable elsewhere. It would be a huge loss to the town if we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were to lose this area to houses. Its is essential for a sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area needs to maintain green due to Tatton Park e.g. traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems at events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact on farming and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least environmentally damaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic to Tatton Park will be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against development of sites A TO E as they are located in the Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial use only - excellent transport links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing would make living on the outskirts of Knutsford intolerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and change the area beyond recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One scheme already drawn up in outline would involve a massive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development on sites CDE which in itself would provide up to 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houses (ie nearly all of the 1200 maximum forecast need) as well as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disrupting the area previously shown in the Macclesfield DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forerunner Local Plan as â€˜a designated sports areaâ€™. Such large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developments should not be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In paragraph 2.8 it states that there is a need for 64 affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homes to be provided each year, which I take to mean each year of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 20 year period. Also it states that the total of dwellings of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all types required in this same period is 1280. As this number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equates to the number of affordable homes it is assumed will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required over this period, will other types of housing not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered for planning approval? This projected requirement would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be met from any combination of areas A to T so what is your strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the development of this side of Knutsford? Is all this greenbelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land, which is identified for development, to be released at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same time or will it be phased over the twenty year period and if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so in what order?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetically disastrous. Will give a very poor impression on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entering the town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site D: Land between Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane (southern parcel)

Do you agree or disagree with site D as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 79% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (30%); Disagree (70%)

Comments:

Wholly inappropriate. Existing sports facilities should be retained.

The description of the site underplays the activity that takes place there. The Sports activity is at capacity on the land so none can be given up without capacity being provided elsewhere. More land for sport is required eg Rugby and Athletics. The community facility of three buildings for events and meetings needs protecting. The land covers Knutsford football club, Knutsford Sports Club and Egerton Youth Club. Knutsford Sports Club has cricket, squash (2 courts), and tennis (7 floodlight courts) sections plus a clubhouse for wider community use. Rugby juniors train there and there are mother and baby daytime sessions, evening keep fit and Pilates sessions and children’s martial arts. Plus it is a venue for local meetings and parties. An archery section is currently setting up with investment. Egerton Youth Club is home of the football club plus a building for many other clubs such as badminton, basketball and gymnastics. It is also land in trust to the Egerton Youth Club. There is a natural drainage ditch between the tennis and youth club ground. Also a pond. Mereheath Lane will require upgrading. Traffic management projection needs to consider the Tatton Vision plans. Compensation to existing Mereheath Park residents will be needed. Site D is convenient access from many residential parts of town and suitable for walking and cyclist routes, traffic calming such as 20mph and no parking restrictions need considering.

This is Green Belt so cannot be built on.

Some open space required.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.

This might be further explored if any proposed development kept the houses within the current line of houses already along Manchester Road. However it is still green belt land and therefore under the current plans I have to disagree.

Too many sport and leisure facilities in this area - some established over 100 years.
Only if sports facilities and not just protected but improved.
Together with new sports and leisure complex - pool.

**Egerton Youth Club is here!**

There are no grounds for building over local community facilities such as a cricket field, tennis club, squash and Egerton football club. This contradicts all the principles of creating a community via sport, access to sport for the young, maintaining open spaces, recreation and social capacity for Knutsford. The stakeholder group noted that this provides opportunities to improve sports through land swap which seems to indicate subjectivity in their recommendation. The facilities such as the 3G pitch, cricket pitch are of a high standard. The Council could invest in the current facilities and distribute housing impacts across the town. The balance of housing in this area would also cause problems for roads and limit impact to Tatton. It also adversely affects houses in Willow Green where other potential sites do not have a direct impact on current residents. Finally there is preference to rely on the North and East of the town to support the excessive development and not fairly distribute the impact across the town. (Combine B, C, D, E and you are building an expansive and inappropriate level of housing in one area of the town and unfair distribution to North East Knutsford Residents to withstand the impact of additional housing/traffic).

This is open countryside that should be preserved

Seems to me we will be losing the football ground and the sports leisure facilities, Is there enough land for them and 400 houses?

The development of this area for housing will not only disastrously impact on the green area/lung which the town needs but also affect the local wildlife which is already threatened. It will make the area one huge housing estate and completely change the character of the town. There are plenty of sites in the town which are near industrial sites and not agricultural land. Which could better be used.

I agree, although fear that insurance premiums would rise for these residents too. However, the view from many of these residences is already obscured by garden fencing and is not such a large consideration. Of course, people who live there may hold a different opinion to my own.

With a strong proviso that this should be a last resort.

As with Site C - playing fields should be protected.

In a year when there has been considerable national enthusiasm for sport and the development of facilities to encourage younger members of our society to become more involved it seems total nonsense to propose to lose very significant and successful facilities of the Knutsford Football Club, Egerton Youth Club and Knutsford Sports Club to housing. I lodge my objection to that proposal in the strongest terms.

I understand there are plans to build houses in Knutsford at Knutsford Football Club, Knutsford Sports Club and Egerton Boys Club - if this is so I must strongly object for the following reasons: 1. the land is in Green Belt which means it is not meant to be built on. 2. the clubs are meant for the enjoyment of youngsters which following the Olympic Games and the Paralympics Games it is important that they are retained as such for the good of children in their development. 3. It is not necessary to build further homes in Knutsford which has sufficient houses for sale to meet requirements.

Subject to the retention of sports facilities.

Would blight the landscape as rural area. Not close to schools therefore increased traffic/pedestrians.

Definitely a possibility as extends existing housing

The report defines this as 3 playing fields, including cricket and football grounds. This is incorrect, as it also includes tennis, archery and squash clubs. These facilities are servicing the local community; old and young and encourage activity and healthy lifestyle choices.

The National Planning Policy Framework now contains a chapter to specifically address health and well-being (chapter 8 Promoting Healthy Communities). Paragraphs 73 and 74 fall within the remit of Sport England as they relate to the protection, enhancement and creation of sport and recreation facilities. Paragraph 73 now requires Local Authorities to undertake a robust and up to date Needs
Assessment for open space, sport and recreation facilities to identify what provision is required:
Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required. This requirement will be essential when looking at allocating sites for new housing and employment. In areas where an increase in population is planned, including cumulative impacts, there will be a corresponding increase in demand for sport. The Needs Assessment will help plan strategically for sport and recreation throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan and help deliver the objections set out in the Town Strategies. Sport England has a range of strategic planning tools and advice on preparing a robust evidence base which can be found on our website: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance.aspx I am aware the Council are beginning to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy which will form an integral part of the overall open space, sport and recreation evidence base. When looking at sites to allocate for development it is important paragraph 74 of NPPF is taken into account alongside Sport England’s statutory remit on protecting playing fields: Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: - an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or - the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss Where a Needs Assessment identifies the need to create new sites for open space, sport or recreation the Local Plan should allocate sites as necessary and in accordance with the findings of the Needs Assessment. Information on Sport England’s statutory remit and the Playing Fields Policy can be found here: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_applications.aspx

I think Egerton primary should be relocated within this site as it would allow it to expand and the current land Egerton stands on developed for low cost shared equity housing.

What would happen to all the sporting facilities in this area?

Farmland.

But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.

Traffic egress onto A50 - bad news!! Mereheath Lane - major access to Knutsford and also a considerable parking area.

Too many well established sports and leisure facilities. Consider football, cricket, rugby, tennis, squash and archery. If you are considering economic housing why build on the most expensive land?

Strongly disagree. The sports facilities on this site are excellent and used extensively by all sectors of the community. They are accessible unlike the swimming pool which is in an area of the town where roads are congested.

Absolutely NOT the place for any housing or other development. The facilities are well used and within cycling and walking distance for many of their users who are predominantly children. Moving the youth facilities in particular would be a terrible idea - currently they are near the centre of town which means users can use the facilities AND the centre of town facilities before or after their sport/leisure.

NO! Don’t build on paying fields. Don’t turn Mereheath Lane into a major road.

This is Green belt land & should not be considered for development. Recommending building over existing playing fields (does this include the EGERTON youth club as well?), particularly in this Olympics year when this sort of move has been denounced, would seem to be not a good idea, particularly for any people seeking votes! As for Land Swap that may suit the developers but not the public.
Cheshire East is supposed be improving facilities for sports and recreation yet has identified this site for mixed use. We need all the football fields we can get.

This site should also be kept as greenfields.

This site is nearer the town centre than some, which is beneficial. As with all others, though, lost amenities (playing fields etc) would need to be replaced - and indeed augmented, given the increased population!

I am actively involved with the development of Knutsford Cricket Club which is perhaps the oldest sport club in the town and has played here for 130 years. It is part of an outdoor sporting complex which has developed over many years and now includes several clubs - Tennis, Cricket, Archery, squash, Junior Rugby, the Knutsford Football Club and Egerton Sports Club which provides several sports for the youth of the town. Some of these facilities are of outstanding quality and this area should be preserved as a sporting complex serving the whole town. Its position adjacent to the town is also ideal. Any scheme to transfer this land to a developer in 'land swap' will meet with enormous hostility in the town and undermine the efforts that countless numbers of Knutsfordians have made over the years to build up such impressive facilities.

Building on this land would destroy the unique character of Knutsford as a market town. The town cannot absorb the proposed number of houses given the traffic problems that exist. The Environment would be irreversibly damaged and this area is key for local wildlife - bats, lapwings, badgers pond life. This area is grade 1 farmland. This would be a damaging loss of green open spaces. The town infrastructure would not cope with the increased volume of the town (jobs, schools etc.)

Fertile arable farmland again mostly. Will playing fields stay?

This is green belt land and the road network already struggles.

NO!

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with- strongly oppose building so many houses close to town centre. the road network cannot cope and will spoil the countryside

Do not build on playing fields unless you propose to resite them nearby

Green Belt

NO

Knutsford Football Club would be most affected by any development on Site D, but in principle, is supportive of our landlord’s vision and proposal providing any re-location of the Club would be to a purpose built site - (ground, facility) that met The FA National Ground Grading F requirement (Step 5) as the Club is affiliated to and governed by FA Rules and Regulations. Any development of Site D would have a major impact on the town’s premier Sports Club which is currently ranked the number 1 non-league side in the Country and is a flagship Club for the Cheshire FA. We would wish to be directly engaged with any group or organisation concerning any proposed development of this site.

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of 'mixed use' is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

I think this site is contradictory to the statement re excellent sporting facilities as it impacts extremely important and well utilised sports facilities in the town, namely Egerton Youth Club, Knutsford Sports Club and Knutsford FC. I would only support housing that protected this space.

Loss of playing fields, and sports facilities would be a disaster for the town.

As for all other sites, I object.

This will devastate green belt land and is totally unnecessary. Valuable farmland will be wiped away. We must retain open green spaces Knutsford should remain the size that it is or we will lose the uniqueness of the town, its heritage and character. Traffic is horrendous as it is and this will only add to the problem. Schools are already over-subscribed. Medical centres are stretched. There are other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no supporting evidence in the plan.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Site is close to the town centre so meets many requirements but it contains valuable sporting facilities which should not be lost. If there is potential for a land swap, such that sporting facilities are retained, then this Site might be useful but Mereheath Lane may not be suitable as an access route for a major development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land already in use as playing fields should be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No development needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These fields are major sports facilities within the area, and are well used by the towns people. Added congestion of up to 900 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree - this area should be developed as an area of sporting excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area is the sporting hub of our town - many sporting amenities and allotments would be taken away should this development proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site currently provides recreational facilities to many of the town residents, for example: 2 Football Clubs Youth Football Cricket Tennis Squash Basketball Martial Arts (x4) Archery Complex ownerships, perhaps, so not likely to result in a well-planned extension to town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is already a developed area of Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is clearly leisure land that totally satisfies the social principles of any development of the town. Housing this area really sends the wrong message to the community. Is the stakeholder the current landlord of all this land? Why not be done with this and build a new town at over Peover hall. It is an area that with more development could sustain a shop etc. and only upset 2 people the landlord and his son. Shame you have not got the courage of your words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area backs on to my house and I am strongly against any development here. In addition, as a member of Knutsford tennis club, i would object to the removal of these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site should be considered comprehensively with Sites A, B and C as providing a substantial urban extension, in a generally sustainable location, sufficient to provide for the residential and employment and recreational needs for the town during the Local Plan period and, potentially, beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will more concrete and tarmac &quot;offer opportunities to increase access to the countryside&quot; if the green belt is reduced and pushed farther away from the town's residents? Increased traffic flow along a rural route (Mereheath Lane) would change the character of this rural edge of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be scope for housing on this site but I think that priority should be given to improving the existing sporting facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if your developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place i.e. the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:**

**Site D: Land between Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane (southern parcel)**
of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.

4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how this would be used in the small town of Knutsford.

5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced, when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

I agree with all the comments in the Draft Strategy, but feel that the development should be on a small scale, planned together with A, B, C, K and possibly F to meet future housing needs. Access should be from Northwich Road.

This is green belt land and should be protected

Green Belt land should be maintained - Site includes valuable Leisure amenities which should not be pushed further outside town

Traffic would exit onto Mereheath Road and exit towards Knutsford. King Street, Tatton Park, Tatton Street, Garden Road would all become grid lock with traffic.

What would be built here???(see A)

Development of sports and leisure sites should always be resisted. This site should only be developed if all the existing facilities are replaced in advance to at least the same and preferably a higher standard.

This is an appalling suggestion and investment into existing facilities and space is critical. Building on this space, with other areas, will cause a mass estate and I feel it is disproportionate on people living in the north of the town. How can the stakeholder group propose land swap for sporting facilities? Has conversations taken place with Randell Brook? I suggest this consultation has been compromised.

Why is this approach not taken with any other site? I think Cheshire East need to work with sport clubs in order to develop these areas rather than be held to ransom with developers and land swaps.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, e.g. retail development in site k. If the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. These would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities.

Only problem again is extra traffic.

Concentrate on improving our existing facilities before moving out a developing green belt land.

Only expansion of leisure facilities for youth of today.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

The site contains a 240 year old oak tree/s (ancient / veteran trees). It also houses very popular and well used sports clubs which has very convenient access to town and a healthy environment.
Following the amazing summer of Olympic sport this country has just had, with sporting legacy on everyone’s lips, and all from the Prime Minister downwards arguing for retention / development of sporting facilities and prowess (not to mention the medical arguments around health and prevention of an obesity/diabetes epidemic) I would argue strongly against using what is currently excellent land used for sports facilities, for building houses. In fact there is probably an opportunity here to think creatively about how to enhance the sporting facilities in Mereheath Lane and get the various sports clubs and facilities (Golf, Bowls, Cricket, Tennis, Rugby, Football etc) expanding and working more closely together.

All establishes sports facilities should remain intact especially after the Government promise of a lasting legacy to the Olympic Games

Established Sports Areas and recreation areas should all stay

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Mereheath Lane which is already an issue of concern.

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

It is essential to maintain the well used and excellent sports facilities in this area

Even as a member of the sports club, with family members connected to the Youth club, I can see the sense in this, as long as suitable replacements are provided and funded to at least as good a standard as now. This may be difficult as the sports club only leases the land and will not be negotiating directly with any developer. I hope the Council will protect their interests if this happens.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

The town cannot be sold the fairy tale of a land swap to deliver the facilities at the Tennis Club and Egerton. Is the council aware of how many hundreds of children use these facilities on a year round basis. Our own children spend cumulatively at least 7 hours EVERY weekend at these two sites. Before selling the community the fairy tale that another space will be found, the council must demonstrate which site will be used and how the various clubs and facilities will operate. The developers must be made to deliver these facilities first before any earth moving starts or the existing activities are curtailed.

Green belt.

Taking C, D & E together make a very big area. Care needs to be taken in planning this area so as to retain the Knutsford character

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

Strongly disagree because of the impact on Egerton Boys Club as detailed earlier in my response.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

If site A is developed none of these other areas should need to be spoiled.
The same comments apply here as those for site B, D and E. The North West of the town is the closest area to other settlements. Any loss of green belt on this side of town will mean that the other settlements are much closer and in time, there will be nothing to really separate Knutsford from Mere, Bucklow Hill, Altrincham and thus Manchester. It is imperative that Knutsford's open spaces are preserved and that the green belt to the North West of the town is not eroded at all. The main access routes along Northwich Road and Manchester Road begin to define the character of the town, as traffic passes through the green fields. If these are lost, it will irreparably damage the town’s character. These areas are also home to much wildlife, in particular, bats, newts, badgers, foxes, wild pheasants, buzzards and other birds of prey. If the land is lost this essentially English wildlife will be lost too.

Airport plans massive expansion. Are you seriously suggesting building underneath the flight paths. We feel the description of the site needs more accurate information. Knutsford Sports Club (KSC) is one of three organisations located in potential site D. KSC has not been party to any consultation from Cheshire East Council prior to the release of this draft strategy. A full description of our volunteer led, community multi-sport club is outlined later in section 9. KSC leased grounds consists of a club house, 2 squash courts, 7 floodlight tennis courts, a field for cricket, rugby training and archery, with planning permission to build an indoor archery hall, a car park and various storage sheds for equipment. The clubhouse has changing rooms, showers, function room, bar and kitchen which services all our sports section members and other community groups who may hire the facility. The club is within walking or cycling distance for Knutsford Residents through the Town Centre or across the Moor. Knutsford Football Club and Egerton Youth Club are the other two organisations on site D.

The marvellous sports facilities, which have been heavily invested in, are a vital part of life in Knutsford and should be maintained as such. The current site is easily accessible and well positioned on the edge of the town for visiting teams to find. In my opinion we should continue to develop the assets which we already have rather than restart somewhere else which would require huge investment.

This is a potential site for a health and wellbeing centre.

Absolutely disagree. The land is in the Green Belt and there are traffic, parking and utility issues. Additionally, this would take out the Egerton Boys club and other amenities.

Thriving farmland and first impression entering our community Additional traffic near to children’s sports facilities

There is no option here to agree but with provisos. In principle Greenbelt land should be maintained as much as possible but if evidence proved that some development was needed on GB land then there is potential in Sites C, D & E so long as it not at the detriment of town boundaries and existing facilities which contribute much to the community already.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

The amount of housing agreed should not stifle he sporting/youth club needs.

I would hope the any development in this area could be sympathetic to the surrounding green areas, while also retaining the character of the town.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

I totally disagree with taking away any sports facilities.

The full list of possible sites is supported by fairly detailed comments on each and, similarly, the responses of the Stakeholder Panel supporting their selection of favoured sites are given in some detail, making the selection much more credible.

Questions over suitability

Conditional on design and layout and that a suitable edge to settlement is created. Assume mixed use refers to housing/leisure, not retail/employment which would be unsuitable.
Used as sports field including permission in place to extend recreation.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Under the terms of the current local plan, all of this site would appear to fall within designated playing fields and accommodates numerous recreational facilities including the Knutsford football club, tennis and squash club, cricket ground and Egerton Youth Club. The view is taken that the concentration of such recreational facilities close to the town centre is highly sustainable and therefore important. Furthermore many of these facilities have been present on their existing sites for many years and to relocate them may have an impact on their popularity, particularly if they are less easily accessible by means other than the private motor vehicle.

In particular we would like to highlight parcels identified D and E on diagram 4 of the Town Strategy.

Parcels C and D appear to have a large number of smaller fields, which would require substantial hedgerow and potential tree removal to accommodate larger scale residential development.

Improvements would have to be made to Mereheath Lane as well given how it narrows currently beyond the Egerton Youth Club. Careful consideration would have to be given to entrances to any development undertaken onto both Manchester Road and Mereheath Lane to avoid, if possible, this becoming a 'rat run' between the two.

Green belt, sports facilities

Boys club and other sports facilities should be conserved

Green Belt area and should remain so. Significant loss of sports and leisure facilities on Manchester Rd/Mereheath Lane.

6.5 - this seems to have a double meaning - what do you mean 'to review Green Belt boundaries? Where do the future go for leisure?'

The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option.

This is green belt land and those living in surrounding areas will have live disrupted views walks destroyed house values reduced and nobody wants a building site next door.

This site is Green Belt. It conflicts with Knutsford’s Environment objective to protect green spaces around the town.

Any development would impact on the green belt

Access should be along the Northwich or Manchester Roads not Mereheath Lane. Priority given to open areas alongside the present built up areas.

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. The land is in a recreational use which is appropriate to the Green Belt and provides facilities that would require replacement if this land is developed. The land is Green Belt and it serves the purpose of contributing towards the separation of Knutsford with Mere to the north and avoiding the unrestricted sprawl of the town northwards along the A50.

Too close to Tatton Park.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Sports facilities should remain in situ and trees and wildlife to be preserved.

Green belt, which should mean something - it was designated as such because planners realised the importance of green space to the community. This area is also important recreationally, you cannot destroy the football and cricket ground. In destroying the cricket ground you also destroy the archery, tennis and squash clubs which are easily reached on foot.

I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites identified and developed.

This impact on sports facilities in the area which is what you are trying to promote.
These fields are major sports facilities within the area, and are well used by the local residents. Added congestion of up to 900 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Manchester Rd cannot cope with current traffic - adding to that would be criminal

These fields are major sports facilities within the area, and are well used by the local residents. Added congestion of up to 900 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Green Belt Leave it alone

- Sports and young people's facilities here are already good, well developed, and used and should not be threatened. They are accessible to the town by walking and cycling (useful for the youngsters in particular). It is flat land suitable for these sports.

Any new development here would be directly under the flight path. Mereheath Lane is used as a short cut to the Altrincham Road and many drivers do not observe the speed limit. There is nose to tail parking up one side of it at all times and it is particularly dangerous at the weekends when families are setting off to walk in the park. It becomes a traffic jam when there is any sort of holdup in the town centre. How is the traffic problem to be addressed? It will only be aggravated by developing this site.

These fields are major sports facilities within the area, and are well used by the local residents. Added congestion of up to 900 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt land, already accommodating well used community facilities. A few houses (30ish) maybe but not the huge number proposed.

In the middle of existing developments - probably has all the appropriate utilities in place which I don't believe other plots will have.

Sports facilities should be retained, or a land swop take place, but the facilities should remain within easy access of town, preferably by walking or cycling.

Provision of suitable sports facilities will become an issue

How can you even contemplate building on existing facilities where 10,000s to 100,000s of GBP have been spent to upgrade these excellent facilities already.

I strongly disagree with using this plot the most. I travel down Mereheath lane daily, and the traffic is clearly too much for this lovely quiet lane already. Especially when events on at Tatton. I have seen suggestions and plans for building on beautiful cricket club (over a 100 years of crickets played here!) with residential homes and hotels further up the road. This is horrific, and will completely destroy lovely rural drive into Knutsford as well as swamp with traffic. This green land and extremely well used sports fields are a key point of what makes Knutsford great.

Leisure only.

I value greatly the openness of the area adjacent to the park and would hate to see developments which would be detrimental; to this characteristics of Tatton.

Strongly disagree. These are playing fields and sports facilities already. Why waste money on replicating them elsewhere - presumably even further out of town and less accessible? If this allowed, why not build on the golf club? Development here further encroaches on the identity of Tatton Park as well as removing another 'finger' of greenery almost to the town centre. A case could be made for a
small sympathetic development on the western half of this site to match the housing on the other side of Manchester Road but no further than the last house on that side. The existing sports facilities could conjoin the Egerton Club complex.

Maintain green buffer around Tatton Park

There seems to be little point in scrapping the existing sports facilities, which are adjacent to Egerton Youth Club which is not being touched, then rebuilding them further away from the town. It makes more sense to keep them where they are and build housing to the north of them. Have the sports clubs been consulted? I have to declare an interest: my house overlooks the cricket field and I belong to the Sports Club!

The sports fields in this area are a very important part of the town and should be maintained. These have been heavily invested in and are an important part of life for many residents.

Possibly some of this land may be close enough in to town to consider developing, especially as some of it is opposite a lot of housing already.

Agree - but only for housing, and only for the least possible house building. Existing playing field use would need to be relocated.

Green Belt!

Sports facilities should remain in situ and trees and wildlife to be preserved.

Natural England notes the proposed use would cause a loss of public open space.

Not necessary.

This area contains many of the sporting activities of Knutsford. It is an attraction to the town and provides sport to young and old and is used by schools. Now contains cricket, tennis, squash, East Cheshire archery, rugby juniors. Don’t spoil it

Sites C and D have subsidence - i.e. Willow Green built on rafts and the fact that the Holdings on Manchester Road had to be underpinned only supports this. Mereheath Lane on the other side of these plots is a country lane already used as a ‘rat run’. All the approaches into Knutsford are pleasant with Green Belt on every side. Do you consider it fair to take the whole of the Green Belt on the north west side of the town? This is most unfair. Most of the development sites are one side of Knutsford - almost joining Knutsford to Mere and taking all the Green Belt on this side of town. It would make this area one large housing estate. I also feel the land is so water logged it is not suitable.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Kept for leisure facilities only

This land contains playing fields so should not be included

Maintain present usage

Don’t destroy Green Belt, or you destroy the countryside and everything living there.

There are excellent sporting facilities already in these areas. They should be retained in their present form. The A50 and Mereheath Lane would require major work. almost to become dual carriage roads if the amount of housing proposed were to be built here.
What will happen to the leisure facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor drainage and contains ponds. Investment in current sports facilities preferred option. Mereheath Lane unsuitable for increased traffic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is currently primarily used for sports. If these facilities are moved further out then will conflict with objective 1 - Sustainable Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is sports amenity for the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would lose important sports facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing brilliant sports facilities on this site and should be protected from any development. Development of this site would entail loss of playing fields and open aspect on approach to Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mereheath Lane a busy route for traffic to A556 and planned events in Tatton Park. Out of town commuters park cars along route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Green Belt not mean anything anymore?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not - all those sports facilities cannot be destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes Egerton FC which was given to people by Lord Egerton - should be a protected part of Knutsford's heritage. Currently used by several hundred children and their families for football alone, as well as other sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas C, D &amp; E are very important to the local community, are used by large number of children and adults and offer activities unavailable elsewhere. It would be a huge loss to the town if we were to lose this area to houses. Its is essential for a sustainable community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mereheath lane narrow at best. Knutsford should not be joined by mere, preserve facilities i.e. boys club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area provides sports activity for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland less productive and some roads in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic to Tatton Park will be affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against development of sites A TO E as they are located in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected extension of existing Mereheath Park - build on extension of existing leisure facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the proposals to be totally ill considered, unnecessary in almost all the favoured sites as does every single person I have discussed this with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One scheme already drawn up in outline would involve a massive development on sites CDE which in itself would provide up to 1000 houses (ie nearly all of the 1200 maximum forecast need) as well as disrupting the area previously shown in the Macclesfield DC forerunner Local Plan as ‘a designated sports area’. Such large developments should not be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In paragraph 2.8 it states that there is a need for 64 affordable homes to be provided each year, which I take to mean each year of the 20 year period. Also it states that the total of dwellings of all types required in this same period is 1280. As this number equates to the number of affordable homes it is assumed will be required over this period, will other types of housing not be considered for planning approval? This projected requirement would be met from any combination of areas A to D so what is your strategy for the development of this side of Knutsford? Is all this greenbelt land, which is identified for development, to be released at the same time or will it be phased over the twenty year period and if so in what order?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site D - The site is home to Knutsford Football Club, a cricket pitch, a youth club a pavilion and a number of playing fields. These would need to be relocated as part of any proposed development when it could be demonstrated that that the provisions are surplus to requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site E: Land to the east of Mereheath Lane

Do you agree or disagree with site E as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 79% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (27%); Disagree (73%)

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfect site with excellent access, existing allotments could easily be retained or even enhanced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Tatton park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires the Green Belt protection next to Tatton Not suitable for housing as only road out Mereheath Lane not enough options so too congested. Not suitable for commercial as next to Tatton Park and within residential area. Currently Sports club Knutsford Bowling. Mobile phone mast in situ. Storage tanks to rear United Utilities; they may need expanding if Knutsford develops. Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Green Belt so cannot be built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some open space required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its green belt land and is too small and the impact is high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment land and a leisure facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments are here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no grounds to remove allotments and contradicts the principles outlined. This proposal will also adversely affect the access and feel of Tatton Park - our greatest asset. Mereheath Lane can not also support additional traffic and therefore causes linkage problems into the town. Finally there is preference to rely on the North and East of the town to support the excessive development and not fairly distribute the impact across the town. (Combine B, C, D, E and you are building an expansive and inappropriate level of housing in one area of the town and unfair distribution to North East Knutsford Residents to withstand the impact of additional housing/traffic).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

**Site E: Land to the east of Mereheath Lane**
This is open countryside that should be preserved
No strong thoughts about this one.

The development of this area for housing will not only disastrously impact on the green area/lung which the town needs but also affect the local wildlife which is already threatened. It will make the area one huge housing estate and completely change the character of the town. There are plenty of sites in the town which are near industrial sites and not agricultural land. Which could better be used.

I agree so long as Tatton Park will be protected from the proximity of developments. It is already protected by some degree by the golf course.

Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.

With a strong proviso that this should be a last resort.
Subject to the retention of sports facilities, particularly the Bowling Club.

Would blight the landscape as rural area. Not close to schools therefore increased traffic/pedestrians. Would increase traffic on side roads.
Too close to Tatton and aren’t there allotments here.
A small housing area or allotment provision.
Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

This section acts as a buffer between development and Tatton Park. It has woodland and well established allotments - if these were replaced it would cause distress and financial loss to the allotment holders.
A need to retain and development the existing Mereheath Lane allotments.
Farmland.
But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.
An established bowling club and allotments.

A clear boundary needs to exist between the perimeter of Tatton Park and housing in the town. Mereheath lane takes a lot of commuter traffic in and out of the town. A development as envisaged in this strategy would add substantially to this traffic flow and the conflict between traffic, pedestrians and cyclists (that already exists) at the junction of the road adjacent to the entrance gate to Tatton.

Not too big a development so minimising any impact on Tatton Park and traffic stress on Mereheath Lane
Too much to lose here.
This is greenbelt land & should not be considered for development. Making the proposed developments on land bordering the Tatton National Trust Parkland it would only serve to degrade the peaceful nature of this area. Wiping out a recreational facility (the Bowling green) typically used by older people should not to be supported (certainly by people seeking votes).
Loss of oversubscribed allotments facility
This land should also be kept as greenfields.

I have similar concerns to those already expressed. However, this site also includes an allotment, which the strategy document acknowledges the need to re-locate. I have two concerns about this: 1. it is hard to see where in the town there is sufficient open space; hence it would presumably entail commandeering even more greenbelt land; 2. there will undoubtedly be tenants who have invested heavily in their plots; would they be compensated in any way? (And, to be clear, I am not one of them.)
Development not appropriate on both sides of Mereheath Lane, too close to Tatton Park. Access onto a narrow road would be difficult and dangerous
Building on this land would destroy the unique character of Knutsford as a market town. The town cannot absorb the proposed number of houses given the traffic problems that exist. The Environment would be irreversibly damaged and this area is key for local wildlife - bats, lapwings, badgers pond life. This area is grade 1 farmland. This would be a damaging loss of green open spaces. The town
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site E: Land to the east of Mereheath Lane</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure would not cope with the increased volume of the town (jobs, schools etc.)

A possibility, some development already.

This is green belt land and the road network already struggles.

No!

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with -- concerned for the countryside and the effect on neighbouring Tatton park

Don't kill any more woodland

Green Belt

This land should be kept greenfield so that the perimeter of Tatton Park is not compromised. Mereheath Lane should mark the edge of the built area of the town in this sector.

NO

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of 'mixed use' is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

I think this site is contradictory to the statement re excellent sporting facilities as it impacts extremely important and well utilised sports facilities in the town, namely Egerton Youth Club, Knutsford Sports Club and Knutsford FC. I would only support housing that protected this space.

Totally wrong - lose Tatton openness.

All these proposed sites are unworkable- the provision of 1200 homes in Knutsford, when there are only 6000 at present will result in a complete change in the nature of the feel of the town- the heritage we are so proud of- this is a small market town and should remain so.

This will devastate green belt land and is totally unnecessary. Valuable farmland will be wiped away. We must retain open green spaces Knutsford should remain the size that it is or we will lose the uniqueness of the town, its heritage and character. Traffic is horrendous as it is and this will only add to the problem. Schools are already over-subscribed. Medical centres are stretched. There are other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan

There is woodland here. Woodland is valuable and must be preserved. The House of Commons Library Standard Note SN/SC/934 (April 2012) refers specifically to woodland. As with the previous Sites, there are access issues with Mereheath Lane being so narrow.

Green Belt. No infrastructure. Encroachment on leisure facilities. Road safety issue

Expand the allotments into any available in this area, rather than redeveloping entire area and losing the allotments

No development needed.

This site has a set full and part allotments, as there is a waiting list this would be taking a community asset away. The woodland has high biodiversity, though there is a small patch of land that used to be used by Knutsford Bowling club that could have a small development on, if this was within the keeping of the area. Added congestion of up to 500 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems, that could drive away potential long term investment developing this site in full would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment

This area is the sporting hub of our town - many sporting amenities and allotments would be taken away should this development proceed

Even worse with traffic congestion at its worst. Again no schools.

Recreational facilities + allotments

Hems in Tatton. Not a good idea, though would not object to further 'sporting' uses, here.
Loss of allotments when MORE are needed

Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

This is already a developed area of Knutsford.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is

This is clearly leisure land that totally satisfies the social principles of any development of the town. housing this area really sends the wrong message to the community. Is the stakeholder the current landlord of all this land. why not be done with this and build a new town at over peover hall. it is an area that with more development could sustain a shop etc. and only upset 2 people the landlord and his son. shame you have not got the courage of your words.

This site projects into the open countryside to the north of Knutsford and is adjacent to the valued countryside next to the Tatton Park boundary and in the existing Local Plan is shown as an Area of Special County Value.

Allotments at Mereheath Lane are threatened by this proposed development (see my comments in section 9 below).

The bowling club site could be developed provided that the club remains, but the woodland and the allotments should be retained

1. The building of over 1000 houses is not needed in a small town of Knutsford, it does not have the infrastructure to cope.
2. The A50 could not cope with the additional amount of traffic which would occur if your developed the number of houses you are suggesting. It can hardly deal with the current amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the M6. Also your proposals showing development running along Mereheath Lane would not be able to deal with the traffic such development would engender and as far as I can see are not needed.
3. I am perfectly sure that the sporting arrangements which are currently in place ie the Knutsford Football Club, Cricket Club and the Tennis Club are very well established and would not want to move. What a waste of money pulling down established buildings and pitches and rebuilding them a matter of 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile away. Also the tennis club I understand has only recently received a substantial amount of money to set up flood lights for evening tennis.
4. I can understand why Cheshire East would want to develop Green Belt land, especially from an Income point of view, greater council tax which would enable a larger pot of money, but I question how would this be used in the small town of Knutsford.
5. I cannot see from the initial plan what additional advantage this would be to me and my family. There would be a great disadvantage in that the value of my property would be reduced ,when you think that at present I look out on to green fields in a very pleasant environment. The only major problem being is that we have to endure is the noise of aeroplanes going and coming from Manchester airport which we have now come to live with.
6. Having only received a copy of the proposals today I am setting out my main pertinent thoughts so that they are received by the closing date, but I would be happy to discuss this further if your thought it would be appropriate.

The woodland area is magical, and preservation of the whole area, as allotments (increasing their number), orchards, field, woodland and native hedgerow etc would be a rich environmental asset, especially if some development takes place in A, B, C and D. Mereheath Lane is not suitable for increased traffic and access into an estate on either side.

This is green belt land and should be protected

Green Belt land should be maintained - Site includes valuable Leisure amenities which should not be pushed further outside town

Ancient woodland on this site.
Part of the essential 'green finger' into the town. The potential loss of woodland, allotments and sports facilities is in conflict with the Vision for the town and the strategies for its implementation. Are the 'waterworks' easy to relocate and if so to where? Traffic is already an issue in this part of town and more development would make for a poor quality of life. 

Too close to Tatton.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, e.g. retail development in site k. if the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. these would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities.

Only problem again is extra traffic.

Concentrate on improving our existing facilities before moving out a developing green belt land.

Preserve the existing allotments.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

As above all sports facilities should be within walking distance of the town so the established clubs etc should stay as they are. My 4 children and now grandchildren have all benefitted immensely from Knutsford’s established sports clubs

Established Sports Areas and recreation areas should all stay

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Mereheath Lane which is already an issue of concern.

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We we develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

It is essential to maintain the well used and excellent sports facilities in this area

Although my least favoured option as it will remove more trees than other sites.

It is green belt.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Deep concerns, but it is for the folk who live on that side of town to make the right decisions.

Green belt.

Taking C, D & E together make a very big area. Care needs to be taken in planning this area so as to retain the Knutsford character

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land
Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

**GREEN BELT** - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

Strongly disagree. This is contrary to the heritage and environmental aims set out in the policy in that it destroys allotments, woodland and is adjacent to Tatton Park. It would also cause substantial disruption to the surrounding area and traffic flow whilst it was being developed.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

If site A is developed none of these other areas should need to be spoiled.

The same comments apply here as those for site B, D and C. The North West of the town is the closest area to other settlements. Any loss of green belt on this side of town will mean that the other settlements are much closer and in time, there will be nothing to really separate Knutsford from Mere, Bucklow Hill, Altrincham and thus Manchester. It is imperative that Knutsford’s open spaces are preserved and that the green belt to the North West of the town is not eroded at all. The main access routes along Northwich Road and Manchester Road begin to define the character of the town, as traffic passes through the green fields. If these are lost, it will irreparably damage the town’s character. These areas are also home to much wildlife, in particular, bats, newts, badgers, foxes, wild pheasants, buzzards and other birds of prey. If the land is lost this essentially English wildlife will be lost too.

Airport plans massive expansion. Are you seriously suggesting building underneath the flight paths.

This is a potential site for a health and wellbeing centre.

Absolutely disagree. The land is in the Green Belt and there are traffic, parking and utility issues. This would also take out the allotments which are very valuable in these days of expensive food and also provide useful amenities

Thriving farmland and first impression entering our community Additional traffic near to children’s sports facilities

There is no option here to agree but with provisos. In principle Greenbelt land should be maintained as much as possible but if evidence proved that some development was needed on GB land then there is potential in Sites C, D & E so long as it not at the detriment of town boundaries and existing facilities which contribute much to the community already.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

I would hope that this plot, being so close to Tatton Park and the green belt could be retained as green space, whether for sport or recreation rather than developed for employment or housing. Smaller plots may be considered (A1, A2, A3 for example) Greater information on the current use, character and ownership of the land must also be made available

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

I totally disagree with building on the cricket/tennis/archery club, bowling club, and the Youth Club never mind on the allotments and worst of all on Tatton park woodland, this is outrageous use of green space and natural open land/woodland.

The full list of possible sites is supported by fairly detailed comments on each and, similarly, the responses of the Stakeholder Panel supporting their selection of favoured sites are given in some detail, making the selection much more credible.

Questions over suitability.

Do not agree with further built development adjacent to Tatton. Visually this area is part of the estate/park (or at least should be).

Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.
This site currently falls within an Area of Special County Value within the existing local plan. Furthermore it currently accommodates playing field and allotments. It also adjoins the Knutsford Golf Club and associated course. The site is therefore sensitive and has limited potential development opportunities. Furthermore there is no precedent existing for residential development on the eastern side of Mere Heath Lane.

In particular we would like to highlight parcels identified D and E on diagram 4 of the Town Strategy.

Parcel E sits within an area of special county value landscape and adjacent to the Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden designation of Tatton Park. Given the other development options that are available and the landscape constraints of this site, we would question the need to release this sensitive parcel of land.

Green belt, allotments and sports facilities would be lost.

Bowling green and allotments should be conserved.

The woodland and other facilities are too important to lose.

Green Belt area and should remain so. Significant loss of sports and leisure facilities on Manchester Rd/Mereheath Lane.

6.5 - this seems to have a double meaning - what do you mean 'to review Green Belt boundaries? Where do the future go for leisure? Needs a cycle and separate footpaths for people to walk on.

In part. Development should be restricted to area to south of the allotment to preserve the rural feel of Mereheath Lane and Tatton Park. The allotment land the others in town need to remain in situ as would take many years for a new site to become as fertile and those growing crops such as fruit to establish new plants.

The inclusion of Site E would incur a loss of woodland and public open space. The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option.

This is green belt land and those living in surrounding areas will have live disrupted views walks destroyed house values reduced and nobody wants a building site next door.

This is too close to Tatton Park.

This site is Green Belt. It conflicts with Knutsford’s Environment objective to protect green spaces around the town.

Any development would impact on the green belt.

This area has allotments which this strategy already gives priority and also has a beautiful piece of woodland - the only one on this side of town. Mereheath Lane is very unsuitable for increased traffic.

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, in isolation this site would represent an extended and isolated development that would not integrate with the existing build form of the town and would produce an incoherent form of development.

Too close to Tatton Park.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Woodland should not be sacrificed.

I think the waterworks could be developed as a brown field site but please leave the rest. Knutsford is famous for the boys club and many a child who can now walk to the centre will be upset if it goes. In destroying the cricket ground you also destroy the archery, tennis and squash clubs which are easily reached on foot.

I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites identified and developed this impact on sports facilities in the area which is what you are trying to promote

This site has allotments for which there is a waiting list. Removing them would remove a community
The woodland has high biodiversity, though there is a small patch of land that used to be used by Knutsford Bowling club that could be used for a small development, providing it if was within the keeping of the area. Added congestion of up to 500 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site in full would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

If traffic diverted to avoid Manchester Road.

This site has allotments for which there is a waiting list. Removing them would remove a community asset. The woodland has high biodiversity, though there is a small patch of land that used to be used by Knutsford Bowling club that could be used for a small development, providing it if was within the keeping of the area. Added congestion of up to 500 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site in full would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

Green Belt, Leave it alone.

Any new development here would be directly under the flight path. Mereheath Lane is used as a short cut to the Altrincham Road and many drivers do not observe the speed limit. There is nose to tail parking up one side of it at all times and it is particularly dangerous at the weekends when families are setting off to walk in the park. It becomes a traffic jam when there is any sort of holdup in the town centre. How is the traffic problem to be addressed? It will only be aggravated by developing this site. Also it would encroach on Tatton Park.

This site has allotments for which there is a waiting list. Removing them would remove a community asset. The woodland has high biodiversity, though there is a small patch of land that used to be used by Knutsford Bowling club that could be used for a small development, providing it if was within the keeping of the area. Added congestion of up to 500 vehicles to the North side of Knutsford would create environmental and economic problems that could drive away potential long term investment. Developing this site in full would null and void the vision, and goes against the objectives and strategy for realizing the vision within this plan.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt land, already well used by a variety of community resources.

Too close to Tatton and detrimental to woodland.

There should be no harmful effects on Tatton Parks.

Build on allotments and Tatton Park woodland is a disgrace.

Leisure only.

I value greatly the openness of the area adjacent to the park and would hate to see developments which would be detrimental; to this characteristics of Tatton.

Strongly disagree. Too close to Tatton Park; removes allotments when the objective is to increase them. Development here further encroaches on the identity of Tatton Park as well as removing another 'finger' of greenery almost to the town centre.

Strongly disagree. Maintain green buffer around Tatton Park.

My agreement is provided that there is a buffer between any new housing and Tatton Park.

Preserve the open space next to Tatton Park.

Agree - but only for housing (unless for replacing facilities), and only for the least possible house building (and not near woodland).

Green Belt!

Woodland should not be sacrificed.

Natural England notes the proposed use would cause a loss of public open space.
Not necessary.

This area contains many of the sporting activities of Knutsford. It is an attraction to the town and provides sport to young and old and is used by schools. Now contains cricket, tennis, squash, East Cheshire archery, rugby juniors. Don't spoil it.

All the approaches into Knutsford are pleasant with Green Belt on every side. Do you consider it fair to take the whole of the Green Belt on the north west side of the town? This is most unfair. Most of the development sites are one side of Knutsford - almost joining Knutsford to Mere and taking all the Green Belt on this side of town. It would make this area one large housing estate. I also feel the land is so water logged it is not suitable.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Keep allotments at all cost.

This land contains allotments so should not be considered.

Maintain present usage.

Don't destroy Green Belt, or you destroy the countryside and everything living there.

There are excellent sporting facilities already in these areas. They should be retained in their present form. The A50 and Mereheath Lane would require major work. almost to become dual carriage roads if the amount of housing proposed were to be built here.

What will happen to the leisure facilities?

Removal of woodland and building on edge of Tatton Park.

Valuable woodland and allotments.

Loss of woodland would be great shame (particularly as STAG are complaining about the loss of trees) but is not all woodland.

This land is sports amenity for the town.

Allotments and resident area not for mixed use.

Insufficient information and loss of allotments.

Mereheath lane has several sports, golf and recreational clubs along route. Will add to the congestion generally, dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.

Does Green Belt not mean anything anymore?

Too near to Tatton Park and would spoil the environment around it.

Areas C, D & E are very important to the local community, are used by large number of children and adults and offer activities unavailable elsewhere. It would be a huge loss to the town if we were to lose this area to houses. Its is essential for a sustainable community.

Tennis club should remain on their present sites. The area should be left alone.

Impact on environment, nature and community sports.

Against development of sites A TO E as they are located in the Green Belt.

Small housing development - upmarket detached homes - Tatton Park Estate.
One scheme already drawn up in outline would involve a massive development on sites CDE which in itself would provide up to 1000 houses (ie nearly all of the 1200 maximum forecast need) as well as disrupting the area previously shown in the Macclesfield DC forerunner Local Plan as ‘a designated sports area’. Such large developments should not be allowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site E - The site is currently used for allotments, houses a bowling club, a golf club, water works and there is a dense area of mature woodland on the site. Again the sports uses would need to be relocated. Additionally, the site is an area of special county value, abuts a protective landscape area to the east and a conservation area to the south.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site G: Land to the north and east of Parkgate Trading Estate

Do you agree or disagree with site G as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 79% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (65%); Disagree (35%)

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much aircraft noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area liable to flooding and if built on may well cause problems with environment down stream. Poor access and likely to cause traffic problems. Loss of viable farmland and poor vehicular access without enhancements to Parkgate lane or creation of new railway bridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree it is ok for some commercial development but be careful of destroying natural environment edge of Tatton. Expansion a total non starter unless new access road across railway to Parkgate business estate. Not suitable for housing due to Aircraft noise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be developed, however better links through Mobberley would need to be considered as well has a bus station hub and facilities for children e.g., parks and schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is by far the better option and fits around existing housing and would allow Knutsford to retain its unique identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote area capable of development - consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the only area which is not Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some but not all. Better to move the Parkgate industrial estate to near the motorway and replace with houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited impact on existing residents. Good space for developments and enough space to build supporting community facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would enhance a depressed area of Knutsford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong thoughts about this one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perhaps non green-field areas could be developed.

Close to schools in an already built up area.

There is existing development here - mixed use for starter homes and small businesses

Small developments of affordable housing in keeping with the local area

Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

Green Belt.

But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.

Consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable homes

Agree on the basis of employment development only if land is not available on the area that is most logical for commercial access to the motorway e.g. the land currently occupied by the lower school

Only if aircraft noise is at an acceptable level

Before any more development is allowed in the Parkgate area there need to be another access road built.

This is green belt land & should not be considered for development.

In principle already earmarked and is not green belt but not enough school places at local schools

Flood risk too great.

I have several objections to developing this site: 1. Why would you even consider building on land that is "within a flood risk area"? 2. Aircraft noise, even in my part of town (WA16 9DG), is occasionally bad enough, but out at Site G it will no doubt be unbearable. 3. This site is too far removed from the town centre so would need drastically improved transport links - maybe a new railway station? 4. Allied to 3, is there a danger this estate would be effectively isolated from the town itself, both culturally and economically? In fact, I believe the town has already spread too far in the northerly direction.

Agree but cannot understand why no second access has been built under the railway. I gather a developer some years ago offered to build this if he was allowed to develop the land where Bentley's now is but was turned down. Did Bentley's offer anything towards this??

If Knutsford has to have development, this area would be the least damaging to the town.

Suitable for employment and commerce. Not residential.

This area is already partly developed and would have the best impact on Knutsford residents, without affecting the look and feel of the town.

NO

would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - concerned for the countryside and the effect on neighbouring Tatton Park

Yes - for mixed use (but not the 6ha green belt).

Green Belt

I would agree if the boundary of the site was set to exclude the flood risk area.

NO

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of 'mixed use' is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

Good location for more housing.

The only possible time I would agree to any new housing being built is the demolition of the unused parcels of the present trading estate. No green belt or land should be utilised. Brown sites only should be used.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan

The whole development of this Site is dependent on access. Create new access routes and this site could be perfect.

Although site with least Green Belt, flood risk appears to be significant
Flood risk area, with the ongoing environmental changes look for alternative areas for redevelopment.

No development needed.

With over 20% above capacity for industrial units within Knutsford the building of more industrial units seems to be a waste of time and money, however if this area was developed correctly cheaper/starter housing could be built for Knutsfordians that cannot at present afford their own home. If Knutsford took the bull by the horns and agreed that we should share our burden of population growth we should have 7% or 427 more housing units. Using the land here that has already been agreed on 480 new houses could be built. Going into the other 6 ha a primary school and shop area could be incorporated, with land to spare to form a village green/park. This would enable public transport links to the new "village" and help with the workers on the industrial site and any transport problems they may have.

This will merge Knutsford into the neighbouring village of Mobberley, is under the direct path of airlines into and out of Manchester Airport.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Only potentially deliverable if new road connection provided under railway. However primary issue with sites to east is vehicular access. Mobberley Road and in particular its entry into town centre at Hollow Lane is at capacity for extended periods. Capacity of road network into town centre from east is the lowest of any corridor into town centre and there is no potential for developments to fund alternative improvements when compared with sites to north west or west of the town. Additional traffic will add to existing issues on what is also the busiest bus corridor into town and where service reliability is already impacted upon by traffic congestion. At best site should be used for further employment.

Ideal with little added traffic congestion.

This should be for commercial development ONLY and only after access is improved

Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

This is the only site which is not entirely situated on greenbelt. The factors stated which could impinge development such as flood risk could be overcome in the design of the development.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is

Your stakeholders clearly have not visited the site and been there when the plastic factory is in full swing and the obnoxious smell that drifts out

None of the site currently within the Green Belt should be taken for employment development it should form a substantial buffer to Tatton Park from the balance of the site which has, historically, been considered for employment purposes. This would not be an appropriate housing site as there would be conflict between housing and employment traffic especially at the junction on to Mobberley Road. Access in to this area should be via a crossing of the railway line.

It is not just access arrangements that would need changing. Mobberley Road is not suitable for such an increase in traffic, and neither is the town, particularly Adams Hill with its junctions at top and bottom.

This is the only site that is not entirely green belt

THE ACCESS TO THIS AREA NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED

If any land needs to be developed this is the only site not in the Green Belt but focus should be solely on affordable housing which was the only housing concern expressed in any of the surveys I've seen and then only by a minority of Knutsford residents

Access to town would be impossible.

This is the most appropriate place for any kind of development. Road links are better but still need much improving. It is brown belt land and therefore is more in keeping with environmental protection. This may help increase the current industry in the area.
But this is not a suitable residential site due to flood risk and waste water treatmant plant.

Limited impact on residents

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

Knutsford is located in the Birkin Brook water Body (GB112 069 061 340), a Priority water body at Poor Ecological Status (objective is "Good" status by 2015; macro-invertebrate and fish classifications, and Physico-Chemical Status, are already Good). Any development should include measures to protect surface water quality. We welcome the inclusion in the Environment Strategy of commitments to enhance the town's greenspaces and areas of water. Of the sites considered suitable for development by the stakeholder panel, Areas F, G & K incorporate or are adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites: any development should include measures to prevent degradation or loss of these.

The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, eg retail development in site k. if the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. theses would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities.

Only problem again is extra traffic.

Natural expansion to Trading estate and improved links.

I understand it is the only brownfield land in/around Knutsford.

Possible development site as is not Green Belt.

Particularly for mixed use.

Brownfield.

If a site has to be allocated at least choose a brownfield site.

There should be no further development on greenfield or green belt sites, in flood risk areas or around ponds. Because of the location of Tatton Park it is not possible to increase access opportunities to the town centre from this side of town.

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Mobberley Road which is already an issue of concern.

This is thee only area I think we should be considering developing which is marked out in the town plan. It is an existing brownfield site. It would need better connection to Mobberley Road across the railway. I am not sure further industrial units would be of any benefit with so many of the existing ones being empty.

Ultimately if there was a metro link then potential for a stop here

This is too far away from the town centre and too out on a limb.

Possibly, at least on the part that is not green belt. But, must improve access by another road over / under the railway line, so there are at least 2 ways in and out.

Should be for employment in office or light industrial use only, with extra access from the main road.

Green belt.

Looks like a good area for development, especially taking into account that some of it is "brownfield"

If land is required for development the this is the only option not in the Green Belt but should only be considered for first time buyers or more affordable housing which was the only housing need that I've seen stated in any of the survey documents and then only by a minority of residents.
Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

If some housing must be built (Although I am not in any way convinced of the need) this is the one area which is not green belt, and therefore the only one which I would even consider. Although I still disagree, it's a less strong disagree than the other sites.

The only bit of none green belt, plan on developing here if you must.

As most of this site is not in the green belt this may be a suitable place to develop, however, as it is not large enough alone to meet the housing demand, site A would be preferable.

This land is not so visible to daily passing traffic, and whilst it is wrong to lose any Green Belt, if developments have to occur it would be better here than on the North West of Town. The visual and environmental impact will be far less here. This is already a developed area and the expansion of it would not encroach on other settlements. Due to the boundary with Tatton Park, there could be no further expansion on this land and thus no future threat to the loss of green belt or encroachment on other settlements.

Although green belt includud in this area, building here will not cause visual pollution.

Airport plans massive expansion. Are you seriously suggesting building underneath the flight paths.

Agree as long as changes enhance the living for those who live on Longridge and that their facilities and access are improved. Access is a serious issue.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. Part of this site is within a flood risk area. It would therefore be irresponsible to develop it.

This site already has plans to build attached to it.

Although I agree that this site could be considered for development, access is a very major concern, with Parkgate Lane and already congested area due to the shops and industrial estate. Access via an underpass under the railway must be a pre-requisite of this land being developed, while traffic issues along Mobberley Road must also be considered. Mobberley Road should for example be narrowed considerably in width, to remove the appearance of a trunk road. Hollow Lane and Brook Street must also be explored and improved. Ideally, directing traffic bound for Macclesfield along Toft Road and Seven Sisters Lane, rather than Brook Lane, should alleviate problems in this area.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

The full list of possible sites is supported by fairly detailed comments on each and, similarly, the responses of the Stakeholder Panel supporting their selection of favoured sites are given in some detail, making the selection much more credible.

Questions over suitability. Part within Green Belt - development should be considered carefully in terms of visual impact and integrity if the park.

Conditional on design and layout and that a suitable edge to settlement is created. This area currently gives a poor first impression of town from railway. Additional access is essential.

Part planning permissions already given access across railway to be constructed.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

G & K are also suitable because of local access to employment area and proximate Fire Station.

The site is currently identified in the existing local plan as a proposed employment area and an existing employment area adjoining Parkgate Industrial Estate. It has no direct connection with existing residential development. Furthermore it is considered to be too remote from the town centre and would therefore not be sufficiently sustainable.

Parcel G is an allocated employment site in the adopted Local Plan. Given its location on the north east edge of the town it is less accessible to facilities such as schools and leisure facilities than any of the other alternative sites. The surrounding area is characterised by employment and poor access. We
would therefore question whether this site provides the appropriate amenity for a future residential development but it could provide options for expansion of the existing employment uses at Parkgate Trading Estate.

| I believe that developing any flood-risk area is asking for trouble. |
| Difficulties of rail line and only one old railway bridge to take traffic, need for infrastructure in place before any building takes place |
| Does not seem to be ideal area for housing and would be better used entirely for employment as originally planned. If large scale development takes place the opening of Parkgate should be considered. |
| Site G is located in an area of flood risk and has limited access to public transport and scores seventeenth out of all twenty sites in terms of its sustainability. The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option. |
| If absolutely necessary. unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree |
| This is too close to Tatton Park and too remote from the town centre. |
| Agree apart from Green Belt land. The impact on traffic congestion and schools would have to be resolved before any houses should be built. |
| The majority of this site currently does not sit within the green belt. There are easy access routes into the town centre. Its already a designated development area. For people without cars, it is within close proximity to 2 of the largest trading estates, which may increase employment opportunities. |
| Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town. |
| Farmland to be retained as food is more important. |
| Less damage to the green belt and our treasured facilities. Clearly there is an opportunity to develop on brown field sites too. |
| Brownfield, go for it. |
| I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites identified and developed. road access must be improved. |
| With over 20% above capacity for industrial units within Knutsford the building of more industrial units seems to be a waste of time and money. However, if this area was developed correctly, cheaper/starter housing could be built for Knutsfordians that cannot at present afford their own home. If Knutsford grows in proportion with the rest of East Cheshire. The burden of population growth Knutsford should have is just 7% or 427 more housing units. Using the land here that has already been agreed on 480 new houses could be built. Going into the other 6 ha a primary school and shop area could be incorporated, with land to spare to form a village green/park. This would enable public transport links to the new "village" and help with the workers on the industrial site and any transport problems they may have. |

With over 20% above capacity for industrial units within Knutsford the building of more industrial units seems to be a waste of time and money. However, if this area was developed correctly, cheaper/starter housing could be built for Knutsfordians that cannot at present afford their own home. If Knutsford grows in proportion with the rest of East Cheshire. The burden of population growth Knutsford should have is just 7% or 427 more housing units. Using the land here that has already been agreed on 480 new houses could be built. Going into the other 6 ha a primary school and shop area could be incorporated, with land to spare to form a village green/park. This would enable public transport links to the new "village" and help with the workers on the industrial site and any transport problems they may have.
I do not believe that the area already identified for development should have been agreed, this is a wildlife corridor and as such should have been correctly surveyed. To build on here at the levels suggested at the recent meeting I attended is I believe unacceptable, if housing needs to be built then a small amount of social housing and first time buyer homes could be built here instead of further development of the industrial estate...meaning that the current access route could be used as it stands, without further decimating green belt land...I am extremely concerned by the suggestion of an access road in dog wood....this information was given at a public meeting at brook street heritage centre during proposals being put forward by Henry Brook, the developer. This area is currently used by many people in Knutsford for access to Tatton Park...the Birkin Brook provides a wonderful wildlife corridor and the suggestion of building a road under the railway bridge in such close proximity to it, onto an already congested Mobberley Road is disgraceful. This will cause the estates locally to be used as rat runs by the traffic that builds up, this already happens to a large extent. The first impression for those travelling in to Knutsford by train will be a sprawling mass of development. There is much objection amongst those that know.

No building on any area liable to flood should be allowed

But the traffic on the Mobberley Road is bad at the best of times. This would make it worse. In fact there should be no more development of any sort in Knutsford until we have a bypass.

With over 20% above capacity for industrial units within Knutsford the building of more industrial units seems to be a waste of time and money. However, if this area was developed correctly, cheaper/starter housing could be built for Knutsfordians that cannot at present afford their own home. If Knutsford grows in proportion with the rest of East Cheshire. The burden of population growth Knutsford should have is just 7% or 427 more housing units. Using the land here that has already been agreed on 480 new houses could be built. Going into the other 6 ha a primary school and shop area could be incorporated, with land to spare to form a village green/park. This would enable public transport links to the new "village" and help with the workers on the industrial site and any transport problems they may have.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Limited development to the SE portion only would be acceptable

Access is a problem.

Additionally, given the empty units on Parkgate convert some of this area to housing. The long sought improvements to Mobberley Rd (separate entry and exits?) are essential

Strongly disagree. Maintain green buffer around Tatton Park

Am concerned about the flood risks.

This is too far from the town centre to be used for housing or mixed development.

possibly this could be looked at for development

Not a good location for new homes: Site is under flight path, adjacent to rail line, and next to sewage works. Needs new access under rail line.

Green Belt!

Farmland to be retained as food is more important.

Green belt must be saved here.

Green belt must be saved.

But as a self contained community with a primary school and shops, but no work units. The lake could be landscaped to create a village green; some for extra allotments

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if
our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Houses and school.

Agree for development.

This site provides a great opportunity as it is outside the Green Belt.

This site provides a great opportunity as it is currently outside the Green Belt

Using this land does not affect any existing residents and will link in with the connectivity plan as well.

Potential to develop new employment area. Better road links required.

Exit from here via Bentley garage will cause massive problems on Mobberley Road, Hollow Lane and Adams Hill.

Access would cause severe traffic problems.

OK to complete the business park area.

Development would benefit local people and enhance area for residents.

Providing a new access road is built into the trading estate.

Although what is mixed use.

This seems a good location and convenient.

Why have you only given reasons of suitability on preferred sites + no reasons on other sites? Odd.

This is already used for light industry and could be expanded.

Development in sites F-J will increase traffic generation an add to congestion in town centre, thereby requirement of northern and southern by-pass!

Affordable housing

Area G - The site is allocated as employment land. It has been allocated for many years but has never been delivered. The site abuts an industrial estate and is dissected from the town by a railway line. Access to the site is taken over the rail line; this presents potential highway and deliverability issues as an additional bridge/means of access may be required to access the site.

Poor access. Potentially sever traffic congestion.
Site K: Land to the south of Longridge

Do you agree or disagree with site K as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 78% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (46%); Disagree (54%)

A petition containing 461 signatories objecting to the inclusion of the site as a preferred option has been submitted.

The petition is against the development of Site K as this land contains Springwood, which is listed as Ancient Woodland, of which there is only 2% left in the entire UK. The area contains an abundance of beautiful wildlife and plant species. We are concerned not only for the woodland, but also, with regards to amenities, school places, doctor’s surgeries and dentists, which are already in short supply and the additional traffic congestion to our town.

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too far from the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly inappropriate. Existing public open space to the South West should be retained. Area liable to flooding and if built on may well cause problems with adjacent site of special scientific interest. Poor access and likely to cause traffic problems. Area to South West should be enhanced and Booths Mere turned into a public park. Existing woodland and tree lined roads should be retained. Issues with aircraft noise would make proposed development unsuitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is close to land in Mobberley already approved for building. Site has public footpaths across. Close to farm land. Includes playing field/ football open space that needs retaining improving or replacing if more houses are built nearby. Booths mere signals high underlying water table. Do not put a large supermarket here but neighbourhood facilities need looking at in Longridge and Parkgate. A community meeting building without alcohol licence needs consideration. Do not make social housing only as this will create a ghetto on this side of Town. Impact of aircraft noise needs considering, would you live there?.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the most favourable site as this area is currently not used as farm land. However better links through Mobberley would need to be considered as well has a bus station hub and facilities for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

**Site K: Land to the south of Longridge**
children e.g., parks and schools. Improvements to local shopping would also need to be guaranteed.

No trading.

We have precious few very very limited areas for sport on this side of town, the fields at Booths are part of our plan to have as an asset transfer and develop the area for sport and recreation on this side of Knutsford, the woods and fields play an integral part of this scheme.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.

Again by far the best option.

Capable of development - consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable housing. Flood risk.

Allotments, orchards.

Already too much housing for the infrastructure on this side of town.

Limited impact on existing residents though we are concerned that we may merge into Mobberley.

This would enhance a depressed area of Knutsford.

No strong thoughts about this one.

Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.

Green belt, contains playing field should be protected if possible.

Close to schools in an already built up area.

I or J would be better. Although K could be considered- however playing area and flood risk may be a problem. Booths Mere has an artificial bank and an over flow. This has caused problems in the past when the sluice has been opened and water has flooded the playing area.

This is an area of natural grassland and wooded areas providing much needed space for our local wildlife. This area should definitely not be developed.

Seems like the best option to start with.

Small developments of affordable housing in keeping with the local area.

Really keen to bring some more mixed housing on the Mobberley side of Longridge - and renaming streets with individual names - to get rid of the ghetto nature of Longridge and to widen out facilities for people living on this side of town.

Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

The potential threat to Booths Mere and nature conservation area. It is an important open space for Longridge resident.

A need to preserve the St Helena Chapel, also the existing conservation areas.

Could expand here.

Please don't take away this area of green land, particularly the football field and the field in front of Booths Mere. It gives people valuable breathing space and lovely countryside to look at while going about their daily lives. The area would look incredibly run down if the development was even bigger. Improve housing within Longridge but don't take away the areas that make it look better.

But not much development needed! Therefore not all sites will be needed.

Capable of development.

Agree on the basis of a small housing development in association with retail, community, health and social care developments would enhance services in an area that is quite a distance from services in the town centre.

Northern half only, southern half should be green space.

As long as there is a mix of green spaces and development.

Any upgrading of his area would be welcome.

This is lovely open countryside and used regularly by children and locals for sport and recreation.
This is green belt land & should not be considered for development.

Strongly object to any development around the open fields (including football pitch) around Booths. Don't think any more shops required. If only affordable housing/social housing then its going to area into more of a problem then already is Why isn't there any infill used. Not enough school places at local schools.

Keep playing fields. Also this is in a flood risk area.

There are many factors mitigating against the development of Site K; for example: flooding risk? loss of playing field; loss of pond; too close to nature conservation priority area.

Increased congestion loss of open spaces effect on wild life habitat adjacent area of special scientific interest.

If Knutsford has to have development, this area would have less damage to the town than areas A, B, C, D and E.

Some development already. Could expand retail outlets.

Building on the playing fields shared by Longridge and North Downs residents should not be allowed. There are no other green spaces for the residents to use and it would change the feel of the whole area.

NO.

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with. Concerned that the roads just cannot cope with the increased traffic in that area - would affect the playing field and pond and I have concerns for the nature conservation area. This would adversely affect the countryside and wildlife and the residential roads would suffer due to the increased traffic.

Not large enough - but could be OK for light industry.

Green Belt.

Agree if adequate protection is given from adjacent flood risk area.

NO.

I find it very difficult to draw specific decisions on this part of the Plan without having a clearer idea of what type of ‘mixed use’ is proposed. But would accept that these are suitable areas for development.

Good location for more housing.

Longridge is a sprawling estate as it is - it the Council wanted an example of why mass house building should not now take place in Knutsford- this is it. There is little social cohesion in Longridge and it does not enhance the town. Don't make the same mistake again.

The Sites G, H, I, J, & K are areas which would benefit from mixed development. That side of Knutsford has very few amenities, no large supermarket within easy reach, no leisure facilities, shortage of medical facilities and schools, but land that would not affect existing residents and is also not prime agricultural land. The development of this area to include low cost housing, school, sports facilities and a supermarket would not only benefit this side of Knutsford but would also benefit the residents of Mobberley.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan. The proximity of Longridge estate limits its desirability for mixed housing. It would need another school in the area. It would need improvements to the traffic flow to/from Knutsford town centre.

There is a pattern of affordable housing in the area so development could be done. The additional housing would need to be complimented by additional facilities, retail and leisure, as well as medical and schools.

Some suggestion that perhaps this would enhance the adjacent areas by bringing in leisure, retail and community sites. That said, still requires the demolition of Green Field and the introduction of unwanted housing and commercial property.

Flood risk and playing field, again look for other options for redevelopment.

No development needed.
It's adjacent to a flood risk area!!!!!

This area should not be developed as a housing estate but some of the site could be used to supply local shops. I believe that there is a local need for allotments in this area as there are at present non on this side of town.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Site with best bus service in Knutsford but road access very poor. Only really satisfactory if sites l, m,n combined and road connecting through to Toft road from Mobberley road provided. This would relieve Mobberley Road and also potentially allow F and G to be developed without adversely impacting on access into town and enabling efficient operation of bus services from this end of the town.

Excluding the football pitch and Booths Mere.

Limited development would tidy up area and provide additional facilities.

Any greenbelt sites within Knutsford should not be built on, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is.

if you can really get the bus system out there. this has been dominated by social housing and needs proper architecture not experimental.

This would be taking land that is well used for recreational purposes by residents in the area and could well affect the nature conservation priority area indicated in the current Local Plan. Development here would increase cross town traffic congestion.

Small scale development should be considered, incorporating the playing field and nature conservation area as described. Rumour has it that there is a legal problem about access to this land - is there?

This is green belt land and should be protected.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

I believe that this land is green belt and should therefore not be developed upon.

No crash site for the Airport.

Houses are not needed here especially as Booths mere is here. Perhaps it could be used as an area for allotments or community recreation for that ward of knutsford.

But only if the playing field can be relocated in close proximity. A buffer zone needs to be established around the nature conservation site.

Limited impact on residents and better connections to the south

A new large community with retail will spoil the town environment of Knutsford and take business away from the town centre shops.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

Knutsford is located in the Birkin Brook water Body (GB112 069 061 340), a Priority water body at Poor Ecological Status (objective is "Good" status by 2015; macro-invertebrate and fish classifications, and Physico-Chemical Status, are already Good). Any development should include measures to protect surface water quality. We welcome the inclusion in the Environment Strategy of commitments to enhance the town's greenspaces and areas of water. Of the sites considered suitable for development by the stakeholder panel, Areas F, G & K incorporate or are adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites: any development should include measures to prevent degradation or loss of these. In relation to parcel K, we would also like to see details of any improvement works to be done along Birlin Brook.
The scale of all of the development on all of the favoured sites is extremely vague, and no explanations are given in the document for the omission of the original potential sites. The favoured development sites could cater for up to 8 times the required housing requirements. There is mention of the need for increased local facilities to meet demand, e.g. retail development in site K. If the number of favoured sites were increased by the addition of some if not all of the rejected sites this could result in much smaller developments, with a maximum of between 20 and 60 homes per site. These would have little or no impact on the existing infrastructure and amenities. There is mention of "It was considered that there may be an opportunity to increase retail opportunities in this area to expand the choice within the existing neighbourhood centre." The existing retail centre as described must refer to the Longridge shopping area, which used to be a useful and well used facility.

we are now left with a Chinese and Indian takeaway, a mediocre convenience store and a community cafe. The writing is surely on the wall, if the facilities are not required or used they will once again disappear.

Only problem again is extra traffic.

Natural expansion to Trading estate and improved links.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

There should be no further development on greenfield or green belt sites, in flood risk areas, ancient woodland or around ponds or meres or adjacent to nature conservation areas. A large part of this area has not been farmed or fertilised for many years and has returned to its natural state, rich in wildlife (butterflies, dragon flies, rose bay willow herb, crab apples, blackberries etc). It forms the only green corridor between St John's Wood and the green belt. New homes here would destroy all this and put more pressure on already stretched services. It would also put added pressure on the Manor Park Schools and Mobberley Road/Adams Hill traffic bottlenecks. Longridge and Mobberley Road retail outlets are under utilised so there is no case for more. This general area already has under used commercial areas at Parkgate and Longridge Trading Estates so there is no case for yet another commercial area. Development adjacent to flood risk areas increases the risk of flooding because it hinders the ability of water to soak away naturally into the surrounding natural flood plain so please don't interfere with this process.

New development in this area will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution through the town centre and on Mobberley Road which is already an issue of concern.

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

I can see this working, although replacement sports facilities would need to be provided.

Possibly, but it is still greenbelt. It is also adjacent to flood risk area and to nature conservation priority area. Would need infrastructure changes such as shops, buses and more places at Manor Park Primary School.

Should only build housing, and this to be opposite Longridge Estate, leaving existing open space at junction of Higher Downs/Longridge.

Green belt and ancient woodland.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

This area provides a lovely natural haven for wildlife and pleasant surroundings for the estate. The area around Booths Mere and the football field is regularly used by dog walkers and families.

This site is a haven for wildlife, and is designated as ancient woodland and Greenbelt. It is also in flood risk area.
risk area, and adjacent to a nature conservation area, where there are foxes, and buzzards. The shops in this area are under used making more retail unnecessary. The traffic problems that this extra housing would cause would be horrendous. Higher Downs is very busy at school times, because of the two Primary schools and the congestion caused by traffic emerging on Mobberley Road would be a bottle neck on this side of Knutsford. The gas repairs that have recently been in force in the town have given everybody a taste of what the extra traffic would mean for local residents. New housing should be built on brown field sites and also not within the noisy limits of Manchester airport.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county.

Nature reserve, playing field, etc should not be removed. This too goes against the purported aims of the plan regarding heritage and environment.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

I don't think this area should be developed - the booths hall area - with the mere is like a small nature reserve and should be retained as such.

In many ways the arguments in favour of G are relevant here too. In addition, there is a wonderful opportunity to build something very special in order to improve the environment around Longridge. If all of the Vision principles are applied and adhered to, a development here could significantly improve the quality of life of the existing residents. I am not all in favour of losing green belt. However, if the developments must happen, this should be the place, as the improvements to this area outweigh the loss. This site will have far less negative visual impact than other sites.

Building here will not cause visual pollution and would provide an opportunity to improve facilities in the area for existing residents.

This land is in the Green Belt and adjacent to a Nature Conservation Area: there is a pond and risk of flooding.

KCHG is concerned that some of this land may contain areas of SSSI and potential Ancient Woodland, and would therefore proposed that such areas of this plot are protected, and only areas not included with the classifications above are included for development consideration.

Agree as long as changes enhance the living for those who live on Longridge and that their facilities and access are improved.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. Part of this site is within a flood risk area. It would therefore be irresponsible to develop it. This site is adjacent to a nature conservation area and so provides an environmental corridor.

Retail outlets nearby, on Longridge, have not proved very successful so this site may not be very successful either. Other commercial activity should not be introduced into an area which is presently used purely for housing.

The eastern side of the town has seen the most significant development post war, and has now reached unsustainable levels on infrastructure, and lack of connections to the rest of the town. This side of the town already feels very separated from the rest of Knutsford, and any development in this area must be focused on redressing this balance before adding any more houses. I would prefer to see enhancement of Longridge, the community centre and general facilities.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

How can anyone contemplate building on land with potential flood risk?

Site K: Booths Mere is an SBI and Birkin Brook is a Nature Conservation Priority Area. Submissions from a local resident suggest that this site may be of high biodiversity value and edged by ancient woodland. From a nature conservation point of view this may therefore be one of the more valuable sites. Other constraints include power lines and a PROW. Aerial photos (Google Maps) show that the site is crossed by casual user paths which suggest extensive unofficial use, especially on the northern half (trail bikes?)
Too far from town centre and cannot understand it being ‘favoured’, particularly if it is adjacent to a flood risk zone and nature conservation area. Also doubt there is the population to support retail in this isolated location.

Unattractive land - looks brownfield.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

G & K are also suitable because of local access to employment area and proximate Fire Station.

The site currently accommodates a designated open space and playing fields in the existing local plan. There is also a large nature conservation area within the land and it adjoins a nature conservation priority area. Therefore the site is sensitive with limited development opportunities.

Site K is referred to as having the potential for providing enhanced retail provision and housing accommodation for the Longridge Estate. Feedback on the stakeholder panels was that this would provide a much needed facility together with potential recreation facilities, albeit would need to replace any playing field lost as part of any development. This was seen very much as addressing existing issues rather than providing for significant growth in the town. This location is again relatively remote from the town centre and would need careful consideration given proximity to an area of flood risk and being adjacent to a nature conservation area as identified on the adopted Plan Proposals Map.

Development here could help revitalise and sustain the existing settlement although consideration would need to be given to how this could be maintained given its relative distance from the centre of town.

Ancient woodland and preservation? Road infrastructure needed to cope with extra traffic; traffic calming.

Facility for Longridge Flood risk.

Keep as Green Space, St Helens Chapel - site of historic importance

Provision for sports facilities should be made either within this or on open land west of Longridge to avoid all residents having to travel across town to the present facilities.

The sites that are considered favourable all have similar constraints relating to the loss of landscape character, the loss of historic landscape character and the loss of agricultural land classified between Grades 2 and 3. It therefore is important to take into account how sustainably located each site is when establishing whether it should be considered as a preferred option.

If absolutely necessary.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

Threatens nature conservation area. It is Green Belt, but there is a proposal for retail development, a need for which has not been established.

This site is Green Belt. It conflicts with Knutsford’s Environment objective to protect green spaces around the town.

Any development would impact on the green belt

Mainly buffer extension to Longridge.

Some small-scale development would be good for the area as long as the woodland and nature conservation are respected.

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, I agree that development of this site could contribute towards improving local shopping and services in this part of the town and thereby contribute towards a more sustainable pattern of development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed
Woodland to be retained.
Green belt should mean something!
I would agree but would prefer to see brown field sites identified and developed - road access must be improved

This area has already undergone a lot of development in recent years, with the addition of a large number of houses/flats. Many of these new developments are still empty, as the area is not considered a popular choice for a home with the residents of Knutsford. It would therefore be more sensible to provide new housing developments elsewhere in the town, which may prove more popular and therefore may actually ease the problem surrounding the lack of housing for young professionals. In addition, there is a large lake on the site which, as the town plan points out, is a flood risk and building on this site would also destroy the playing fields and nature areas that are sparse in this area of the town. Finally, this area would not provide housing that is close to the town centre and therefore, according to the Stakeholder’s priorities, should not be considered as a "high priority area" for housing.

This site is already used significantly by the local community for recreational purposes, it contains ancient woodland dating back to 1570 and scrubland into which the woodland is regenerating, there are many oak trees of 15 to 20m years old, along with significant wildlife...this is a beautiful place used by many people in the area and there is much objection locally amongst those who are aware of these proposals. it is in close proximity to Booths mere which is an SSSI. This area should be protected.

Excellent choice. It has infrastructure and attractive natural features and would be a natural progression in development.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and it's already busy enough! I also disagree with putting all of the affordable housing in one area of the town. If there is going to be affordable housing it should be scattered throughout different areas.

Limited development to include community facilities

Please refer to comments above. The existing road junctions are not capable of accommodating an increase in traffic and are unsatisfactory even for existing traffic. It would not be economically possible to increase the capacity of these junctions due to the constraints of existing development. The existing sight lines at the junctions described above do not conform to current highway design standards. Site K is subject to serious flooding, particularly near to Birch Grove. This would be a problem for future house insurance.

This is already an area that would benefit from development.

Especially if this is the chosen location for affordable housing.

Would unbalance the east as opposed to west of the town in terms of housing and exacerbate access and traffic movements to the town centre

Site K, which includes Booths Mere is considered a potential site for development. The mere is visually important in views from Booths Hall and any development should include management of the existing edge planting and its enhancement, linking the existing playing field to countryside.

Am concerned about the flood risks.

Land is already built up in that area of the town.

This is Green Belt land and Booths Mere has protected ecological status.

If development has to go anywhere, I think it should be here (for reasons given earlier). But otherwise, I’d oppose this.

Possible development area

Green Belt!

Woodland to be retained.
As identified within the Knutsford Town Strategy Sustainability Appraisal (SA), this site contains a designated Site of Biological Importance and lies in close proximity to another similar site. Any developments within a close proximity to these sites could have a negative impact on the biodiversity within these sites.

Save and protect ancient woodland.

Save and protect ancient woodland.

Again this is turning this area into much more of a built up area.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

I would like to place my objection to the proposed development of the Longridge area within the Knutsford plan. I believe it would create a traffic problem when more people try to use the road near the school where cars park all the time on Higher Downs to get to the school. It also seems to be destroying the football pitch which gets used in the summer.

Agree for development.

Limited value as out of town link to Chelford Road can be made.

Access from Longridge already poor at trading estate. Access via Higher Downs is narrow, congested near school, bad turning into Chelford Road. Drainage in area not good - very high water table.

Land is waterlogged - unsafe for houses

OK to partial in fill.

Development would benefit local people and enhance area for residents.

While Parkgates land may be suitable, it seems a pity to build close to Booth’s Mere.

No to destroying ancient woodland.

the residents of Longridge enjoy the environs of open countryside.

A small area could be considered for development of affordable housing.

Affordable housing and detached housing if entrance from Chelford Rd

Area K comprises the parcel of land promoted by Dewscope Ltd, as shown on the attached site location plan, and the council-owned playing fields immediately to the south-west. The site is included in the 2012 SHLAA update. It is identified as being suitable (subject to a change in policy), available and achievable for development in years 5-10. The SHLAA identifies a potential net capacity of 330 units. It is identified in the consultation document for the delivery of 250-400 dwellings. The land south of Longridge, Knutsford is identified as one of the council’s preferred sites, and we consider that it should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development. Area K would comprise a logical and sustainable small-scale urban extension of Knutsford. It is capable of meeting housing needs, and its development would also bring about regeneration and economic benefits. We consider that it should be allocated for residential development early in the plan period. This would also allow the regeneration and economic benefits to be realised immediately, in accordance with the NPPF and the governments stated objectives for growth.

Poor drainage. Severe strain on infrastructure, Longridge already a rat run. Interference with ind
estate.
Site F: Land to the west of Parkgate Lane

Do you agree or disagree with site F as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 76% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (50%); Disagree (50%)

Comments:
- Loss of viable farming land is not supported. Poor vehicular access.
- Capacity Not needed - Access not sustainable with one route into Parkgate.
- Green Belt
- Amenities (shops) and transport required.
- NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.
- I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.
- Capable of development - not a preferred site in my view
- This seem an obvious are for development as well within the town.
- Moving too close to Mobberley.
- Need a buffer zone for Tatton park
- Limited impact on residents and fits well with the site at G. Fairer distribution than the preferred options as it spreads the impact and thus meaning the impact is not only felt by those in the North East Knutsford.
- This would enhance a depressed area of Knutsford
- No strong thoughts about this one.
- If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas.
- This is more central than some of the other sites recommended and near existing shop etc
- Access would need to be sorted out so site G is preferable
- Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.
- Green Belt.
- Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites?
- This site is self contained and could accommodate a Metrolink Station and medical centre. This
therefore seems the most important site in Knutsford to consider

Capable of development.

Too close to Tatton Park.

The development of site F alongside site G, which is currently outside the greenbelt, could vastly improve the facilities in this part of town and make a real difference to people's lives.

The development of site F could really improve the facilities in this part of the town and make a real difference to people's lives.

As long as aircraft noise is acceptable

Mainly farmland but need second access to Parkgate

This seems suitable for housing but Parkgate Lane MUST be widened along its whole length.

But with the usual reservations concerning ponds, potential flooding and the need for integration with the rest of the community. I would comment on this entire section (Sites F-T) that as I understand it these have already been rejected, so why are we being asked to waste our time in this survey?

I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development. It would seem more suitable than zones A, B, C, D, and E given the proximity to town and the benefits from developing this area.

Why is this not suitable?

This would have the least impact on local residents and could suit both residential and industrial use.

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - concerned for the effect on Tatton Park. proposing so many houses will affect Tatton and the surrounding countryside.

Green Belt

No green land should be built on. The same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

The whole development of this site is dependent on access. Create new access routes and this site could be perfect. It ticks all the boxes and is probably the nearest of all the Sites to the town centre. In section 6.11, the third point in the Stakeholder Panel's considerations for housing priorities covers sites on the edge of the urban area with potential for good access to services or where they could increase facilities and opportunities for integrated communities. How does this Site not fit that requirement?

Site F not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment

No development needed.

This will merge Knutsford into the neighbouring village of Mobberley, is under the direct path of airlines into and out of Manchester Airport.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Unless access to Parkgate improved to east and potentially developed in conjunction with sites g,k,l, m

Too close to Tatton for comfort.

Commercial expansion only after new access roads built

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

The impact on Tatton Park makes this site not a good option.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is.

this land is for business use

This site would create conflicting traffic flows from an existing difficult access point into the Parkgate Industrial Estate and its junction with Mobberley Road. The site is also of high amenity value and its development would impact adversely on Tatton Park and its boundaries. The site is also shown in the

-
current Local Plan as being an Area of Special County Value.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

I think development of this land would be useful infill

This is a site to reconsider for Mixed Use - a small housing estate and community facilities such as a Medical Centre and Youth Club.

I object to this one. I consider this important open space around the Tatton Park.

Green Belt land should be maintained

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Access to Mobberley Road must be improved first and a buffer zone created between housing and industry.

Why was this discounted? Seems to have limited impact on residents.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

Knutsford is located in the Birkin Brook water Body (GB112 069 061 340), a Priority water body at Poor Ecological Status (objective is "Good" status by 2015; macro-invertebrate and fish classifications, and Physico-Chemical Status, are already Good). Any development should include measures to protect surface water quality. We welcome the inclusion in the Environment Strategy of commitments to enhance the town’s greenspaces and areas of water. Of the sites considered suitable for development by the stakeholder panel, Areas F, G & K incorporate or are adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites: any development should include measures to prevent degradation or loss of these.

all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents

Rocks can not cope with extra traffic.

Natural expansion to Trading estate and improved links.

This must not include land from Tatton Park.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

I do not agree with the Stakeholder panel. I think this site should be reconsidered for possible development. It may require improved access (I assume this means a better / new bridge over the railway line - which would be a good thing anyway!) but don't see why this is any kind of stopper for a development.

Increased traffic congestion concerns

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton
School and through the conservation areas. We develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green belt land, good agricultural land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjoins access to Tatton Park, development could spoil this access, although it is good for easy access to the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green belt. Also risk of adversely impacting Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate is dangerous as it is, especially near the shops. With the amount of traffic trying to get up and down, any more housing will make it 10 times worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is already moderately low cost housing in this part of Knutsford but need to be careful not to encroach on the park area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, adjacent to Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Green Belt, leave it alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it would be a shame to use this farmland which borders on to Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is not so visible to daily passing traffic, and whilst it is wrong to lose any Green Belt, if developments have to occur it would be better here than on the North West of Town. The visual and environmental impact will be far less here. This is already a developed area and the expansion of it would not encroach on other settlements. Due to the boundary with Tatton Park, there could be no further expansion on this land and thus no future threat to the loss of green belt or encroachment on other settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a potential site for a health and wellbeing centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt and serious traffic issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unclear what I am agreeing or disagreeing with. My view is that green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. There is a wide range of species on this area, which provides a wildlife corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with Stakeholder Panel for no development in this plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I support the idea of developing this land, improvements must be made to access along Parkgate Lane, as referred into under Site G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we take land from Tatton Park?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree only if it can help provide an additional crossing of railway. Also good location for an additional rail station (particularly if Metrolink was more than a dream).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is
uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.
Rail line and road congestion.
Could be noisy from aircraft.
Agree land should be considered in future - little advantage in redeveloping Parkgate, any development should compliment it. Development would make Parkgate Farm available to its entire area should be considered when necessary.
If absolutely necessary.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area. If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree
No development should be allowed. The question above is ambiguous. Do you mean do I agree with the Stakeholder Panel opinion that sites F,H,I,J,L,M,N,O,P,Q,R,S and T are unsuitable for development? In this case the answer is yes I agree. However, if you mean do you agree with the development of these sites, irrespective of the opinions of the Stakeholders, then the answer is I disagree.
Any development would impact on the green belt
For use as a medical centre - as proposed by Tatton Estates.
There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, the majority of this land is not designated Green Belt and therefore should be the first choice when considering development options. Development of this land (together with site G) could enable improvement to the access for Parkgate Trading Estate and in doing so meet an important objective to support existing businesses and make better use of existing developed land.
Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.
This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed
Farmland to be retained.
Although green belt I understand there must be a compromise. I agree primarily because less current residents will be affected and it will not create too much of a blot on the landscape as building next to Manchester Road would.
This should be used for development, if anywhere. This would appear to be a natural, organic development, with good access to Tatton Park, and potentially to the town.
road access must be improved
I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained.
Green belt. Leave it alone! This contains significantly utilised areas of Green Belt and contains Dog wood...completely unacceptable.
Too close to the development being considered for Tatton. Bewilderwood.
There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!
This is an obvious development area with good access for pedestrians and cyclists through the park to town.
Green belt
Too close to Tatton Park.
Too close to Tatton.
I value greatly the openness of the area adjacent to the park and would hate to see developments which would be detrimental; to this characteristics of Tatton.
This site has the most significant impact on me personally. The diagram I have seen which annotates an emergency services route through Dog Wood concerns me enormously & I will object in the strongest terms if this proposal is ever made.
Too close to Tatton Park and will damage both its and Knutsford's USP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree. Maintain green buffer around Tatton Park.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’; i.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't see why this land shouldn't be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland to be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F is adjacent to a Site of Biological Importance and a RAMSAR site. Site F also contains a pond which may provide a habitat for certain species as stated within the SA (Knutsford Town Centre Sustainability Appraisal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land not to be taken from Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion would help pay for the bridge under the railway for access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of site F alongside site G could vastly improve the facilities in this part of the town and make a real difference to peoples' lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of site F alongside G could vastly improve the facilities in this part of town and make a real difference to peoples' lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Tatton plus industrial estate to be good for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested to know on what grounds these sites were deemed unsuitable. A simple unsuitable is not an adequate explanation. Elaboration is required before any decision is made on plots A,B,C,D,E,G, and K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor road access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Tatton Park maybe if access improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reservations regarding traffic management from the trading estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would improve amenities for local people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is there no explanation as to why these are not suitable for development? I think these SHOULD be considered further if not then WHY NOT?! This is a massive gap in information and needs answering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes station park used my many locally and tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is almost encroaching on Tatton Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent site for affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't agree with any more development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Tatton Park. Access problems will occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site H: Land to the east of Parkgate Trading Estate and Birkin Brook

Do you agree or disagree with site H as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 76% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (50%); Disagree (50%)

Comments:
Area liable to flooding and if built on may well cause problems with environment down stream. Poor access and likely to cause traffic problems. Loss of viable farmland and poor vehicular access without enhancements to Parkgate lane or creation of new railway bridge. Erosion of boundary between Knutsford and Mobberley merging the two distinct places.

Isn't that Mobberley?

No extra trading.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.

Remote area capable of development - consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable housing.

This seems an obvious area for development and extends/could improve on existing development.

Moving too close to Mobberley.

Limited impact on residents and fits well with the site at G and F. Fairer distribution than the preferred options as it spreads the impact and thus meaning the impact is not only felt by those in the North East Knutsford.

This would enhance a depressed area of Knutsford

No strong thoughts about this one.

If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas.

Too many problems; too far out and isn't this where second access to Parkgate Industrial Estate would have to go?

Agree because forms boundary between Knutsford and Mobberley

Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? Could be developed as a logical extension of neighbouring sites G and K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remote area capable of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites H,I,J expand the boundary in an area of that is already at a greater distance form the town centre and its services than other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good space for building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far from centre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isn't this in Mobberley as the Birkin Brook is the boundary? Also the water treatment works are there. Too far from centre no transport links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk and too close to waste water treatment work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far out. Too much impact from aircraft noise. Flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development. Why is this not suitable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again this would not affect many local residents and could benefit that area of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt, ecologically sensitive site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would take the built area too close to Mobberley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no supporting evidence in the plan. For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site ‘was not considered suitable for development’ and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site H not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over time, developments in this area could result in Knutsford and Mobberley becoming a single town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No development needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will merge Knutsford into the neighbouring village of Mobberley, is under the direct path of airlines into and out of Manchester Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only on non-farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will encroach on Mobberley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is near to existing commercial development. Flood risk measures can be taken into account when designing the properties to be built. Any development here would not impact on anyone's residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is for business use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area - However, it would be appropriate to look at the potential of this area as part of the development of sites G and F in terms of improv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This would lead to development taking place beyond the Birkin Brook which currently forms a logical boundary to Knutsford. Development of this site would lead to coalescence with Mobberley, exacerbate cross town traffic congestion and is shown in the current Local Plan as being an Area of Special County Value.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

But not for housing even if the waste water treatment works could be relocated.

Again limited impact on residents. Does nito compromise the look and feel of country knutsford.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

All the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

Natural expansion to Trading estate and improved links.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

If only because it would extend Knutsford even further towards Mobberley and away from the town centre. I.e. I agree with the Stakeholder panel.

Increased traffic congestion concerns

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

Flood risk and smell from water treatment works a problem

Poor access. Green belt. Flood risk.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.
Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county
This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

We should not develop Knutsford beyond the natural boundary of the birkin brook. Mobberley should be allowed to remain as a distinct village although the transport network could be improved.
Too far to the East of town, for access to the town centre. This will creep toward Mobberley and thus there will be very little separation between Knutsford and Wilmslow
Green Belt. Also this land is to the East of the natural town boundary - the brook. Valuable land for food production
This site beyond the natural town boundary (the River Birkin) and would encroach on Mobberley. Some of this land may contain areas of SSSI and potential Ancient Woodland. KCHG proposes that such areas are protected and excluded from development if, in other respects, the site is considered suitable for development.
On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.
Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. Part of this site is within a flood risk area. It would therefore be irresponsible to develop it.
Agree with Stakeholder Panel
I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town (as defined by the river Birkin) and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring habitation of Mobberley.
I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spolt.
Potential flood risk...
Questions over suitability.
Too far from town centre and coalescence with Mobberley (which can clearly be seen on plan).
Ideal for mixed use - near possible labour source.
In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.
Developing a flood-risk area is unsustainable.
Rail line and risk of merging with Mobberley
Could lead to eventual joining of Mobberley with Knutsford with no green space in between
Knutsford and Mobberley already close - important that they remain separate Knutsford should not have been allowed to develop beyond Birkin Brook
If absolutely necessary.
unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree
No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.
Any development would impact on the green belt.
There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, it would be appropriate to look at the development of this area as part of the development of sites G and F in terms of improving access to the land lying to the north of the railway line (see comments on Site I also. Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.
Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed

Grazing land to be retained.

Again, I appreciated it is green belt but there is breathing space for established and new residents. No established sports clubs are being destroyed.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained

Again Green Belt, the suggested alternative power site suggested in Mr Brooks plan will cause further disruption for those on Broadoak lane and chip into the Green Belt towards Mobberley. This is not acceptable

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Limited development infill around existing buildings.

Closing the gap between Knutsford and Mobberley. Danger of further infilling and sprawl.

I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.

I feel this area is too far out of the centre of town

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt and sewage treatment works.

Grazing land to be retained.

Aircraft noise and safety zone.

Aircraft noise and safety zone.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland abnd forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? - What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Leave.

Flood risk - would be really stupid.

Poor road access.

Where will the sewerage works go? If the development is to be either side of the railway line. Exit sites to include Parkgate traffic too?

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

Would improve amenities for local people. Not affected directly by incidents on M6 and A556.

New access road into trading estate essential.

There would be hardly any green belt left between Knutsford and Mobberley

Should be favoured site. Rail link should be considered

Don't agree with any more development.
As long as commercial development is small units
In danger of making Mobberley part of Knutsford.
Site I: Land to the north of Knutsford Road

Do you agree or disagree with site I as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)

- 73% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (35%); Disagree (65%)

Comments:

Area liable to flooding and if built on may well cause problems with environment down stream. Poor access and likely to cause traffic problems. Loss of viable farmland and poor vehicular access without enhancements to Parkgate lane or creation of new railway bridge. Erosion of boundary between Knutsford and Mobberley merging the two distinct places

Green Belt.

Some extra trading.

Good area to use.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.

Remote area capable of development - consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable housing

Moving too close to Mobberley.

Limited impact on residents and fits well with the site at H, G and F. Fairer distribution than the preferred options as it spreads the impact and thus meaning the impact is not only felt byt those in the North East Knutsford.

This would enhance a depressed area of Knutsford

No strong thoughts about this one.

If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas.

Too far out and isn’t this where second access to ParkGate Industrial Estate would have to go?

Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

Green Belt.

Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? Could be developed as a logical extension of neighbouring sites G and K.
Remote area capable of development - consistent with the remit to provide affordable housing

Too far from centre?

This is part of the belt of countryside that separates Knutsford from Mobberley. If development takes place here how long will it be before the two communities lose their separate identities?

Isn’t this in Mobberley as the Birkin Brook is the boundary. Too far from centre no transport links

Flood risk area. Also existing roads are quite narrow.

Too far to the north. (One might as well suggest a Knutsford-Mobberley conurbation!) Flood risk.

I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development.

Why is this not suitable?

Again this would not affect many local residents and could benefit that area of the town.

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - concerned for the farm and countryside.

Green Belt.

Would take the built area too close to Mobberley.

No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site “was not considered suitable for development” and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Site I not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.

Over time, developments in this area could result in Knutsford and Mobberley becoming a single town.

No development needed.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Farmland should not be built on.

Another ‘gateway’ site, so sensitive to quality of development.

Will encroach on Mobberley.

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

The site is near to existing commercial development. Flood risk measures can be taken into account when designing the properties to be built. Any development here would not impact on anyone’s residential properties.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, and the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is.

Small development.

- There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area - However, it would be appropriate to look at the potential of this area as part of the development of sites G, F and H in terms of importance.

This site lies beyond the Birkin Brook which forms a good physical boundary to the eastern expansion of Knutsford. Development of this site would lead to coalescence with Mobberley. Development of this site would exacerbate cross town traffic flows and congestion in the town centre.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the
criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favored others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

But not mixed use. Limited development with quality housing could work. Too far from necessary amenities for affordable housing.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

All the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

Has the effect on road congestion been considered? Difficult now.

If only because it would extend Knutsford even further towards Mobberley and away from the town centre. i.e. I agree with the Stakeholder panel.

Increased traffic congestion concerns

This is a green belt area which should not be developed. It is made up of fertile farmland and hosts a diverse wildlife. The road network here is currently under extreme pressure and any further development would place a massive burden on this. It would force cars past the high schools, Egerton School and through the conservation areas. We we develop the green belt it is gone forever and we should not let this happen.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Flood risk.

Possibly, but needs better access. Stll greenbelt. Still flood risk.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

We should not develop knutsford beyond the natural boundary of the birkin brook. Mobberley should
be allowed to remain as a distinct village although the transport network could be improved.

Too far to the East of town, for access to the town centre. This will creep toward Mobberley and thus there will be very little separation between Knutsford and Wilmslow

Green Belt. Also this land is to the East of the natural town boundary - the brook. Valuable land for food production

This site beyond the natural town boundary (the River Birkin) and would encroach on Mobberley. Some of this land may contain areas of SSSI and potential Ancient Woodland. KCHG proposes that such areas are protected and excluded from development if, in other respects, the site is considered suitable for development.

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. Part of this site is within a flood risk area. It would therefore be irresponsible to develop it.

Agree with Stakeholder Panel

I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town (as defined by the river Birkin) and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring habitation of Mobberley.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Too far from town centre and coalescence with Mobberley (which can clearly be seen on plan).

Ideal for mixed use - near possible labour source.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Rail line, flood risk and merging with Mobberley.

Could lead to eventual joining of Mobberley with Knutsford with no green space in between

Knutford and Mobberley already close - important that they remain separate. Knutsford should not have been allowed to develop beyond Birkin Brook

Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area. If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Any development would impact on the green belt

There is insufficient information within the draft Strategy to come to an informed view as to the merits of this area. However, it would be appropriate to look at the development of this area as part of the development of sites G and F in terms of improving access to the land lying to the north of the railway line (see comments on Site I also. Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed

Green Belt to be retained.

Again, I appreciated it is green belt but there is breathing space for established and new residents. No established sports clubs are being destroyed.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G, K please could this be explained

Not acceptable. Green Belt

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt.
| Closing the gap between Knutsford and Mobberley. Danger of further infilling and sprawl. |
| May affect Dukenfield hall (though we are uncertain about this site as we have no information on it) |
| I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. i.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’. |
| Too far out of town |
| Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development. |
| Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process. |
| Green Belt to be retained. |
| I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever. |
| Leave. |
| Flood risk - would be really stupid. |
| Outside the natural NE town boundary. |
| If develop the other side of road OK. |
| Where will the sewerage works go? If the development is to be either side of the railway line. Exit sites to include Parkgate traffic too? |
| More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the ‘other development options’ were rejected by the Stakeholder Panel. |
| Would improve amenities for local people. Not affected directly by incidents on M6 and A556. |
| Should be considered for small development and affordable housing. |
| Don't agree with any more development. |
| In danger of making Mobberley part of Knutsford. |
**Site J: Land to the south of Knutsford Road**

**Do you agree or disagree with site J as a potential area for future development (suggested use: residential)**

- 73% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (35%); Disagree (65%)

![Pie chart showing agreement and disagreement percentages]

**Comments:**

Area liable to flooding and if built on may well cause problems with environment down stream. Poor access and likely to cause traffic problems. Loss of viable farmland and poor vehicular access without enhancements to Parkgate lane or creation of new railway bridge. Erosion of boundary between Knutsford and Mobberley merging the two distinct places

Green Belt.

Some extra trading.

Access will be problematic, and Community Spirit have identified parts of area J and most of area K for a recreation and sport scheme that we are planning for this side of town as there is no sports facilities here apart from a few fields that need lots of TLC, we do need these areas!

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.

Remote area capable of development - consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable housing.


Limited impact on residents and fits well with the site at I, H, G and F. Fairer distribution than the preferred options as it spreads the impact and thus meaning the impact is not only felt by those in the North East Knutsford.

This would enhance a depressed area of Knutsford

If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas.

This land is near existing development and would be suitable.

Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

Green Belt.

Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? Could be developed as a logical extension of neighbouring sites G and K.
Remote area capable of development - consistent with the remit to provide affordable housing  

Too far from centre?  

Isn't this in Mobberley as the Birkin Brook is the boundary? Too far from centre no transport links  

Also flood risk. You might need a sewage pumping station to deal with these sites.  


I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development.  

Why is this not suitable?  

Again this would not affect many local residents and could benefit that area of the town. This is mainly scruffy land at the moment, so developing this is one of the few areas in Knutsford which could do with improving.  

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - far too many houses - access will be a problem. Will affect the surrounding residential streets. access will be a problem.  

Green Belt.  

Would take the built area too close to Mobberley.  

No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.  

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.  

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site 'was not considered suitable for development' and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.  

Site J not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.  

Over time, developments in this area could result in Knutsford and Mobberley becoming a single town.  

No development needed.  

Another 'gateway' site, so sensitive to quality of development.  

Will encroach on Mobberley and destroy more greenbelt  

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.  

The site is near to existing commercial development. Flood risk measures can be taken into account when designing the properties to be built. Any development here would not impact on anyone's residential properties.  

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is  

Small development.  

- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.  

This would be a projection beyond the Birkin Brook which forms a good and recognisable boundary to the eastern expansion of Knutsford and would lead to coalescence, if developed, with Mobberley. Development here would exacerbate cross town traffic flows and congestion.  

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.  

This should be developed and this applies to all the areas of "no development"...they should all be
Green Belt land should be maintained

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

But not mixed use. Limited development with quality housing could work. Too far from necessary amenities for affordable housing.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

All the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents

Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

If only because it would extend Knutsford even further towards Mobberley and away from the town centre. i.e. I agree with the Stakeholder panel.

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Flood risk.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

We should not develop Knutsford beyond the natural boundary of the Birkin brook. Mobberley should be allowed to remain as a distinct village although the transport network could be improved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site J: Land to the south of Knutsford Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too far to the East of town, for access to the town centre. This will creep toward Mobberley and thus there will be very little separation between Knutsford and Wilmslow</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Belt. Also this land is to the East of the natural town boundary - the brook. Valuable land for food production</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This site beyond the natural town boundary (the River Birkin) and would encroach on Mobberley. Some of this land may contain areas of SSSI and potential Ancient Woodland. KCHG proposes that such areas are protected and excluded from development if, in other respects, the site is considered suitable for development.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable.. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. Part of this site is within a flood risk area. It would therefore be irresponsible to develop it. There is also a pond on the site and so there will be a wide variety of wildlife.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town (as defined by the river Birkin) and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring habitation of Mobberley.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too far from town centre and coalescence with Mobberley (which can clearly be seen on plan).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal for mixed use - near possible labour source.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk area, green belt and risk of merging with Mobberley.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Could lead to eventual joining of Mobberley with Knutsford with no green space in between</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knutsford and Mobberley already close - important that they remain separate Knutsford should not have been allowed to develop beyond Birkin Brook</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any development would impact on the green belt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Again, I appreciated it is green belt but there is breathing space for established and new residents. No established sports clubs are being destroyed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not acceptable. Green Belt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and it’s already busy enough!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing the gap between Knutsford and Mobberly. Danger of further infilling and sprawl.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May affect Dukenfield hall (though we are uncertain about this site as we have no information on it)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
being an ‘Other Development Option’.
Too far out of town
Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.
Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.
Green belt land.
No link into Mobberley required or wanted.
No link into Mobberley required or wanted.
I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.
Leave.
Could be potential small business area.
Outside the natural NE town boundary.
OK to complete Longridge estate
More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.
Would improve amenities for local people. Not affected directly by incidents on M6 and A556.
Encroachment on to the Green Belt.
should be a favoured site and available for affordable housing.
Don't agree with any more development.
In danger of making Mobberley part of Knutsford.
Site L: Land to the north of Booths Hall

Do you agree or disagree with site L as a potential area for future development

- 73% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (35%); Disagree (65%)

Comments:
- Poor access and likely to cause traffic problems. Loss of viable farmland and poor vehicular access without enhancements.
- Farmland.
- Should be preserved as open space for future generations.
- Transport required.
- NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.
- I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.
- Remote area capable of development - consistent with the economic remit to provide affordable housing
- All should take development. With good path, cycle ways and landscaping planting.
- Limited impact on residents and fits well with M. Fairer distribution than the preferred options as it spreads the impact and thus meaning the impact is not only felt by those in the North East Knutsford.
- Access would be an issue.
- Current farm land and attractive setting for offices at Booths Hall
- Although access is a concern on any residential development, a key project like this should be able to overcome such peripheral issues to achieve their objectives. The presence of a pond, given the changes in legislation currently proposed for Parliament, shouldn't present you with any insurmountable difficulties.
- Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.
- Green Belt
- Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? This land is next to site K which is a site favoured for development.
Remote area capable of development - consistent with the remit to provide affordable housing not affected by aircraft noise and pedestrian access and cycle access could be put in place.
This land valued by the community as an open green space.
Limited access through already oversubscribed roads.
Access to site very difficult.
Too many risks and loss of amenities.
I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development.
This looks suitable for residential use and would stop Knutsford's ribbon development along the A50. Why is it rejected? No reason is given.
This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I & J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town.
Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - too many houses - will affect residential streets. Access will be a problem.
Green Belt
No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.
There is no supporting evidence in the plan. Its a playing field
In section 6.11, the third point in the Stakeholder Panel's considerations for housing priorities covers sites on the edge of the urban area with potential for good access to services or where they could increase facilities and opportunities for integrated communities. How does this Site not fit that requirement? There is a pattern of affordable/intermediate housing in the area so development could be done to encompass both types. The additional housing would need to be complimented by additional facilities, both retail and leisure. However, for this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site ‘was not considered suitable for development’ and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.
Site L not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment
No development needed.
If needed there is the possibility of a small amount of ribbon development
Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment
Ideal but would require a bye pass around the town centre
Farmland should not be built on
Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.
small development
- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.
This is part of the parkland setting of Booths Hall and the very attractive countryside approaches to Knutsford from the south and west. Access to this site may be difficult and its development would lead to further traffic congestion with cross town movements.
Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.
Green Belt land should be maintained

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Would need to be developed in conjunction with sites K and M to provide access.

This would make sense, as Booth Hall is struggling as a economic centre, and therefore we can use the space with housing and economic development. Why was this rejected - is it too close to the South and more affluent areas?

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

It is not clear to me why this is not plausible land for development. Why is access stated as a problem with this Site, but not for the immediately adjacent Site K, which is favoured? I disagree with the Stakeholder panel.

Increased traffic congestion concerns

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Green belt, good agricultural land

Seems suitable, providing the pond can be maintained

Possibly, but green belt and problems with access.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.
I don't think this area should be developed - the booths hall area - with the mere is like a small nature reserve and should be retained as such.

Too far from the town centre

Green Belt and traffic issues

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

The eastern side of the town has seen the most significant development post war, and has now reached unsustainable levels on infrastructure, and lack of connections to the rest of the town. This side of the town already feels very separated from the rest of Knutsford, and any development in this area must be focused on redressing this balance before adding any more houses.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Too far from town centre.

Good.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

No access

Keep as green space

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Any development would impact on the green belt

Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed

Green Belt land.

Green belt and access will mean too much development.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G, K please could this be explained

Not acceptable. Green Belt already removed from plan by you

Pond? Access?

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt

Again this would be building on greenbelt

Suitable for small development with walk/cycle ways to units at Booths Hall

Site L is within the historic designed landscape associated with Booths Hall

I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.

Why not?

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Green Belt land.
The site contains a designated Site of Biological Importance as identified in the SA. In this respect any development of the site has the potential to harm the ecosystems within the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Chelford Road required - could be mixed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Boothsmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environment and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't agree with any more development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to Booths Mere - danger to children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site M: Land to the south west of Booths Hall

Do you agree or disagree with site M as a potential area for future development

- 72% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (31%); Disagree (69%)

Comments:

Good access and suitable for development

Interesting how Toft Cricket club land has been omitted- Why when it is leased same as other land on Mereheath Lane.

Where would we have the annual bonfire? Maybe in your garden?

Transport required.

NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.

I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.

All should take development. With good path, cycle ways and landscaping planting.

Limited impact on residents and fits well with L. Fairer distribution than the preferred options as it spreads the impact and thus meaning the impact is not only felt byt those in the North East Knutsford.

My reasons for disagreeing with this are that a) this site is regularly used for teh Booth Hall bonfire, and has become a very popular tradition and b) Bruntwood have a large number of vacant units at Booths park, so business development in this area would need to be done using an entirely different model. That field could, of course, be used for community gardens, as having such a space by the cricket ground would enhance such a pleasant space.

If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas, so long as cricket club is unaffected.

Cricket club is an asset and should not be spoilt.

No comments on this area indicate that housing couldn’t be developed here.

Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.

Green Belt.

Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites?

Site of Knutsford bonfire and open ground.
Please don’t destroy the Cricket Club. You will need a new sewage pumping station - expensive.

Unacceptable loss of amenities.

I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development.

This looks suitable for residential use and would stop Knutsford’s ribbon development along the A50. Why is it rejected? No reason is given.

This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I & J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town.

Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - takes away from the cricket club and Booths Hall. Concerned for the residential streets surrounding the area.

Green Belt.

No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site ‘was not considered suitable for development’ and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Site M not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.

No development needed.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Ideal but would require a by pass around the town centre.

Farmland should not be built on.

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

The site has access on to Chelford Road which is not congested.

Small development.

- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

This would cause too much additional traffic onto the Chelford road.

This is an important part of the parkland to Booths Hall and is very visible in approaches to the town from the A537 from the east. This is an integral part of the setting of Knutsford and its development would adversely impact on the Legh Road Conservation Area adjacent to the site. Cross town traffic would also be exacerbated leading to further congestion.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Quality low density development could work. Buffer to cricket club is needed.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage.
All the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Risks can not cope with extra traffic.

Should not destroy open Cricket Club ground.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estates on one or two locations.

Should not be considered for Development (I agree with Stakeholder panel).

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but I think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

Greenbelt. Already has leisure facility of cricket club, which must stay.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

But consider developing Booths Hall site.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

No- impact on cricket club.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

I don't think this area should be developed - the booths hall area - with the mere is like a small nature reserve and should be retained as such.

Too far from the town centre.

Green Belt and traffic issues.

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable.. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

The eastern side of the town has seen the most significant development post war, and has now reached unsustainable levels on infrastructure, and lack of connections to the rest of the town. This side of the town already feels very separated from the rest of Knutsford, and any development in this area must be focused on redressing this balance before adding any more houses.
I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Too far from town centre.

Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Green belt.

Keep as green space.

Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Any development would impact on the green belt.

Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Possible due to paucity of traffic.

Green belt and it will ruin the character of the cricket club which has played a part in many lives for many years.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained.

Not acceptable. Green Belt already removed from plan by you.

Excellent. Has pleasant amenities.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt.

Suitable for small development with walk/cycle ways to units at Booths Hall.

Site M is within the historic designed landscape associated with Booths Hall.

I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.

Why not?

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Possible due to paucity of traffic.

Not necessary.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>changed for ever.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not to encroach on cricket club at Toft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be mixed use with expansion of Booths Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/medium development should not have an adverse effect on routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket club important to local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take opportunity now to prevent further development on the green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development would impact on use for sport, social and community activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't agree with any more development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upmarket housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site N: Land between Gough’s Lane and Chelford Road

Do you agree or disagree with site N as a potential area for future development

- 74% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (30%); Disagree (70%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of ancient entry aspect into Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot be serious!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill roads need attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another good area for expansion with access and low impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good potential site - it surprises me it is not preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All should take development. With good path, cycle ways and landscaping planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroys the sense of countryside and ruins Toft woods. Though it is only fair for the south of the town to bear some of the burden of developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a major impact on the appearance of the town approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas, perhaps the best of the purely green belt areas. Am interested to know the reasons for this not being a favoured site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments on this area indicate that housing couldn’t be developed here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be used for housing but felt that getting a bit far from town centre especially if used for affordable housing where people may not have own transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? This land would appear to be ideal for housing development 400-1100 homes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good potential site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A small development with access from Chelford Road only.

This is Green Belt! Meant to protect the town from excessive development! Do we want to carry on sprawling out towards Macclesfield??

Farmland so farmer would be well compensated.

To my knowledge this area has been considered for over 50 years but it is very low lying and all water / sewage will have to be pumped - very expensive. A conservation area.

That is a splendid idea, but I’m not holding my breath!

This looks suitable for residential use and would stop Knutsford's ribbon development along the A50. Why is it rejected? No reason is given.

This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I & J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town.

Why though was this dropped / not favoured? Too many well heeled lawyers living there that makes CE Council not fancy the fight?

would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with strongly disagree with the proposed number of houses

Green Belt.

Green space.

No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan. Why is it deemed unsuitable?

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site 'was not considered suitable for development' and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Site N not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.

No development needed.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Ideal but would require a by pass around the town centre.

Farmland should not be built on.

It would be a visual disaster to develop this area. Very prominent from both main entrances to the town from south and east. Should remain Green Belt.

Limited building only in character with surrounding houses.

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

Access on to Chelford Road is better than Manchester Road or Northwich Road because they are already congested. Fewer existing residential properties would be affected by this site being developed.

To exclude this site seems completely unfathomable. This is a field that has spent many years fallow it is large enough to take a reasonable mixed development with minimal disruption to the town and is on the Kings school bus route. it is the only site the developers will use in exchange for a smaller affordable development maybe at Tabley Rd.

- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

This is an important area of open countryside when approaching the site from the east along the A537. It provides a fine setting to the town with views toward the Legh Road Conservation Area. Development of this site would exacerbate cross town traffic and congestion.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for..."
"development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Too remote from town centre.

Ruins the country feel for Knutsford.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

This site would also create traffic problems and is good agricultural land. However, on what basis was this site was not preferred? why is site A better when: - it will be worse traffic wise measured against the plan for where extra jobs will be located - site A will be very close to the M6 and suffer more from traffic noise.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

Should not be considered for Development (I agree with Stakeholder panel).

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Green belt and Legh Road conservation area.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the
site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

This is attractive farmland but also is actually a long way out from the town centre.

Too far from the town centre.

Green Belt and traffic issues.

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. There is a pond on this site and so there will be a wide variety of wildlife.

I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring rural area of Toft.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Too far from town centre.

Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Farmland - tends to flood.

Toft Wood should be conserved.

Would risk joining Knutsford and Ollerton. Would detract from footpath through Windmill Wood - popular walk with local residents.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Any development would impact on the green belt.

Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

INTRODUCTION These representations to the Knutsford Town Strategy are submitted on behalf of Cranford Estates who have an interest in land to the rear of 16 Oakleigh in Knutsford. It is located within “Site N”, one of the development option sites in the strategy. Our client’s site is 0.23ha within the green belt and adjacent to the south-east urban boundary of Knutsford. It comprises the rear gardens of several properties and a vacant parcel of scrubland adjacent to Chelford Road.

DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS: SITE N The Knutsford Town Strategy recognises that there is a need to identify and allocate sites for housing in order to meet the requirement of between 460 and 1,280 new homes up to 2030. A total of 20 Green Belts sites have been identified as having potential for housing and our client supports the need to release such sites. There is a lack of appropriate brownfield sites in the town, yet a pressing demand for new and more affordable housing in order to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities in line with paragraph 50 of NPPF. Housing needs should also be addressed in the locations in which they have been identified; therefore housing need identified in Knutsford should be met on sites in Knutsford rather than elsewhere in the Borough (NPPF; parag. 50, bullet point 2). According to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA; 2010), Knutsford has a low level of affordability with only 6.4% of households being able to afford median house prices. There is a current annual need for affordable housing up to 2014 of 64 units (net), and this includes some specialist older persons housing. Affordable housing completions will
only be met through the release of sites for market housing. Within the 20 identified sites, 7 have subsequently been favoured by a Stakeholder Panel within Table 6.2 and these are all located in the north-western and north-eastern part of Knutsford. Site N was not considered suitable for development and assessment details are described in the Sustainability Appraisal. The approach of the strategy is flawed as it identifies only relatively large sites with arbitrary boundaries for development. It therefore fails to recognise that there are smaller sites within these that are ideal for development. The strategy should not simply seek to meet the housing needs of Knutsford through the release of a few large sites to the north of the town. This will result in large urban extensions within the green belt which are likely to change the character of the town. The release of a larger number of smaller but more suitable sites across all areas of the town would be more appropriate and sustainable. Paragraph 84 of NPPF emphasises the need for local planning authorities to take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Site N is the second largest identified site covering 38ha and it is stated that it could accommodate up to 1,100 new homes. Given that there is only a need to identify land for up to 1,280 homes, it would not be logical for such a site to be allocated as this would not allow for an even distribution of houses across a number of the most suitable sites. While it may be the case that developing the whole of Site N would not be appropriate, our client’s site at Oakleigh is suitable, achievable and available for development. A draft layout and elevations have been sent with this submission showing a potential development proposal for 19 units. This shows a courtyard almhouse style scheme, which could potentially deliver high quality housing for people over 55. This level of housing can clearly be achieved at the site, will help to meet the varying needs of the wider community and free up existing family housing. The Sustainability Appraisal of the Site N lists a number of constraints which have led to it being labelled as unsuitable for development. However, some of these constraints are not applicable to our client’s site. It is stated that Site N is categorised at being the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 2 and 3). However, our client’s site is the only part of the land which is not agricultural land as it consists of extended rear gardens of several properties and a vacant parcel of scrubland. Looking at the site from above, it clearly appears as a separate entity to the adjacent high quality agricultural land. Development of the site would therefore not appear as encroachment into open countryside as the remainder of Site N would. Given the nature of the site, it would be unnecessary to keep it permanently open and paragraph 85 of NPPF states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should not include such land within the Green Belt. It is also stated that Site N is adjacent to a Site of Biological Importance (SOBI). However, our client’s site is at the furthest point away from the SOBI to the south and not directly adjacent. The appraisal states that the site has limited access to a range of public transport, key services and amenities. However, our client’s site is within walking distance of the centre of Knutsford approximately 1 mile away which includes a wide range of services and facilities. It is noted that some of the constraints listed are also applicable to a number of favoured sites. This includes that all of the favoured sites except for Site G are also within the green belt. Due to the size and nature of our client’s site, being separate from the remainder which is agricultural land, its release from the Green Belt will not be to the detriment of the five purposes of the Green Belt described in paragraph 80 of NPPF. Its development will not lead to unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas or the merging of neighbouring towns. It will not lead to encroachment into the countryside and the setting and character of Knutsford will not be affected. Finally, the urban regeneration will not be compromised as there is a clear need for the release of Green Belt sites to meet housing need. Due to their size, releasing any of the 7 large sites favoured in the Strategy would be detrimental to the purposes of the Green Belt as they would represent significant encroachment into the countryside and is likely to change the character of the town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Although green belt I know one cannot object to all sites. It is a substantial plot and I think the impact on the town would not be as great as other areas - no long-established facilities will be destroyed.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E,

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:
Site N: Land between Gough’s Lane and Chelford Road
G, K please could this be explained.

This would seem an ideal location for all of Knutsford’s additional housing requirements. Less than 30 houses would lose their aspect onto open countryside. Developing his site would inconvenience the smallest percentage of Knutsford residents. However, compensating the residents of Gough’s lane (apparently one of the top ten most expensive roads in the whole country to purchase a property) could prove quite expensive.

This would seem an ideal location for all of Knutsford’s additional housing requirements. Less than 30 houses would lose their aspect onto open countryside. Developing his site would inconvenience the smallest percentage of Knutsford residents.

Not acceptable Green Belt already removed from plan by you

This would seem an ideal location for all of Knutsford’s additional housing requirements. Less than 30 houses would lose their aspect onto open countryside. Developing his site would inconvenience the smallest percentage of Knutsford residents.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt and wet land

The northern half of this field would be suitable but it will never happen - all those gated mansions and bungalows knocked down to build palaces will never accept their equity being devalued even if it was not affordable housing

Site N is a large extension, the scale of which would not be in keeping with the character of the town. It would also affect the setting of Kerfield House and its grounds.

I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. i.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an Other Development Option.

Too far out.

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Not necessary.

This appears to be a very large site. Could a portion be used and why has it been deemed unsuitable?

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Could be developed.

Green belt and prime farming land.

Area defined is too large.

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the ‘other development options’ where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

Small/medium development should not have an adverse effect on routes.

People will not buy existing homes if they know you are considering building.
especially N + O + Q.
Don't disagree with using this site - expensive to purchase.
Encroachment on the Green Belt.
should be favoured site and could provide all additional housing for the town.
Development on green belt and green field would be inappropriate and alter the unique approach to this historic town.
Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.
Don't agree with any more development.
Too close to Toft Wood.
Site O: Land between Gough's Lane and Toft Road (southern parcel)
Do you agree or disagree with site O as a potential area for future development

- 73% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (30%); Disagree (70%)

Comments:
Suitable site for development.
Green Belt.
Infill roads needs attention.
NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.
I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.
All should take development. With good path, cycle ways and landscaping planting.
Destroys the sense of countryside.
Has a major impact on the appearance of the town approaches.
If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas.
Too far out.
Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.
Green Belt

Mainly farmland so farmer would be well compensated
Almost a conservation area. Again, drainage is a problem.
Loss of pond is a concern, otherwise a good idea, as for N.
No reason given for rejection.
This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I & J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town.
Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - strong concerns for the conservation area.
Green Belt.

No green land should be built on- the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site was not considered suitable for development and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Site O not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.

No development needed.

If needed there is the possibility of a small amount of ribbon development.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Ideal but would require a by pass around the town centre.

Farmland should not be built on.

This, too, would be a prominent and visually threatening site to develop. The way in which countryside merges into suburb on this side of town is delightful and wholly dependent on retention of Green Belt to preserve.

Limited building only in character with surrounding houses

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

To exclude this site seems completely unfathomable. This is a field that has spent many years fallow it is large enough to take a reasonable mixed development with minimal disruption to the town and is on the Kings school bus route. it is the best site to offer developers to use for their favoured in exchange for a smaller affordable development maybe at Tabley rd

- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

This land would be an unnecessary projection of the built area of the town to the south and would impact on the approaches to Knutsford from the A50 and would affect the setting of the Legh Road Conservation Area, lying immediately north of the site. Cross town traffic congestion would be increased.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case? What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Too remote from town centre. Disagree that 'there are a number of residential properties within this site' - there are a few.

Ruins the country feel for Knutsford.

This is a crowded area already.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

| all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents |
| Roads can not cope with extra traffic. |
| As it’s on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable. |
| It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations. |
| Should not be considered for Development (I agree with Stakeholder panel). |
| Increased traffic congestion concerns. |
| As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but I think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites. |
| Greenbelt land, good agricultural land |
| Being close to Legh Road would seem to be an irrelevance |
| Green belt and Legh Road conservation area. |
| Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture. |
| Green belt. |
| Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land |
| Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development. |
| GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county |
| This is Green Belt, leave it alone. |
| This is far from the town centre. |
| Too far from the town centre. |
| Green Belt and traffic issues. |
| On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable.. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning. |
| Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. There is a pond on this site and so there will be a wide variety of wildlife. |
| I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring rural area of Toft. |
| I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt. |
| Too far from town centre. |
Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment into Green Belt.

This site along with site P is well related to the existing built-up area and includes existing residential development. The view is taken that by extending the built-up area further south would not impact on any important gap between the town and neighbouring settlements as is the case to the north-west of the town. The site is all so well contained by highway and field boundaries.

Green belt, farmland, adjacent conservation area.

Toft Wood should be conserved.

Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is Green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Any development would impact on the green belt.

Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Again, although green belt I do not think the impact will be too dramatic for reasons articulated above. Although green belt I know one cannot object to all sites. It is a substantial plot and I think the impact on the town would not be as great as other areas - no long-established facilities will be destroyed.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G, K please could this be explained

Not acceptable Green Belt...already removed from plan by you

But presumably these sites are not favoured because a bypass would take this route.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Green belt.

Strongly disagree. Another green ‘finger’ that makes such a strong contribution to Knutsford’s definition as a distinct town set in countryside.

Affects Legh Road CA

It would make no sense to develop this site without developing site P. I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.

Too far out.

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Site 0 contains a pond which may be habitat for protected species.

Not necessary.

The A50 is far too busy a road to accommodate more traffic - although it is not as bad as the Warrington side of town.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland abnd forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is
opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? - What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

**Could be developed.**

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

People will not buy existing homes if they know you are considering building.

Don't know this area.

Didn't spend lots of money to have open views of houses built.

Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt

Don't agree with any more development.
Site P: Land between Gough’s Lane and Toft Road (northern parcel)

Do you agree or disagree with site P as a potential area for future development

- 73% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (33%); Disagree (67%)

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitable site for development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infill roads need attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All should take development. With good path, cycle ways and landscaping planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroys the sense of countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If green belt land has to be built on then this could be one of the lower-impact areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far out and will affect current amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above statements - development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A conservation area. Again, very costly to develop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I can’t believe affordable housing will ever be built in a conservation area like this is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same applies here - no reason given for rejection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I &amp; J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - concerns for the conservation area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No green land should be built on— the same objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as being included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan. Its one of the more obvious potential development sites. Why is it considered unsuitable?

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site was not considered suitable for development and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Site P not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.

No development needed.

This area if needed could have high quality housing on it.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.

Ideal but would require a bypass around the town centre.

Farmland should not be built on.

This would be the one of the worst sites of all to develop. It would wreck the delicate interplay between country and the edge of town as well as the setting of Legh Road Conservation Area. If ever developed, it would only yield a scatter of footballer’s mansions - hardly a category of housing that East Cheshire is short of. Should remain Green Belt.

Limited building only in character with surrounding houses

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

To exclude this site seems completely unfathomable. This is an open field and it is large enough to take a reasonable mixed development with minimal disruption to the town. again it is potentially a site the developers will use in exchange for a smaller affordable development maybe at Tabley rd

- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

This site lies within the Legh Road Conservation Area and forms an integral part of its setting. It would impact adversely on the southern approach to Knutsford and its development would merely increase cross town traffic congestion.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case? What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Quality low density development could work and be compatible with the conservation area.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

All the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using...
more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

Should not be considered for Development (I agree with Stakeholder panel).

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Being close to Legh road would seem an irrelevance.

Still greenbelt and Legh Road conservation area, but at least it is on a main road.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

Don't build in the conservation area.

Too far from the town centre.

Green Belt and traffic issues.

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable.. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Too far from town centre.

Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Although this site falls within the designated conservation area, it already accommodates existing residential development and relates very well to the existing urban boundary. Therefore, the view is taken that a sensitively designed scheme would at the very least preserve the character of the
conservation area.
Green belt.

Could be developed if houses in keeping with those around i ideally with access from Goughs Lane/Leyster Rd.

We support the inclusion of Site P within the document although we suggest that this site should be considered a ‘favoured site’ rather than an other development option. The site is located close to several transport facilities and local amenities. In terms of the sustainability criteria contained within the Sustainability Appraisal, the site performs exceptionally well. When assessing sites in terms of these criteria, Site P is more sustainable than five out of the seven sites identified by the Stakeholder Panel as favoured sites. Site P was considered unsuitable for development by the Panel; however there is no justification as to how this decision was formulated. The justification for these decisions needs to be evident in the Town Strategy in order for the process to be clear and transparent. The sites that were considered by the Panel to have potential for future development are given several points to justify the reasons why they should be included in that category. In order for an informed decision on the suitability of each site to be made, there should be further information on each site.

Site P is suitable, available, achievable and therefore deliverable. There is no technical reason why the site could not accommodate future residential development, and a full suite of supporting documentation is being prepared to support the promotion of the site through the formal site allocations process.

Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Any development would impact on the green belt.

Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Although green belt I know one cannot object to all sites. It is a substantial plot and I think the impact on the town would not be as great as other areas - no long-established facilities will be destroyed.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained.

Already removed from plan by you, Green Belt.

There is already residential development here so it would seem a good idea to continue to fill in the spaces.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!

Limited development may be acceptable.

Strongly disagree. Another green ‘finger’ that makes such a strong contribution to Knutsford’s definition as a distinct town set in countryside.

Affects Legh Road CA.

I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.

Possible...

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Not necessary.

The A50 is far too busy a road to accommodate more traffic - although it is not as bad as the Warrington side of town.
I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

This site is ideal for development and should be favoured - low density housing only.

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

People will not buy existing homes if they know you are considering building.

Don't know this area.

A small amount of housing here.

N and O sites would be enough to satisfy the need for additional housing.

Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.

Don't agree with any more development.
Site Q: Land to the south and west of Beggarman's Lane

Do you agree or disagree with site Q as a potential area for future development

- 74% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (29%); Disagree (71%)

Comments:

| Perfect site for development, close to local schools and good vehicular access. |
| Green Belt. |
| Amenities (shops) and transport. |
| NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable. |
| I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing. |
| A good potential site - it surprises me it is not preferred. |
| All should take development. With good path, cycle ways and landscaping planting. |
| Impacts on residents. |
| No strong thoughts about this one. |
| Try to protect playing fields. |
| Too far out. |
| This is one of if not the largest area of land considered for development. There are should be re-visited to look at developing certain pockets, sitting 80-250 homes instead of 600-1,000. |
| Small developments of affordable housing in keeping with the local area |
| See above statements - development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction. |
| Green Belt. |
| Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? |
| A good potential site |
| A development here would put even more pressure on Bexton Lane and Bexton Road |
| Green belt again! Loss of farming land. More traffic congestion to add to that already around Bexton School. |
| Currently farmland so no green space loss. |
| This would be possible for housing if made much more access to be Toft Road. |
| I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development. However, I still believe these areas should not be developed as this would destroy green-belt and destroy the nature of Knutsford as a market town. |
| Same applies here - no reason given for rejection. |
| This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I & J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town. |
| Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with - too many houses on one site. Concerned for conservation area. |
| Green Belt. |
| This is open space up until Holmes Chapel and should remain so. It is ancient land which has been tilled and worked as agricultural land for hundreds of years. It should not be touched. All other objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as included in this comment. |
| There is no supporting evidence in the plan. |
| For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site ‘was not considered suitable for development’ and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless. |
| Site Q not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment. |
| Farming and playing field. |
| No development needed. |
| If needed there is the possibility of a small amount of ribbon development. |
| Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment. |
| Development to the west of the town, encompassing sites Q,R,S,T seems to have greater merit than in other directions. Sites should be considered holistically in this area and the simple investigation of areas immediately abutting existing development is naive. An urban extension of Knutsford east of the motorway providing links around the town centre from Northwich Road to A50 south of the town is worthy of consideration. New road crossing of rail line at some point seems fundamental to relieving centre of town of some traffic. It could possible help reduce the severance generated by King Edward road uniting elements of the town centre, for example, library, court house, Booths supermarket and bus station with main part of the town centre. Such a road around south west constructed as part of comprehensive development would also help resolve issues on Gaskell Avenue and around Leisure Centre and High school. |
| Should remain green belt. |
| Farmland should not be built on. |
| Could compromise the setting of Bexton Hall. |
| Encroaching on green belt. |
| Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice. |
| To exclude this site seems completely unfathomable. This is an field but with many oak tress but is large enough to take a reasonable mixed development with minimal disruption to the town. again it is potentially a site the developers will use in exchange for a smaller affordable development maybe at Tabley Rd. |
| - Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development. |
| This is part of a large area of countryside separating Knutsford from the M6 and is somewhat remote from the town centre facilities. The development of this site would add pressure to cross town traffic. |
and congestion in the town centre.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Well I would, since I live on Beggar mans Lane!

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Although some parts (adjacent to Beggar mans Lane) could be developed for quality low density housing.

With the primary school here the area is too congested.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Roads can not cope with extra traffic.

The playing fields for the young must not be taken away.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

Should not be considered for Development (I agree with Stakeholder panel).

Already far too congested.

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but I think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Being close to Legh road would seem an irrelevance.

This greenbelt land is actively farmed.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county.
Should not be losing farm space.
This is Green Belt, leave it alone.
Zone A would be preferable.
Too far from the town centre.
Green Belt and traffic issues.
On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.
Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.
I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring rural area of Bexton whilst also closing in on the motorway.
I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.
Too far from town centre.
Good agricultural land.
In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.
This site relates well to the existing urban area and includes within its boundaries existing residential development unlike others sites which are favoured by stakeholders. The development of this site along with site P would result in development extending southwards from the existing built-up area but in a favourable manner given that there is no important gap between Knutsford and a neighbouring settlements to protect.
Farmland and properties adjacent conservation area.
In part. Developing whole area would be detrimental to setting of Yewtree Farm, Bexton Hall and Toft footpath.
unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.
No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.
As this is green belt we still disagree with development. However, as it is one of the closest sites to the town centre, of all of the sites we would consider this to be favourable, however, for reasons which have not been disclosed this site has been dismissed. If development must go ahead then we feel that this site should also be considered as a favoured option.
Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.
Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.
This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.
Green belt Land.
Green belt, destroys a farm, and will impinge on a conservation area.
I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G, K please could this be explained.
Already removed from plan by you. Green Belt.
To fill in the land between the M6 and the town seems a good idea as the motorway provides a boundary.
There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and its already busy enough!
Green belt.
Some possibility of infilling with existing properties at the western end of Beggarman's Lane and
I do agree each of those sites is NOT ‘suitable for development’. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an ‘Other Development Option’.

Too far out.

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Would provide enough land for the whole project, and the road system could be accommodated

Green belt Land.

This site lies adjacent to an identified Site of Biological Importance.

Not necessary.

Again a very large plots may be could be partially used.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? - What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Possible for development.

Area too large - use of small pockets of this land would give high quality housing.

Encroachment into a Green Belt and farmland.

Area too large.

May add to existing congestion around Bexton School.

What a huge area and what a shame to take all that land.

too much encroachment on the Green Belt.

Leave the farming land as this is part of our character.

Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.

Don’t agree with any more development.

Too close to M6. There will be excessive traffic noise.
Site R: Land to the west of Blackhill Lane

Do you agree or disagree with site R as a potential area for future development

- 74% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (31%); Disagree (69%)

Comments:

<p>| Perfect site for development, close to local schools and good vehicular access. |
| Green Belt. |
| Amenities and transport required. |
| NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable. |
| I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing. |
| OK but near the railway line. |
| Crown land in a low lying natural dip. |
| Could be ok with housing. Reasonable access from existing roads. |
| Limited impact on residents and provides options to spread the impact across knutsford. Current preferences are an unfair impact on the North East of the town. |
| No strong thoughts about this one. |
| Using this space for development would make the Ashworth Park area become very crowded. House prices there would fall as a result and insurance premiums would rise. |
| Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town. |
| Not sure developing close to school would be ideal. |
| Too far out. |
| Small developments of affordable housing in keeping with the local area. |
| Development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction. |
| Green Belt. |
| Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites? |
| OK but near the railway line. |
| A development here would put even more pressure on Bexton Lane and Bexton Road. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential for school to expand if required to service increased demand.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a possible housing site but the surrounding roads will need to be widened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development. However, I still believe these areas should not be developed as this would destroy green-belt and destroy the nature of Knutsford as a market town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland - Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area does not need developing. The areas around Parkgate and Sites I &amp; J would have a better impact on the overall feel of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as included in this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no supporting evidence in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site was not considered suitable for development and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site R not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No development needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If needed there is the possibility of a small amount of ribbon development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development to the west of the town, encompassing sites Q,R,S,T seems to have greater merit than in other directions. Sites should be considered holistically in this area and the simple investigation of areas immediately abutting existing development is naive. An urban extension of Knutsford east of the motorway providing links around the town centre from Northwich Road to A50 south of the town is worthy of consideration. New road crossing of rail line at some point seems fundamental to relieving centre of town of some traffic. It could possible help reduce the severance generated by King Edward road uniting elements of the town centre, for example, library, court house, Booths supermarket and bus station with main part of the town centre. Such a road around south west constructed as part of comprehensive development would also help resolve issues on Gaskell Avenue and around Leisure Centre and High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland should not be built on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would compromise the setting of Bexton Hall. Would also spread development towards the railway line, to the detriment of an important approach to the town. Should remain Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a large development here will put a lot of pressure on Bexton school a small development would be acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would be an illogical extension, taken on its own, to the form of the town taking it closer to the M6 thus reducing the buffer between the town and that primary route. This site is not particularly well connected to the town centre facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the
criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Needs to be low density to avoid traffic issues. Potential for school and scouts facilities to expand needs to be considered.

This would make sense - as it would not impact on residents and would not compromise the look and feel of country Knutsford.

Blackhill Lane is a very busy route to both schools, any more housing in the area will make it impossible to move around at school times.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents

Traffic problems again.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

Should not be considered for Development (I agree with Stakeholder panel).

Already far too congested.

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put….. they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land

This greenbelt land is actively farmed.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

Zone A would be preferable.

Too far from the town centre and same comments as A and B This area of Green Belt should not be lost at all. It provides a buffer to the outskirts of the town and is a clearly visible area of green belt. Development on this site will cause visual pollution in addition to increased pollution from the
buildings established. It will greatly increase traffic flow along an already congested route.

Green Belt and traffic issues.

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.

I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town and is therefore in danger of encroaching into the neighbouring rural area of Bexton whilst also closing in on the motorway.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don’t believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

In part. As with site Q some development reasonable but whole site would be visible from the west.

will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

Although green belt, I think there will be less impact on established residents.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained.

Already removed from Plan by You Green Belt.

To fill in the land between the M6 and the town seems a good idea as the motorway provides a boundary.

There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and it’s already busy enough!

Strongly disagree. Impinges on the outlook and setting of Bexton Primary school. the only primary school in the town in a semi-rural situation.

I do agree each of those sites is NOT suitable for development. i.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an Other Development Option.

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

This site has the identified agricultural land classification grade 2.
Blackhill Lane development would be too large.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Possible.

Bexton Road and Bexton Lane are already too busy with traffic.

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' were rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

Development should not have detrimental affect on any farmers.

People who love the adjoining countryside will move out.

Traffic bad around Bexton School - new development would make worse.

Very small amount of housing allowed.

Potential to develop playing fields.

Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.

Don't agree with any more development.
Site S: Land to the west of Knutsford Academy (Lower School)

Do you agree or disagree with site S as a potential area for future development

- 75% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (36%); Disagree (64%)

**Comments:**

- Perfect site for development, close to local schools and good vehicular access.
- Why don’t you ask the academy if they have expansion plans or indeed assess whether any approved development sites will result in demand for more school places.
- This is a prime location to build many houses close together.
- NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.
- I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.
- OK but school developments may be needed.
- With re-build of high school / academy so frees up Bexton Road site to housing.
- Good location for housing. Does not visually impact on the approach to town and is not particularly attractive countryside.
- Limited impact on residents and provides options to spread the impact across Knutsford.
- No strong thoughts about this one.
- As with Site R, using this space for development would make the existing residential area become very crowded. House prices there would fall as a result and insurance premiums would rise.
- Please see my previous comments on further development housing wise of the town.
- Not sure developing close to school would be ideal.
- Could be used as near school.
- Small developments of affordable housing in keeping with the local area.
- See above statements - development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.
- Green Belt.
- Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites?
- OK but school developments may be needed.
too much noise from motorway and too much aircraft noise.
Too much adverse impact on Knutsford Academy.
Currently farmland so no green space loss.
Possible site but some land should be left for school playing fields.
I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development. However, I still believe these areas should not be developed as this would destroy green-belt and destroy the nature of Knutsford as a market town.
Farmland - Green Belt.
This would impact too much on the local residents. The road network would not be able to cope.
would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with.
Green Belt.
All other objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as included in this comment.
There is no supporting evidence in the plan.
In section 6.11, the third point in the Stakeholder Panel's considerations for housing priorities covers 'sites on the edge of the urban area with potential for good access to services or where they could increase facilities and opportunities for integrated communities'. How does this Site not fit that requirement? This Site seems to answer all the requirements of being close to the Town Centre and having good access potential from both the north and the east. Why is it not being considered? As with all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site was not considered suitable for development and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.
Site S not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.
Pylons - noted risk and restriction to development in proximity of pylons.
No development needed.
If needed there is the possibility of a small amount of ribbon development.
Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment.
Development to the west of the town, encompassing sites Q,R,S,T seems to have greater merit than in other directions. Sites should be considered holistically in this area and the simple investigation of areas immediately abutting existing development is naive. An urban extension of Knutsford east of the motorway providing links around the town centre from Northwich Road to A50 south of the town is worthy of consideration. New road crossing of rail line at some point seems fundamental to relieving centre of town of some traffic. It could possible help reduce the severance generated by King Edward road uniting elements of the town centre, for example, library, court house, Booths supermarket and bus station with main part of the town centre. Such a road around south west constructed as part of comprehensive development would also help resolve issues on Gaskell Avenue and around Leisure Centre and High school.
Ideal.
Farmland should not be built on.
If this land is playing fields, developing them is not a good idea.
small area of development only.
Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brown site development needs to be examined as a primary choice.
Strongly disagree to these areas as it is beautiful now. Existing houses outlook spoilt. Roads busy enough now.
The school needs to develop not housing.
Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

This would be an unnecessary western extension of Knutsford towards the M6 that would adversely affect the setting of the town.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case? What was the evidence that informed these decisions? Is it possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained.

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

Needs to be low density to avoid traffic issues. Potential for school to expand needs to be considered.

Does not impact on residents and good connections to motorway without diverting traffic through the town.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

All the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Traffic problems again.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

More traffic in a vulnerable area.

I think this land should be under consideration fro development. Access is good. School adjacency is a plus not a negative. I disagree with the Stakeholder panel.

Increased traffic congestion concerns

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Could develop part of it.

IT is greenbelt. I would never live there because of the power pylons.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.
GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county. This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

Zone A would be preferable.

Too far from the town centre and same comments as A and B This area of Green Belt should not be lost at all. It provides a buffer to the outskirts of the town and is a clearly visible area of green belt. Development on this site will cause visual pollution in addition to increased pollution from the buildings established. It will greatly increase traffic flow along an already congested route.

Green Belt and traffic issues.

On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable.. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.

Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances. There is a pond on this site and so there will be a wide variety of wildlife.

In printed town plan this appeared as 'land to the west of Knutsford High School' does this discrepancy affect the consultation. Loss of school land, does this mean less secondary education with a higher population??

I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town and is therefore in danger of encroaching on the motorway.

I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.

Good agricultural land.

In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.

Green belt/farmland.

Good land to grow crops.

For school use only.

Ideally development should be confined to the three fields North of Blackhill Farm.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.

As this is green belt we still disagree with development. However, as it is one of the closest sites to the town centre, of all of the sites we would consider this to be favourable, however, for reasons which have not been disclosed this site has been dismissed. If development must go ahead then we feel that this site should also be considered as a favoured option.

Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.

This is greenbelt land and should NOT be developed.

Green belt.

Although green belt, a lot of the site will border the school and thus impact less on established residents. I do not agree will destroying farms though.

I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained.

Already removed from plan by you Green Belt.

Some of this area could be suitable.

To fill in the land between the M6 and the town seems a good idea as the motorway provides a boundary.
There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and it's already busy enough!

Green belt.

Good potential especially if the encroachment on the countryside could be limited by Knutsford Academy moving onto one site

I do agree each of those sites is NOT suitable for development. I.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an Other Development Option.

Too far out.

Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.

Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Green belt.

Both sites have identified agricultural land classification grade 2, (the highest grade agricultural land within the area).

Once again sprawling town over too large an area.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Possible would be close for pupils.

Green Belt, wildlife, noise, view.

Pylons - not a good idea.

Bexton Road and Bexton Lane are already too busy with traffic.

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' were rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

Development will add to congestion in and out of Knutsford.

More traffic for the children to avoid.

Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.

Don't agree with any more development.
Site T: Land to the south of Northwich Road

Do you agree or disagree with site T as a potential area for future development

- 75% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (32%); Disagree (68%)

Comments:

Perfect site for development, close to local schools and good vehicular access.
School land Knutsford Academy - should be untouchable.
Green Belt.
Congestion needs to be avoided.
NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.
I will not agree to any greenbelt land being used for new housing.
Looks OK but near motorway.
With re-build of high school / academy so frees up Bexton Road site to housing.
Need to try preserve decent green approaches into the town to preserve its ancient character.
Modern housing estates on the approaches tend to give towns a cloned look.
Limited impact on residents and provides options to spread the impact across Knutsford.
Has a major impact on the appearance of the town approaches.
Not sure developing close to school would be ideal.
Too far out.
Small housing developments only in line with footprint of town.
Could be used for housing.
See above statements - development should be spread throughout Knutsford and not concentrated in one direction.
Green Belt.
Why are there no reasons given in the document for the unsuitability of these sites?
Near motorway.
Currently farmland so no green space loss.
Leave some land for school playing fields.

I have no knowledge as to why this area was not considered suitable for development. However, I still believe these areas should not be developed as this would destroy green-belt and destroy the nature of Knutsford as a market town.

Farmland - Green Belt.

This would impact too much on the local residents. The road network would not be able to cope. would involve building on greenbelt land which I strongly disagree with.

Green Belt.

Agree so long as carefully designed access is provided onto Northwich Road.

All other objections for all other sites so far apply and should be read as included in this comment.

There is no supporting evidence in the plan.

For this and all other Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site was not considered suitable for development and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to this point in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Site T not on the favoured potential so why ask for comment.

Pylons - noted risk and restriction to development in proximity of pylons.

Access to Northwich Road would need to be reviewed from any development

No development needed.

Any development around Knutsford would be to its detriment

Development to the west of the town, encompassing sites Q,R,S,T seems to have greater merit than in other directions. Sites should be considered holistically in this area and the simple investigation of areas immediately abutting existing development is naive. An urban extension of Knutsford east of the motorway providing links around the town centre from Northwich Road to A50 south of the town is worthy of consideration. New road crossing of rail line at some point seems fundamental to relieving centre of town of some traffic. It could possible help reduce the severance generated by King Edward road uniting elements of the town centre, for example, library, court house, Booths supermarket and bus station with main part of the town centre. Such a road around south west constructed as part of comprehensive development would also help resolve issues on Gaskell Avenue and around Leisure Centre and High school

Would cause excessive traffic congestion.

You have to be joking! - much of this is school playing fields!

In the medium term, the responsible land ownership, here, may offer some potential for a properly planned urban expansion, if the Council is proactive.

Encroaching on green belt.

Greenbelt land should not be built on within Knutsford, including this option. Brownsite development needs to be examined as a primary choice.

The traffic, the effect on existing houses, the lack of infrastructure - we do not want to live in a big town we love Knutsford the size it is.

a small development

- Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.

This would be a significant extension of the western part of the town towards the M6 which would erode the setting of Knutsford in the approaches along the A5033.

Explanations from the Stakeholder Panel that the development options (F-T) are "not suitable for development" requires full substantiation. As presented these are unsupported assertions. Is the
reason the same in each case (F-T)? What was the rationale behind the decisions? What were the criteria in each case. What was the evidence that informed these decisions? At present it is not possible to agree or disagree since the data provided is inadequate for an informed opinion.

Green Belt land should be maintained

However there is no reason given as to why Cheshire east council have disregarded these sites and favoured others. This is not transparent is contributing to an unfair consultation. We can not make decisions based on limited, skewed information.

If Academy was relocated.

Does not impact on residents and good connections to motorway without diverting traffic through the town.

6.7 Although the development option sites A to T are outside the Areas of Archaeological Potential, all of the favoured potential development sites would need to be assessed to define the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation and whether this needs to be done at the pre-determination stage or can be secured by condition. This advice is in line with Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Paragraphs 128 and 141.

all the potential sites should be reassessed and rejected only after consideration is given to using more of these sites to create much smaller developments with a lesser impact on local residents.

Traffic problems again.

Look after our / your children.

As it's on prime agricultural land / greenbelt. If the government rules that LAs can build on greenbelt, more information is required as to why this land was considered unsuitable.

It is not clear why these proposed development areas were not considered suitable for development from the consultation document. However, it would seem preferable to spread the necessary development in more natural ribbons across the proposed sites rather than create large new estate on one or two locations.

I think this land should be under consideration for development. Access is good. School adjacency is a plus not a negative. I disagree with the Stakeholder panel.

Increased traffic congestion concerns.

As previously stated I don’t think we should be developing these green belt areas but i think it is untransparent not to give us reasons why you have rejected these sites. Just to put..... they were considered unsuitable for development is not good enough. It can only lead to speculation as to the reasons. The consultation has given detail to why you believe the favoured sites should be developed but I don’t feel we are given a proper chance to understand the decision making process without knowing the reasons behind not favouring the other sites.

Greenbelt land, good agricultural land.

Could use part of it.

It is greenbelt. I would never live there because of the power pylons.

Green belt.

Do not accept that there is any need for development on Green Belt land.

Cannot agree to any proposal until evidence is provided of: what the selection criteria are; how the site meets (or otherwise) those criteria and the exact proposed development.

GREEN BELT - it is not necessary to build on green belt while there are brownfield sites in the county

However farm land and lower school land should not be built on if possible.

This is Green Belt, leave it alone.

Zone A would be preferable.

Too far from the town centre and same comments as A and B This area of Green Belt should not be lost at all. It provides a buffer to the outskirts of the town and is a clearly visible area of green belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development on this site will cause visual pollution in addition to increased pollution from the buildings established. It will greatly increase traffic flow along an already congested route.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Belt and traffic issues.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the grounds that it has not been explained as to why the Stakeholder Panel deemed this site unsuitable. It is impossible to agree or disagree without understanding the reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt sites should not be developed under any circumstances.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this land is outside the natural boundary of the town and is therefore in danger of encroaching on the motorway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disagree with building a large number of houses on any of the proposed sites because I don't believe the infrastructure of the town can cope, and I think Knutsford has reached the size it can be before the character is spoilt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not provide a suitably balanced edge to settlement (one side of road only) and suitable separation from M6.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good agricultural land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In relation to the siting of new developments in the neighbouring towns, the Parish Council is uncomfortable with the proposed encroachment in to Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt/farmland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good land to grow crops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For school use only. With more houses, need schools within walking distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No development should be allowed. I agree with the Stakeholders.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any development would impact on the green belt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.3 of the draft Strategy provides no reasons which this site is considered to be unsuitable for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will cause too much traffic through the centre of town.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is green belt land and should NOT be developed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Belt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt, but I do not think the impact on the town’s sense of space will be too great.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t understand why these are stated as not suitable for development relative to sites A, B, C, D, E, G,K please could this be explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwich road less congested than Manchester Road.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already removed from plan by you Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some of this area could be suitable.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again there is already development here so it could be continued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is already too much traffic on the roads around Knutsford. Increase in housing means that there would be more traffic and it's already busy enough!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green belt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would increase traffic on an already busy road that is often congested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some potential for limited development provided it went no further than Sudlow Lane along the Northwich Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This site affects part of the Tabley House landscape, still of some visual importance and interest.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do agree each of those sites is NOT suitable for development. i.e. I disagree with each of those Sites being an Other Development Option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too far out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous question. Agreed NOT suitable for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green Belt! Would like to know why discounted so early in the process.

Green Belt.

Both sites have identified agricultural land classification grade 2, (the highest grade agricultural land within the area). Furthermore site T contains a designated public open space and the development of such a space does not assist in the promotion of healthy community and the ability to engage with the natural environment.

Once again sprawling town over too large an area.

I wish to record my objection to all the proposed development sites for housing / mixed use in Knutsford and to register my concern that Cheshire East Council is thinking about plans to sell the Green Belt in, around and surrounding Knutsford. I am sure you are aware that Green Belt was created to ensure wildlife was preserved and people had access to open countryside but it looks as if our Council is bent on selling this along with woodland and forestry. The sell-off of the Green Belt is opening the door for developers to swoop in and make substantial profits on our countryside. Please consider other options: -What empty homes can be used? -What brownfield sites can be developed? -What derelict buildings can be redeveloped? Serious questions need to be answered about any plans to build on our open space. These include: -are the roads able to cope? -are there enough shops / schools / doctors and play areas? All of these things need to be taken into account. We will see the loss of much loved countryside and green space and the very nature of our community will be changed for ever.

Possible.

Green Belt.

Increased traffic problems.

Pylons - not a good idea.

Bexton Road and Bexton Lane are already too busy with traffic.

More information regarding the viability of the preferred sites would have been helpful e.g. land ownership issues, drainage, access and land quality. Also the reasons why the 'other development options' where rejected by the Stakeholder Panel.

Could add to congestion when M6 and A556 incidents result in traffic coming into Knutsford.

Mixed use?

Why no explanation as to why these aren't favoured sites.

Excellent area for development of industrial use and affordable housing with good access.

Opposed to development of sites L-T as they are located in Green Belt.

Don't agree with any more development.
### Q5 Other Sites

**Are there any other sites that you would like to consider for potential development?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Development Proposed:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All land between sites S,T and A up to the M6 motorway</td>
<td>Open fields with excellent vehicular access and within walking distance of the town centre.</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>All your areas are too large; you might have better results if you tripled the amount of options. Also how do you justify marking off these areas, what are your design parameters? The plan just looks like someone had an afternoon free and a red pen, very little thought has gone into this at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford Town Centre</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.</td>
<td>NO LAND Should be taken from the greenbelt. No site is acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s see the private land of all the council members being developed in blocks of flats before we eat into greenbelt land.</td>
<td>All property owned by council members.</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tatton Street - car park area</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Re-build of new cinema / theatre / civic centre with shops and offices and housing under ground car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fire Station site</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land bounded by M6, Railway, Knutsford high School, Sudlow farm</td>
<td>Crop fields but not of much ecological value.</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not put everything in one place and extend sites H, I and J towards Mobberley, far</td>
<td>So far as I know its open land to ether side of the railway (future metrolink?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
less disruption for the rest of the town and it meshes into current / planned mixed use areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egerton Primary school site</th>
<th>School site and playing fields</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Shared equity- mews houses, small block of flats and a few bungalows and if space a small playground nearer to Booths end. This site is central to the town so ideal for the elderly and starter homes. The school could be moved to site C/D allowing expansion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The rear of Red Cow / Sessions House off of Canute Square - both sides.</td>
<td>This should be developed into new town square area with demolition of Red Cow to provide 2 sided row of shops opening to new square at back. Vital for town development. Keep front of Red Cow only.</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Including housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land between the A50 and Mereheath Lane to the North of Site C; and Land to the North of Sites F and Gate Parkgate</td>
<td>Logical extension to these sites to establish the natural defensible boundary of the greenbelt</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the North of Site F</td>
<td>There is an element of land which has not been included in any options, close to park gate and site G and directly above site F. Development here would seem to make sense up to the natural boundary/tree line</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land to the north of site F</td>
<td>Site F has an area of land above it that runs up to a natural boundary. I believe this site should also be considered for development.</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford High Lower School - I have been told that 50% of the children going to Knutsford High School come from outside of Cheshire East, i.e Trafford...Could the council Potentially explore lowering this number and then using the land that Lower School is on to build extra housing.??</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Crewe Congleton Sandbach.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Go and build in Wilmslow - they like their residential areas and highly commercial town centre which they have spoiled - businesses continuously close and shops remain empty because the town was too greedy in their expansion. Look at Wilmslow and decide if we really want to end up like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmslow</td>
<td>Wilmslow</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Go and build in Wilmslow - they like their residential areas and highly commercial town centre which they have spoiled - businesses continuously close and shops remain empty because the town was too greedy in their expansion. Look at Wilmslow and decide if we really want to end up like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longridge and Shaw Heath</td>
<td>Primarily a housing Estate that needs Sports and Leisure Facilities</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I suggest those industrial units which are not used in the Longridge trading estate are used for housing development. There are no suitable green field sites. The whole point of Knutsford is it is a rural town. Lets keep it that way and not spoil a rural area for the sake of money in developers pockets.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have so far turned down development on brownfield land off King Street - sorry can’t remember the name, its ......Yard I think, where Cheshire Mowers were and this would be perfect for low cost town houses. Also the end of the Moor by the railway line to the private car park</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Knutsford not suitable for either housing or employment development at this time. I have seen no research that suggests there is any demand for this and have had no benefits of any such development explained</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Green Lane And Manchester Road Knutsford</td>
<td>The site is approx. 6/10 of a hectare, and presently has a set of green houses (disused) one dwelling property (disused), and a set of outbuildings.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>This site could take 12 to 18 housing units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of urban extension to west/south west of the town centre should be considered as an alternative to series of smaller sites around centre which cannot provide any strategic infrastructure improvements to mitigate impacts of development or relieve town centre of through traffic. A strategic site in this area could provide new crossing of rail line which is fundamentally needed if traffic levels to be reduced at critical junction of A50 at Adams Hill and along King Edward Road. West side of town has best links to M6. West side best access to High School West side as close or closer to rail station and bus station as other areas West side nearest leisure centre</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesars cottages site knocked down by Aldi. Proposed developments at the yard site at the scout hut near the Moor. Villages on the outskirts of Knutsford may need further housing to relieve pressure on Knutsford and boost the sense of community and economy within these villages. The infrastructure problems could also be solved by investing in local schools and health facilities previously closed.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a derelict garage in the centre of Ashley, and one in Mobberley approximately 200m from the Chapel House Inn near the railway bridge on the back way to Wilmslow. If you need to know exactly where this is, please contact me by email.

The former Allen and Appleyard building - could this property be converted into residential properties rather than being another public house. Area of land behind booths - could this be used for car parking if extra car parking is so desperately required. It is not a public open space which is used regularly.

| Peover hall estate Over Peover Knutsford | This is a self contained site that is not unlike the ones developed in the 70's around Knutsford. Over Peover needs further development to support its 2 pubs and school. It needs to support a medical centre as the existing population ages and grow its leisure facilities. The displacement of a single family would be balanced against the new homes and potential complaints of 11000 Knutsford residents to further developments. In a world of no vested interests where planning was genuinely about social cohesion and sustainability on green field sites, it would make huge sense for Cheshire. It would offer population support and footfall to Chelford business and Holmes Chapel as well as Knutsford. |

| Mixed Use |

| The hall could be a hotel or sheltered flats for employment there is room for rural business units as well as a medical centre, There is a rural landscape that can be very sympathetically suited to a full range of mixed developments, It is a natural hub for buses feeding Chelford and Macclesfield, or south to Holmes Chapel. |

My only comment is that the council should undertake a detailed study of unused rooms which exist above all the shops in Knutsford to examine to what extent additional accommodation could be provided in the town centre for singles/couples.

None - see previous comments regarding traffic at peak times.

| Aldi Site- we do not need another supermarket. |

| Mixed Use |

| Academy (Lower School) site. Toft Cricket Club site. |

| Academy (Lower School) site could be developed if Lower School is relocated to site T and part of S. Toft Cricket Club has been excluded from site M but other sports facilities have been suggested for development. A more consistent approach is needed. Cricket Club site could be developed if Cricket Club could be relocated. |

<p>| Housing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Brownfield sites in surrounding towns.</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>Employment and housing if it can be proved without doubt that it is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldi site for houses, we don’t need another supermarket.</td>
<td>Town centre location.</td>
<td>Housing on the Aldi site if you think we require more housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booths Hall</td>
<td>Sparsely populated and under used site</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown field sites</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Any development needs to be proportionate to the needs of people that live in Knutsford and extra resources and employment need to be created for each individual that any housing development would add to the population of Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexton Road, Hospital site (Community Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a potential site for a new health and wellbeing centre, or if it is located elsewhere (Location D and F being the current preferred sites), then the hospital site could become good for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham and Northwich, rather than build on prime agricultural land on the edge of Knutsford.</td>
<td>Use any brown field sites or unused houses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatton Street and King Street car parks</td>
<td>Council owned surface car parks.</td>
<td>Other Both car parks could be decked and fronted by housing (onto Tatton St and Moor) with no loss of car parking (possibly more) in order to repair these gaps in the townscape. Both car parks are probably the worst scars in the fabric of the town centre. Appreciate contamination land issue on Tatton Street car park (Â£), but to leave them as they are is short-sighted. The Council should be taking the initiative to provide an innovative design/development solution here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the south of site Q (see Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan mentions Knutsford being an historic town but no mention of how much Knutsford should grow. Will growth be 6000 homes or 60,000. Also no mention of private housing. The figures of 460 - 1200 are all affordable housing. Renovation of unoccupied housing is not mentioned and the town centre could end up with no houses at all.
email sent to LDF team on 02/05/2012. This was a site put forward by Ads-Plan Ltd in an e-mail to the LDF team dated 2 May 2012. The view is taken that it should be given serious consideration if sites Q, P and O are identified for future development as it would provide a further opportunity for development on the western side of Holmes Chapel Road in a southerly direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land between Lilybrook Drive and Sanctuary Moor.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derelict field. Former small holding. Suited for housing for elderly due to proximity to town centre and quiet location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexton lane site urgently needs to be fully reopened for use as intermediate hospital care ward and day respite and assessment centre for people with confusions and dementia. Also local hospital facilities need to be extended beyond 9-5 weekdays only. To include more consultants and minor injuries and out of hours units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not want Knutsford to be developed anywhere beyond its current boundaries. Any further expansions will be to the detriment to the charms of Knutsford, its inhabitants and businesses. Knutsford is blessed to be surrounded by beautiful greenbelt land and ancient woodlands which should be respected and retained at all costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Legh - it needs a community feel that infrastructure would bring and I think residents would welcome facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Green Lane And Manchester Road Knutsford.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is approx. 6/10 of a hectare, and presently has a set of green houses (disused) one dwelling property (disused), and a set of outbuildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site could take 12 to 18 housing units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Green Lane And Manchester Road Knutsford.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is approx. 6/10 of a hectare, and presently has a set of green houses (disused) one dwelling property (disused), and a set of outbuildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site could take 12 to 18 housing units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Green Lane And Manchester Road Knutsford.</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a greenfield site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either side of Northwich Road between Knutsford and the M6.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infilling around current areas of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldi site</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the proposed Aldi site would be better used for...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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accommodation. These could go fairly high, and would be very close to the train line and the town centre. It could incorporate a convenience store (preferably an independent delicatessen rather than a chain store) about where Autoden is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infill town back-land areas eg at Heritage Way.</th>
<th>Mixed Use</th>
<th>Housing (flats) and shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office buildings behind Bentley - they have been unoccupied since being built so surely constitute a brown field site now.</td>
<td>Car park and empty office blocks.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not within Natural England's remit to promote or otherwise suggest any other sites that may be suitable for development.

Cllr’s back gardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little Heath</th>
<th>car park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Land to the north of site F to follow the existing natural boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T, S, R, Q</th>
<th>These sites could link Northwich and Toft Rocks, diverting traffic from town centre.</th>
<th>Mixed Use</th>
<th>Small housing developments rather than large block of non-descript units.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

None - no other brownfield sites other than old court house

Any brownfield sites should be re-developed as appropriate before green field areas or even corridors.

On behalf of local conservation architects, Batley Architects. Their specific land interest is the car park at Moorside, Knutsford, which is a previously developed site located in the heart of the town. The site is proposed for a small-scale, high quality residential development, but has not been consulted on.
Q6 Knutsford Town Centre Boundary

Do you agree or disagree with the potential amendments to the town centre boundary?
Area A: Residential areas around Albert Street

Do you agree or disagree with the potential amendments to the town centre boundary at Area A?

- 63% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (60%); Disagree (40%)

Comments:

Yes previously a car leasing business existed but it was out of place and has since been developed for housing so this should be returned to residential only.

The greater the area that comes under the heritage "banner" will be better for all those in the capture area.

Tightens up town definition - logical. The Moor needs to be lit and have CCTV for safety.

No need to change town centre boundary.

What's the point of this redesignation what does it achieve?

The plans for all areas are not clear cut and are really mere waffle.

Not quite sure what is to be achieved by altering the town boundary? Other than spending unnecessary funds?

It has not been explain what the significance is of the town centre boundary so i can't answer this question.

Don't understand the need for change.

Agree - but fail to see the difference between these properties and those on Gaskell Avenue.

It should be extended up to the 5-way cross roads where the Tatton Park road is (next to the Church).

Don't fully understand the implications.

The Strategy is not clear what this means? I.e. what will the effect be to there and surrounding areas? Are they suggesting putting shops/ restaurants there?

I don't understand what effect 'amendments to the town centre boundary' has on anything! Its all for complicated for me to give any useful comments (and I suspect that this applies to most Knutsford citizens).

It is by no means clear from this document what would be the implications.

A good intention that will never happen but it seems a good plan.

I am unsure what this means?
Currently wasted space - may have potential for development within reason.

Insufficient data to make a decision.

Not sure how a boundary change helps.

Agree in principle.

This is mainly residential development and there seems to be little point in continuing its designation as part of the town centre.

Essentially residential and not town centre character.

Not enough information has been provided on the implications of boundary changes to enable the public to respond in an informed way on this amendment.

It is not clear why you want to change the town centre boundary. So I can't see any advantage to the change.

The documentation does not explain to me why one would take Albert Street out of the town centre.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

Knutsford town centre is very small, if the conservation area is tied to the boundary, then I have no wish to see it change. What benefit accrues?

Would it not be beneficial to retain this as part of the town centre?

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

It is hard to assess the benefits/drawbacks from the information given in the plan. I therefore cannot express a view.

No point.

I don't understand what difference this will make in practice - the documentation does not explain it properly.

Don't see any point.

It is not explained properly within the consultation document why it is felt necessary to remove this area from within the town centre boundary and what, if anything, would be the effect or consequences of this and so I feel I must disagree with the proposal.

Why?

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

This is a Part conservation Area historically aligned to the Town Centre.

It will not be Knutsford if you do this. Keep it compact, and charming.

Leave things as they are.

The implications of this designation have not been sufficiently explained for me to form an opinion

Presumably this is to release Egerton Primary site for development. If so the town will need a replacement and enlarged primary school to accommodate the pupils population from the new housing. Possible site for this could be site D Mereheath Lane (south) which could make use of existing playing fields. Joint use could protect cricket and tennis club use.

Can't really see the point.

This is clearly a residential area, not town centre.

The Area should not have been included in the first place.

Not enough information to make a decision.

This is a Part conservation Area historically aligned to the Town Centre.

The purpose of amending the town centre boundary is to promote active town centre uses. Natural England agrees with the reduction of the town centre boundary to remove the residential areas from being within the town centre. This would retain the residential amenity area whilst promoting the concentration of town centre uses within the boundary. Natural England suggest enhanced footpath
and cycle routes connecting the residential and town centre areas would be of benefit to the town in promoting sustainable movement networks and promoting a healthy community.

To house and support local business reduce rental rates.

With houses replacing the garage this is now residential rather than town centre.

It's not been made clear in the report what difference this makes - and what impact it would have on different areas that would be brought within the TC Boundary.

I don't understand why boundary needs to change and what impact this will have - it is not explained clearly in the consultation document. More information please!

Agree with exclusion from town centre.

Why?? Need for more detail.
Area B: Residential areas around Egerton and Ruskin Court

Do you agree or disagree with the potential amendments to the town centre boundary at Area B?

- 63% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (60%); Disagree (40%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should include houses that back onto malt street and old market place across from Egerton square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tightens up town definition - logical. The Moor needs to be lit and have CCTV for safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need to change town centre boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s the point of this redesignation what does it achieve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not quite sure what is to be achieved by altering the town boundary? Other than spending unnecessary funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't understand the need for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree - but fail to see the difference between these properties and those on Gaskell Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't fully understand the implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategy is not clear what this means? i.e what will the effect be to there and surrounding areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they suggesting putting shops/ restaurants there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure why declassifying it would help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't understand what effect 'amendments to the town centre boundary' has on anything! Its all for complicated for me to give any useful comments (and I suspect that this applies to most Knutsford citizens).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As with the other proposed changes, it is by no means clear from this document what would be the implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good intention that will never happen but it seems a good plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure what this means?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The boundary should be amended to protect these residential areas from development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient data to make a decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In character terms, as well as historically, I think this is town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree in principle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Area B: Residential areas around Egerton and Ruskin Court*
I cannot understand what the designation for town centre means if it means loss of conservation rights then these houses in Egerton Square are a distinctive part of the town building heritage. If this means lack of say in the pedestrianisation debate then again we are integral as the unmade up road and Moorside are essential to its success. We have our drains blocked by fat from the restaurants and smells from the cooking and vandal incidents from the pub goers returning to the estates off the Mobberley rd. we are guardians of the moor an integral part of the look of the town we are the few residents who walk into town I cannot see how we are not part of the town centre. However if it means being a car park then perhaps better off outside.

Whilst this area is primarily residential in nature it does form part of the historic core and whilst it could be argued there is some inappropriate housing development within it as part of the Conservation Area it should be retained in the town centre.

Essentially residential and not town centre character.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

This should include Ruskin Rooms, Drury Lane Cottages, Water Tower, Ruskin Court - All Grade 2 and 3 buildings - By Richard Harding Watt.

Not enough information has been provided on the implications of boundary changes to enable the public to respond in an informed way on this amendment.

It is not clear why you want to change the town centre boundary. So I can't see any advantage to the change.

The documentation does not explain to me why one would take this area out of the town centre.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

Knutsford town centre is very small, if the conservation area is tied to the boundary, then I have no wish to see it change. What benefit accrues?

Would it not be beneficial to retain this as part of the town centre?

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

It is hard to assess the benefits/drawbacks from the information given in the plan. I therefore cannot express a view.

No point.

I don't understand what difference this will make in practice - the documentation does not explain it properly.

And square?

It is not explained properly within the consultation document why it is felt necessary to remove this area from within the town centre boundary and what, if anything, would be the effect or consequences of this and so I feel I must disagree with the proposal.

Already in Town Centre conservation area.

Why take out important historic buildings there

These are Grade II Richard Hardy Watt area should be in town centre as it always has been.

Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

What benefit would this area receive? it is a pleasant, slightly shabby backwater. I would not want to see the possibility of "car parking opportunities" or other town centre-related activities.

New Developments.

It will not be Knutsford if you do this. Keep it compact, and charming.

Leave things as they are

This is an excellent blend of original Watt houses and modern developments in the same style. It should be protected within the townscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can't really see the point.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Again, clearly a residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Area should not have been included in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information to make a decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Developments.**

The purpose of amending the town centre boundary is to promote active town centre uses. Natural England agrees with the reduction of the town centre boundary to remove the residential areas from being within the town centre. This would retain the residential amenity area whilst promoting the concentration of town centre uses within the boundary. Natural England suggest enhanced footpath and cycle routes connecting the residential and town centre areas would be of benefit to the town in promoting sustainable movement networks and promoting a healthy community.

To house and support local business reduce rental rates.

Should this not be Egerton Square and Ruskin Court.

This should include all Grade II properties in Drury Lane etc

Mainly residential, not commercial.

I don't understand why boundary needs to change and what impact this will have - it is not explained clearly in the consultation document. More information please!!

Agree with exclusion from town centre.

Why?? Need for more detail.
Area C: The Moor and car park

Do you agree or disagree with the potential amendments to the town centre boundary at Area C?
- 63% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (61%); Disagree (39%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
This is a public open space on the fringe of the built up area of Knutsford town centre and is distinct. It could just as easily fall into the Crosstown conservation area.

Absolutely not to be included in Town centre boundary for development. This is an open space that needs protecting. It is in the walkable catchment for a great deal of Knutsford residents. It is the only equipped play area in The Town and should have been expanded and invested in since the Macclesfield Borough Strategy for Parks was done in 2003/4. A very important pedestrian route way linking the two halves of Town. Hands off you car park enthusiasts. A community facility - Scout Hut site that needs protecting and this part of the moor should be moved outside the Town Centre boundary.

The Moor should be protected from development.
Tightens up town definition - logical. The Moor needs to be lit and have CCTV for safety.
No need to change town centre boundary.
What’s the point of this redesignation what does it achieve? is it just a trick so that you can say you have increased the green area within the town centre?
Not quite sure what is to be achieved by altering the town boundary? Other than spending unnecessary funds?
The Moor has to be protected.
Excellent idea to bring the Moor and carpark into town centre boundary
Don't understand the need for change.
Don't fully understand the implications.
I would only agree providing that no significant areas would be tuned into intrusive car parks.
The Strategy is not clear what this means? i.e. what will the effect be to there and surrounding areas? Are they suggesting putting shops/ restaurants there?
I don't understand what effect 'amendments to the town centre boundary' has on anything! Its all too
complicated for me to give any useful comments (and I suspect that this applies to most Knutsford citizens).

As with the other proposed changes, it is by no means clear from this document what would be the implications.

A good intention that will never happen but it seems a good plan.

I think this area could be developed further to include more car parking and some more sports facilities e.g. tennis courts?

Strongly disagree with extending the town centre boundary to include the moor. This is unnecessary if you want to protect this area from future development. Bringing it into the town centre boundary will inevitably result in this being developed either wholly or partly and this is such a beautiful area that needs to be protected from development of any kind.

Insufficient data to make a decision. As an open space it should be protected and not used for additional parking.

Put the Moor at threat

Section 7.3 says "new retail development should be focused within the town centre". If the Moor was designated as Town Centre would it be vulnerable to retail development? I think the Moor should be part of the town centre as a leisure facility and not used for retail or as a car park. I would not consider the moor to be ‘retained as open space’ if it were used as a car park.

As long as the only improvements are to the children’s play area. We do not need any other building in this area.

However if Moor is to be included, logically Small Heath should also be included

The Moor is a recreational area and should be left as such

This is open space. In characterisation terms this is NOT town centre. I cannot see that this change will do anything but threaten the open space in the mid to long term. A dreadful idea.

Agree in principle

I cannot understand what the designation for town centre means if it means loss of conservation rights then these houses in Egerton square are a distinctive part of the town building heritage. if this means lack of say in the pedestrianisation debate then again we are integral as the unmade up road and moorside are essential to its success. we have our drains blocked by fat from the restaurants and smells from the cooking and vandal incidents from the pub goers returning to the estates off the Mobberley rd. we are guardians of the moor an integral part of the look of the town we are the few residents who walk into town I cannot see how we are not part of the town centre. However if it means being a car park then perhaps better off outside.

Delineation within the town centre may lead to adverse pressures for development in that area that would be inappropriate to its current open nature.

I think it is essential that the Moor is kept in its present form as a green space and not developed in any way

It is not clear what potential benefits would result from extending the town centre boundary to this area.

There are other organisations concerned with looking after the Moor. Focus on the rest of Knutsford!

Completely disagree, this area is for families and leisure and has no place in a retail zone. Knutsford would lose visitors and would result in another loss of green space.

There is no obvious reason to include the Moor in the town centre and none is given. It opens up the potential for 'town centre uses' on what should remain open space.

Why? Leave it as it is.

Not enough information has been provided on the implications of boundary changes to enable the public to respond in an informed way on this amendment.

The Moor should be preserved. It is well used by knutsford residents and a focal point for families. I strongly believe the Moor should be retained as a park.
It is not clear why you want to change the town centre boundary. So I can't see any advantage to the change.

I always thought the Moor was in the town centre. Improve access and signs to the car park behind the Moor.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

Knutsford town centre is very small, if the conservation area is tied to the boundary, then I have no wish to see it change. What benefit accrues?

Yes, it may be beneficial to include this as part of the town centre.

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

Whilst noting that the Moor would be retained as open space, there seems questionable merit in including that area in the designated town centre.

If the area is to be retained as open space - as it should be - there is nothing to be gained by including it in the town centre plan other than to increase the potential for development later and this should be avoided.

It is hard to assess the benefits/drawbacks from the information given in the plan. I therefore cannot express a view.

as long as green space is protected and improved also improved road to car park if anticipated increased number of vehicular traffic. Also this increases value of land - does it belong to CEC

On the proviso that other green space is not lost as a result.

I don't understand what difference this will make in practice - the documentation does not explain it properly.

Why would it make any difference?

This makes perfect sense and hopefully would help enhance the Moor as part of the town centre as I feel it is sometimes overlooked.

Already in Town Centre conservation area

the moor should be excluded from town centre development

Retain as green space

Why should this change?

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree

What benefit would accrue? The Moor should be left well alone (other than being kept as smart as possible. The walkway by the lake needs attention, as does the lake itself which suffers from accumulation of rubbish which is an eyesore as well as being detrimental to the resident wildlife.

I disagree although I do not have access to the town centre policies so I am not clear on the value of including this area within the town centre other than using it for improved parking.

The Moor is already overseen by town organisations.

It will not be Knutsford if you do this. Keep it compact, and charming. We must keep our green space.

As long as the only improvements are to the children’s play area.

As long as the only improvements are to the children’s play area.

I have always regarded this as part of the town centre anyway as I am sure most of Knutsford does so do not see the point of this suggestion

As long as the only improvements are to the children’s play area.

If this ensures no inappropriate development

Why change this?

Can’t really see the point.

As long as no one is going to build a car park or shops on it I would agree - but it has to be guaranteed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as open public green space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep the Moor outside the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this mean you are considering developing on the car park? The reasons in this section are not clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information to make a decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England agrees that the retention of The Moor as a designated Open Space is an important aspect of the potential amendments to the town centre boundary. Natural England recommend the use of ANGSt as a tool that can help ensure adequate provision of accessible natural greenspace, ANGSt can be located via the following weblink: <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east</a> of england/ourwork/gilaccessiblenaturalgreenspace standardangst.aspx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To house and support local business reduce rental rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to be developed. Leave well alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an essential amenity for Knutsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area is out with town centre especially if B removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must stay as a green space - definitely no car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear what difference it would make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't understand why boundary needs to change and what impact this will have - it is not explained clearly in the consultation document. More information place!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced facility - not seen by visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?? Need for more detail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area D: Area around the proposed Aldi and its car park

**Do you agree or disagree with the potential amendments to the town centre boundary at Area D?**

- 63% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (70%); Disagree (30%)

### Comments:

This area is interesting as it was previously a business estate land owned by CEC who sold it to developers. Should have been the location for community facilities such as new GP practice or skate park, or car parking. It is surrounded by residential properties. No more retail development should be granted that will increase the amount of car traffic visitors to Town.

This is a fait accompli, even though building work has not started.

- Tightens up town definition - logical. The Moor needs to be lit and have CCTV for safety.
- No need to change town centre boundary.
- Not quite sure what is to be achieved by altering the town boundary? Other than spending unnecessary funds?
- Doesn't really seem like the town centre.
- We have enough supermarkets.
- Don't understand the need for change.
- Is the Aldi going to be built?
- Don't fully understand the implications.

The Strategy is not clear what this means? i.e what will the effect be to there and surrounding areas? are they suggesting putting shops/ restaurants there?

I don't understand what effect 'amendments to the town centre boundary' has on anything! Its all for complicated for me to give any useful comments (and I suspect that this applies to most Knutsford citizens).

As with the other proposed changes, it is by no means clear from this document what would be the implications.

A good intention that will never happen but it seems a good plan.

deeply concerned about the look of development here - this is the first impression of the town when entering through king street.
Insufficient data to make a decision.

Aldi should never have been allowed to build here as the roads are already too congested. they should have been told to build off Longridge.

Seems a sensible extension, given the appearance of Aldi in the town.

This needs provision of a lot of car parking space and is going to cause a lot of congestion for through traffic.

In characterisation terms this is not town centre and still won't be even if Aldi is built.

Agree in principle.

You missed your chance to put up a medical centre there instead we get another busines intent on removing wealth from the town. excellent planning

The nature of this area has recently changed and so could now be included.

Should be for housing.

Given the development that has been approved this is logical.

Not enough information has been provided on the implications of boundary changes to enable the public to respond in an informed way on this amendment

It is not clear why you want to change the town centre boundary. So I can't see any advantage to the change

To me this can also be part of the town centre. It appears to be too late to stop the proposed Aldi on this site - it should have been off Longridge where proper parking and buses could be used to access the store. Increasing the traffic at the junction of Adams Hill and King Street will just make it even worse driving from one side of Knutsford to the other. The unreliable contactors used by BT to lay phone lines for Aldi have already left large areas of Knutsford without working phone lines for a week. Those contractors have been on Adams Hill / Hollow Lane for over a month, causing traffic chaos at all times of the day.

Knutsford does not need Aldi! It is surprising that they are still coming with Waitrose/Sainsbury/Co-Op established. They threaten to take out Co-Op and this would leave us without a Post Office and another black hole in the shopping streets. Instead stop the development and put in car parking for the station and shopping areas.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

Knutsford town centre is very small, if the conservation area is tied to the boundary, then I have no wish to see it change. What benefit accrues? You have already lost the cottages and trees on this site, what price enforcement?

Yes, it may be beneficial to include this as part of the town centre.

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

KCHG wishes that this land had been afforded greater protection in the past, such that Caesars Place may have been retained.

It is hard to assess the benefits/drawbacks from the information given in the plan. I therefore cannot express a view.

On the proviso that this is not just an easy way of stating that additional car parking is now available within the town centre, this must be to protect the land from unfavourable development, and should also be included within the town centre conservation area.

I don't understand what difference this will make in practice - the documentation does not explain it properly.

If this had been done maybe Caesars Palace might not have been demolished.

A forthcoming disaster area for traffic passing through.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

This area has been ruined. ALDI have demolished a row of 18thC cottages without permission, as...
already stated. Some restitution should be demanded of a type and extent to be decided by the townspeople. Very strict building standards should be imposed on ALDI with regard to building materials and aesthetic quality of the building. No garish signage allowed and a car park as small as possible.

This is a mess and needs attention.

New development.

Brown field, develop it.

This area will be so congested I am not sure it will be an asset at all!!

In Dorchester Tesco were forced to build a store that complemented the adjacent conservation and protected areas of the town. It is markedly successful. Too late for this development I suspect

This area should never have received planning permission for the Aldi store.

I hope Aldi does come to Knutsford.

I don't think this area should have been developed in the first place (in particular, I don't think the cottages should have been demolished).

Especially as you are letting them put a hideous new supermarket on it.

not enough information to make a decision.

New development.

Natural England suggest enhanced linkages between the existing town centre and the proposed Aldi and its car park will encourage more sustainable transport networks.

To house and support local business reduce rental rates.

This area should be used to improve facilities though Aldi is not the answer.

This area should be included.

Store will add to problems in an already very busy part of Knutsford.

Crazy development in this particular site. The traffic problems will be horrendous.

I don't understand why boundary needs to change and what impact this will have - it is not explained clearly in the consultation document. More information place!!

Agree with inclusion.

Extends King St.

Why?? Need for more detail.
Area E: Area around Egerton Primary School

Do you agree or disagree with the potential amendments to the town centre boundary at Area E?

- 63% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (49%); Disagree (51%)

**Comments:**

I don't understand what a change in status would mean for Egerton Primary School. In general, this has not been explained for any of the areas, but this is the area I am most interested in.

In terms of sustainability this would be a backward step. Obviously not Town Centre. A residential area and school site. Why destroy an excellent school? If Development attracts investment to build new primary facilities elsewhere then this site should be an open space. .. Hands off you car park enthusiasts. Hands off Cheshire East looking to sell more of the towns assets. Do not sell off town centre sites in exchange for the fringe. Cities actively plan green lungs - you don't see all London’s open green spaces around the M25!

Playing fields should not be sold off.

Tightens up town definition - logical. The Moor needs to be lit and have CCTV for safety.

No need to change town centre boundary.

What’s the point of this redesignation what does it achieve?

Not quite sure what is to be achieved by altering the town boundary? Other than spending unnecessary funds?

Not sure of the benefit of including this area in town centre.

Please clarify what impacts this may have on the school though.

How will this affect the playing fields of the school and the school itself??? The school is vital, along with all other schools in Knutsford, to support an increasing number of children in Knutsford.

Don't understand the need for change.

It should be extended to include the Heath and the Leisure Centre.

Don't fully understand the implications.

The Strategy is not clear what this means? i.e what will the effect be to there and surrounding areas? Are they suggesting putting shops/ restaurants there?

Why does the school need to be included in a town centre unless plans for redevelopment which
should be a completely different question.

I don't understand what effect 'amendments to the town centre boundary' has on anything! It's all too complicated for me to give any useful comments (and I suspect that this applies to most Knutsford citizens).

As with the other proposed changes, it is by no means clear from this document what would be the implications.

A good intention that will never happen but it seems a good plan.

If you are proposing to build here I am not sure how the road system would cope? I hope you are not proposing to move the school?

provided it does not end up being a car park I would agree to improving the use of the building.

Insufficient data to make a decision.

As a resident who is already impacted by school traffic near Egerton Primary School I would be wary of any reclassifying of the boundary that might make life even more difficult for local residents. I understand the need to manage parking but it must not be done at the expense of residents who should be able to park outside or near their homes.

Why! More loss of playing fields?

Why put this part in the town centre when it is primarily residential? Section 7.3 says "new retail development should be focused within the town centre" If this area were in the town centre, I am concerned it would be vulnerable to retail development.

Why?

There is no need to include a school within the town centre. This would just open the grounds to build on, and with more pupils within this sector school grounds will become more valuable for the health and well being of our young people.

Again you have to be joking - we already do not have enough primary schools places are you are potentially going to close an existing school that currently has 227 pupils!

The area behind Gaskell Avenue is absolutely not town centre in characterisation terms.

Agree in principle.

The extension of the town centre into this area may be inappropriate given that it has a character of its own and is part of a Conservation Area. Designation as part of the town centre may lead to pressures for introduction of new uses that may be inappropriate to that area.

It is not clear what potential benefits would result from extending the town centre boundary to this area.

Insufficient rationale.

Why would this area be included in the town centre? It is predominantly residential with a school. This area should not be redeveloped for retail and leisure facilities.

Egerton School and Pre-school should not be displaced by an extension of the town boundary

Strongly disagree. Why lose a good school to more shops when units lie vacant as it is??? Egerton is well over-subscribed as it is how could this school could be lost.

There is no obvious reason to include the dwellings and the school site the town centre and none is given. It opens up the potential for 'town centre uses' on what should remain either residential or open space. The heritage buildings along Gaskill Avenue could fall prey to conversion to 'offices' etc if this is adopted. The proposal implies that the school site is a candidate for development. if so it should have been included as a development option.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

More information needs to be provided to the public to clearly explain the potential implications of this change to the use of this land and to the future of Egerton School.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree completely. Egerton should not be put under threat by including it in the Town centre area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear why you want to change the town centre boundary. So I can’t see any advantage to the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly oppose this expansion. I see no reason why a key residential road (Gaskell Avenue), a busy road (Stanley Road), a quite cul-de-sac (Bexton Road spur to the school) and a school need be in the town centre area. What justification is there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton School is logically part of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want to see an developments that encroach on this excellent local school / pre-school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford town centre is very small, if the conservation area is tied to the boundary, then I have no wish to see it change. What benefit accrues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it may be beneficial to include this as part of the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as in keeping with heritage of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only reason to include Gaskell Ave and Edgerton School in the Town Centre is that you have plans to close the school and relocate it to the areas where you will build more houses. This will provide local schooling and allow the Edgerton School site to be developed to expand the retail provision beyond the current areas. This green area should be protected and can be used for leisure facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCHG is concerned that including this land in the town centre may result in its development for uses which KCHG might not support, such as retail or solely for car parking. More information should be provided as to the uses which would be allocated. The area includes buildings of architectural quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to assess the benefits/drawbacks from the information given in the plan. I therefore cannot express a view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could lead to damage to school and loss of land etc. also no point schools are not generally located in a town centre as town centre land is more expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fear that this land could be sold by the council developed for purposes not favourable to the people of Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t understand what difference this will make in practice - the documentation does not explain it properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why??? It’s a school and is closed to the public during school hours to protect the children. It doesn’t need to be part of the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is frankly bizarre, particularly without giving any explanation or reason. If there are proposals for Egerton School, please provide them instead of irresponsibly fueling rumours and worrying parents and teachers. Why propose to remove A and B and then include this area, particularly Gaskell Avenue which is primarily residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprised it isn’t already classed as town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area consists of school and residential property and should be extended to reduce the impact of any disruptive town centre uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should remain as Egerton School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefit would accrue? All I can foresee is disadvantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not clear on the benefits of including a school in the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaskell Avenue is part of the Georgian Inheritance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will not be Knutsford if you do this. Keep it compact, and charming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to include a school within the town centre. This would just open the grounds up to be sold off and built on in the future. With more pupils within this sector, school grounds will become more valuable for the health and well being of our young people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no need to include a school within the town centre. This would just open the grounds up to be sold off and built on in the future. With more pupils within this sector, school grounds will become more valuable for the health and well being of our young people.

Children are being taught in temporary classrooms whilst waiting for permanent facilities dependent upon planning! We need to develop this area for education.

Leave as it is.

There is no need to include a school within the town centre. This would just open the grounds up to be sold off and built on in the future. With more pupils within this sector, school grounds will become more valuable for the health and well being of our young people.

Easier access to Egerton Primary School would be much appreciated.

Possibly - dependent on plans and whether Egerton School might need to be moved to be nearer the houses whose families supply its students, leading to redevelopment of the site.

I fail to see which characteristics this area has which would deem it as an area of the town centre. As a governor of Egerton Primary School I cannot see any benefits to the school in being designated as part of the town centre.

Provided that any development complements the Victorian/Edwardian nature of the area

This area is already being squashed with the arrival of 2 mobile classrooms due to the extra class admitted this September. Surely providing our children with the space to keep fit and active is rather important to help prepare them for the future and leading a healthy lifestyle!!

It is not clear why this should be included.

Can't really see the point.

This entire area is residential without a single shop. How can you even consider putting it in as town centre? Under no circumstances should this area be designated as town centre. This is utter nonsense. You have sensibly suggested removing two other prime residential areas from the town centre area, so why now contradict yourselves and try and include this area instead? There is no sense to this idea whatsoever.

Why is this change suggested?

Could this lead to Egerton School being relocated in favour of retail units? Again, it is not clear as to the purpose of this.

Not enough information to make a decision.

Gaskell Avenue is part of the Georgian Inheritance.

Natural England has no comment to make on this issue.

To house and support local business reduce rental rates.

You are just going to use it for other things when its purpose is a school.

Mainly residential area. Should not be included.

Why? Do you want to change the playing fields to car parks? No.

Most of this is not open to the public.

This should not be included in town centre and available for town centre development. e.g. retail.

Why?? Need for more detail.
Q7 Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment areas within the town centre as set out in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?
Area 1: Canute Place

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 1?

- 69% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (81%); Disagree (19%)

Comments:

Maybe look at public realm (Henry Rolls?) and alfresco dining areas.

What? The conservative and bowling club should be removed from town centre boundary.

The Canute Square shops & flats that include Sainsbury’s & M&Co, should all be knocked down as soon as possible as they are an eyesore & completely out of character with the rest of the town. See 3.1

This development has always been an eyesore. The planners of the sixties were a disaster.

It says nothing so its difficult to agree or disagree!

It is an area which needs smartening up as the main route into Knutsford for a lot of people.

Should be prime candidate for development due to its visibility - needs to make a good impression on passers by.

This is a more modern area but has functional and simple buildings, this is not a priority, though it is not very attractive.

Make this a priority.

This area is a 70s eyesore in the main and could be vastly improved by demolishing and starting again with buildings that actually fit in with the character of the town opposite the White bear.

Red Cow area as new square.

Demolition of dreadful 60’s development should be a priority - a disgrace to Knutsford.

Get rid of the horrible 50s style flat roofed building on the north side and replace with Georgian or Victorian building got blend in with the rest of Canute Place.

Parts of Canute Place area an eye-sore - especially the architecture on the "McLaren" side. It is not an area one feels proud of, shall we say. Car parking? It's not new what is envisaged. I've already given my views on the car culture of the town. I would acknowledge the need for some additional parking
space, but in the same section is mentioned "environmental improvements". Are these two compatible?

Looks scruffy! I agree as it is the impression many have of Knutsford.

This could be improved to make it more appealing to shoppers.

Don’t go too modern - the look of this area is not in keeping with the rest of the town as it is. We need the traditional character returning to this area if it is to be developed.

But only with due care and consideration - there is not a good track record here.

Agree environmental improvements would be welcome but think the scope is limited. The whole parade is an eyesore that clashes with the rest of the Square but we are stuck with it. I don't know if the landlord can be persuaded to amend the awful roof trim.

Disgrace! Needs attention badly.

Improvements not detailed in any way.

Turn Canute Place into a square with no vehicle access? Yes that would be nice. Your proposal? Can’t remember what it was.

Canute Place could be redeveloped

Provided the Heritage is preserved and the thinking on consumerism is not merely to create shop space.

But I would include this in a traffic free area..

But not including car parking.

This is a very dated location which should never have been built in the first place. It looks out of place for Knutsford and needs redeveloping.

The modern look buildings were a big mistake.

Car parking should not become the dominant use.

What are the possibilities for parking?

Given the recent 'improvements', redevelopment seems to be the option implied. Car parking and servicing is a mess but expansion of the site seems impractical.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

This should become the most magnificent focal meeting point of the town.

I agree with the development but we need to be careful to retain the heritage and be mindful that it is in a conservation area.

Not specific about why it needs to be improved and in what way.

Surely this could be considered for a multi-story car park. It is ugly enough already.

How about moving the island and introducing angle parking on the side of Pets at Home, Sainsbury, etc.

Pull down the horrible 60's/70's buildings and replace with something more in keeping with the character of Knutsford.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

Sympathetic development of the area might be good, car parking needs improving in this area.

Not the most attractive area - certainly room for improvement.

As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

Canute Place is an historic market place, and the group would hope that this area could be characterised as such. KCHG agree however that improvements may be required to ensure what is the entrance to the main shopping and conservation areas are protected and enhanced.
It is hard to see where on earth the town centre units could be extended.

Any improvements should have been funded by recent development - another missed opportunity.

Sainsbury’s support the town centre projects identified in the draft strategy, in particular the potential for improvements in the Canute Place area and the support for the extension of some of the town centre units in this area.

This development is unsightly and detracts from the other buildings in the vicinity and Knutsford as a whole. It needs replacing.

Essentially a town square. Previous development has spoilt it visually and improved car parking would destroy it. Second consideration does not make sense.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree

This provides a focus for the town but presents a shabby and moth-eaten image, thanks to poor planning decisions (in the 1960's/70's I presume). The north side is skirted by ugly modern buildings (with the notable exception of the pub), improvements are possible in this area. The south side is better. Try and discourage car access and use.

Buildings on north side of square should be rebuilt to reflect the heritage of the town.

To be developed more in tune with street scene rather that the carbuncle it now is.

Do create more parking though: get people out of cars.

Not sure as to the significance of areas being branded inside or outside the town centre boundary

Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking.

Increased car parking would be welcome here - perhaps behind the retail units within Canute Place.

Needed.

it is looking somewhat sorry for itself but extra traffic isn’t going to help.

Most of the present development is out of character with the town.

My major concern is that there seems no consideration of the impact that increased housing/population will have on traffic flow around and through Knutsford. It is widely recognised that Knutsford is a very congested town with the roundabout at Canute Square being a a focal point for nearly all traffic movements. The character of Knutsford that the town plan seeks to protect requires greater action to manage traffic flows. For example commerce requires not only easy connections through the town to other destinations (e.g. from M6to Macclesfield etc) but also as easy access around town. Additional local traffic will exacerbate the congestion detracting from the appeal of Knutsford that developments need to protect. I strongly suggest that further consideration be given to alternative (new?) routing that keeps through traffic away from the Canute Square focal point. This would assist retaining the character of the town centre and make more feasible other plans to have multi use roads such as King Street. In addition Knutsford residents would benefit from improved road network connections, both to out of town destinations and in-town destinations. Furthermore keeping a large portion of traffic to designated through routes will enhance the quality of the town centre environment, improve its social opportunities and retain the appeal for residents and commerce alike.

Get rid of the 1960s retail and flats north of Canute Place and improvement of the heritage potential of Red Cow Yard and Heritage Way.

The green boarding above the shops looks tatty and outdated already, and should fit in with the character of the town, not like a 1960s shopping parade.

In particular, the 1960s units could use some attention.

Complete redevelopment is needed of the Monkton Properties shops and flats above.

not enough information to make a decision.

To be developed more in tune with street scene rather that the carbuncle it now is.
Natural England note the importance of committing to environmental improvements within town centre areas, amongst the environmental benefits this will make the area more attractive for people to use.

I feel there is very little scope for this area.

Construction of a fountain roundabout - welcome to Knutsford!

The town centre units should not be extended.

Agree.

Keep off.

There also needs to be consideration for pedestrian crossings.

Improvements to car parking? Where - certainly not on road. Could get rid of the 24/7 paying

External appearance of shops could be improved to a more traditional design and appearance.

Canute Place can't be ruined any more than it has been already.

Lets the town down and is often one of the first places seen.

Existing development is ugly and not in keeping with character of town.

Depends on what is proposed. What happens to existing units fall vacant as a result of predicted contraction of high st retailers?

Not a welcome location for the town centre. 1960/70s dev failed the town.

Arrival of Waitrose-Sainsbury’s enhances area.

Why?? Need for more detail.
**Area 2: Market Hall**

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 2?

- 69% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (87%); Disagree (13%)

### Comments:
- Too general - what is meant by this?
- Again, alfresco dining
- Any improvement should be to improve the facility of a covered Market Hall and to consider a public toilet facility. Do not lose the indoor market building.
- The Market should be encouraged and looked after.
- The market is a welcome feature of the town.
- This is a useless eyesore. Markets are best when outside.
- We are called a market town but with so few stalls, visitors would not think so. Need more stalls (lower rate incentive?).
- This is being transferred to the Town Council who have concluded that it is under marketed at the moment.
- What improvements I might agree if these were indicated.
- Market Hall definitely needs improvement, it could attract a lot more stall holders and in turn, business, if it was to be improved.
- Like the market and think it should be improved and highlighted as one of the towns assets.
- An improved market hall would increase use of the market, building businesses in the town and keeping shopping spend within Knutsford. A more attractive setting for the market, without moving away from the range of everyday essentials sold there would bring more shoppers in and be more in keeping with the rest of Knutsford town centre.
- Please make specific recommendations for "opportunities for improvement". This key resource needs to be actively managed to ensure that people continue to use of the market and that it delivers what its customers demands.
- This could be an amazing space but is currently too down market, too hidden and does nothing to...
It looks run down and needs improving.

Don't use market facilities

I strongly favour development here, provided the current facility can be enhanced rather than lost.

The market is important and historic but needs updating and improving also being open longer.

This area is underused at the moment and could do with some investment.

the area could be improved but you do not say how - car parking is a no in my opinion - be careful if you are planning shops you could quickly spoil the area - protect the traders that already exist there

What does improvement mean? The market should remain a market.

Don't lose market.

The market hall needs enhancing. It is a dump and not in keeping with the rest of Knutsford

Keen to hear what opportunities for improvement exist

Leave things alone.

The only improvements here are a proper management strategy and a coat of paint

Knutsford Market Hall is appalling and dire need of refurbishment

Provided the Heritage is preserved and the thinking on consumerism is not merely to create shop space

Knutsford market hall is in a disgusting state of repair and would benefit from a total rebuild

But I would include this in a traffic free area

This is a dated location, under advertising and under promoted.

This is awful

all redevelopments of market halls now will drive out market stall holders. these are the last way of a normal person starting a business at reasonable cost. The private development like regent street has proved can only be afforded by sterile retail chains of little interest to the average shopper.

A much neglected and under supported facility.

The market hall should be improved to bring more customers, at the moment it is not a desirable place to visit. I have lived in Knutsford for over 20 years and still do not go into the market.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

Could be much better utilised. We could have events to support the market.

It is already in the Council’s accountability to improve this building. That has not been done and whilst the town precept has risen markedly this year the Market Hall has not been improved or transferred. There is no credibility in this proposal.

Knutsford is a Market town so of course it needs a market hall. The council have increased the rents so that it is uneconomic for tenants for it looks very forlorn. Look at Northwich indoor market for inspiration.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

Please improve this under utilised, under advertised, and generally shabby bit of Knutsford. What about moving it to the old town hall?

Yes, important and could be improved.

As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

Strongly agree to investment here as its an important area to bring community together supporting local businesses
needs correct management advertising and a lick of paint.

Great, but who funds this? Consider moving to Old Town Hall!

Very important role.

Decent surface and access road would be great improvement.

An important area of town for the people.

Areas need considering together. Provision of new market hall on former outdoor market site to provide improved access, link to Regent St and development of small retail unit around edge should be considered.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree

This should be supported and improved wherever possible. It is an excellent amenity, but rather under-used at present.

It should be re-sited in the vacant allen and appleyard building. Windows removed with open.

Market Hall to be upgraded, as it id part of the Knutsford scene.

Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking.

However I do not think that residents consider this to be the highest priority.

Needed.

It needs some TLC desperately but not at the expense of the stall holders who are already facing a great many challenges financially.

Only IF the current market stall holders are involved and valued - our traditional market is sustained by local traders - often family businesses which serve the town well and provide low-cost good food options.

Needs updating.

Yes, providing it does not increase rental costs discouraging stallholders.

Needs major modernisation in order to encourage shoppers - I currently avoid it purposefully.

Please see my earlier comments about the market.

Yes keep and improve the indoor market

My concern is that Aldi will drive the market out of business - especially the fruit and veg

not enough information to make a decision

Market Hall to be upgraded, as it id part of the Knutsford scene.

Natural England has no specific comment to make on this aspect of the redevelopment areas.

Save above all else. Improve building and reduce rents - fantastic stall holders - need more variety

Do the building up/reduce rental rates, encourage more local businesses

Agree could be much improved

Keep off

Consider possible car parking improvements/underground/multi-storey with new market.

very shabby

Needs to be retained and improve, Knutsford is a market town.

Grossly underused.

Disagree that this is as important as the report indicates - maybe for small minority who use it as a pseudo-community centre. It is old fashioned. Provides small income for small number of traders.

Money better spent on Longridge community centre.

Urgent development needed.
| Keep and develop along with open spaces in Silk Mill areas, chance to attract more visitors |
| Needs upgrading - lacks use |
| Why?? Need for more detail |
Area 3: Silk Mill Street area

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 3?

- 68% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (86%); Disagree (14%)

Comments:

- It requires soft landscaping and improved safety as a pedestrian route combined with car parking. Key route between top and bottom street.
- There is already too much development in this area, and the Royal George development (Regent st) was a financial disaster for the developer; the company is now in liquidation.
- Car park to rear of Regent Street to be shops / office - brownfield site.
- This is a valuable space in the heart of the town and yet it it always looks drab and utilitarian. Seems wasted.
- It doesn't say very much so again its difficult to say if I agree or not!
- Improvements required.
- This works well as a car park/market area.
- What about the people currently residing there? How will this affect them?
- Only if markets are the main driver for improvement, and are improved.
- We should aim to hold a regular outdoor market, as is seen in many other small European towns. There's lots of good local producers, and they should certainly be encouraged.
- Improvements to surfacing and hard landscaping would be particularly welcome. This is a well-used thoroughfare and needs to be made more pleasing.
- Useful car parking - multi-storey.
- The access from and to this location is very steep and would need to be improved.
- Leave things alone.
- Provided the Heritage is preserved and the thinking on consumerism is not merely to create shop space.
- But I would include this in a traffic free area.
A little underuse here does no real harm.

If developed, this could be a new regent street.

Regrettably previous initiatives here do not seem to have been successful.

Needs to work closely with the Market Hall.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

Not specific about why it needs to be improved and in what way.

Just remember that people live here.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

But it is limited by the car park and pedestrian access.

yes - could be improved.

As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town.

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

All of the links between Princess and King Street need to be improved. Part of town centre's character, yet neglected.

This area should have been incorporated into the Royal George redevelopment.

Areas need considering together. Provision of new market hall on former outdoor market site to provide improved access, link to Regent St and development of small retail unit around edge should be considered.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

Encourage more farmer's markets with an emphasis on fresh, high-quality food. Tidy up area; improve surface. I agree with the considerations of the Stakeholder Panel.

Needs resurfacing.

Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking.

Pedestrian access could be improved. Area currently seems underused with traders and parking (parking is difficult due to access from Princess Street).

Needed.

Needs some care.

Landscaping improvements would be good -plus beautifying it a bit - so it had less of a car-park 'feel' but was still practicable for that when not used for markets etc.

Would be good to bring back the outdoor market.

Yes, providing it does not increase rental costs discouraging stallholders. More market stalls should be encouraged.

Redevelop the car park and locate new parking on the Stanley Rd industrial estate.

Please see my earlier comments about the market.

We like our outdoor market and this is also a car park. Keep it please.

Unattractive and "bitty" Area currently.

Traffic access to market street should be stopped and access granted via Silk Mill street.

not enough information to make a decision.

Needs resurfacing.

Silk Mill Street Area forms one of the central points of Knutsford Town and as such improvements to the public realm and pedestrian links are welcomed by Natural England.

Keep off.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider possible car parking improvements/underground/multi-storey with new market.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pot holes and uneven surfaces a potential accident waiting to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rather scruffy at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?? Need for more detail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area 4: Rail Station area (north of rail line)

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 4?

- 68% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (85%); Disagree (15%)

Comments:

More signage needs to be available to link the station and areas of interest in the town centre and outskirts including Tatton Park.

Improvements to the integrated transport of rail, foot and cycle and bus should be only drivers here. A better entrance to the platform. Again opportunities for soft landscaping. Cycle shelter parking. Any increased car parking will congest the entrance from King Street and increase traffic along there. What about relocating bus station alongside rail station.

An eyesore that needs tidying up. A multi-storey car park could solve the town's car parking issues.

All under used.

Improvements required

Improvements to rail stations always welcome!

This houses essential parking and seems fine

Essential as parking for rail travelling.

Would not agree with anything larger than Canute Court being built or with a high level multi-storey car park. Concerns about subsidence on the bank.

Isn't Canute Court fully leased and thus not in need of redevelopment.

More car parking here.

Although it's unclear what kind of redevelopment is being envisaged for Canute Court. The station itself, incidentally, needs to be brought into the 21st Century (bypassing the 20th en route!)

Hard to improve.

Retain Canute Court as is - these are the type of businesses that Knutsford should encourage.

Multi-storey car park.

Again, no detail at all.

What was the proposal actually?
Not needed.

Only improve car parking if it is to be used to encourage the use of the rail station.

Not in principle, but tend to object given the overwhelming likelihood of an architectural disaster.

That office block in the railway car park would make an ideal medical centre. The business in their could relocate. There is 4 floors one for each surgery and a nurses floor. Car parking below and at the railway. Within 90% of population to walk or bus. It appears to be overlooked because PFI want fresh sites to maximise profits. Sell the existing surgeries and use the profits to convert a ready made building.

Redevelopment of Canute Court is very unlikely.

Make King Street pedestrian only.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

Before even think about extending the metro link to Knutsford do you think they could put on an extra train journey to Manchester/Chester, one every hour??!!

Not specific about why it needs to be improved and in what way.

Improve the car parking, again perhaps angle parking.

That site is ideal for a multi-storey car park, shielded where possible by trees.

Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.

A very dark dank and under utilised bit of Knutsford that could do with a refresh.

Room for improvement - parking needed for rail users but also for drop-off / collecting especially if station will have more use if metro operates.

As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town.

As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

I would be concerned about the development of Canute Court, which although is not a building maintaining the character of Knutsford, is a source of much employment for the town. The town could do with a major parking review, and any such review should include provision for workers as well as shoppers and residents.

Funding?

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

Canute Court is a monstrosity and looms over the area. The architects/builders managed to squeeze an extra storey under the guise of a mansard roof. The result is an inappropriately over-sized building, out of harmony with its surroundings. I agree that the Rail Station area needs improving and possibly a small additional number of car spaces.

Original CLC railway buildings to be retained.

Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking.

Environmental improvements welcome. As car parking for the station is not free it is not in high demand, but parking for Canute Court and the town in general is poor.

Much needed.

Not sure how you will do this but improvements to the look of the station necessary.

Any sensible improvements to this station area should be considered.

My friend works in Canute Court and I see no reason why it shouldn't stay as is.

Improvement (via Knutsford in Bloom) is to happen anyway, this year. Re-development would affect jobs.

Build a multi story car park on the site.
Original CLC railway buildings to be retained.

Natural England considers improvements to the rail station area to be important as this may encourage increased rail use as an alternative to the private car.

Up lights to be fitted to law courts to make a feature of this handsome building.

This area could be improved and used more effectively

Keep off.

If Canute Court could be altered much needed parking could be provided.

Could there be a multi-storey car park put here?

Not sure how improvement can be made at Canute Court or its existing car parking provision.

If Metro arrives this area is prime for job creation.

Why?? Need for more detail.
Area 5: Adams Court (east area)

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 5?

- 65% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (83%); Disagree (17%)

Comments:

It’s a commercial lease so car spaces are theirs. Retaining wall needs repointing. Any improvements should be to integrate rail, bus, ped, cycle routes. Bus stop off road.

Needs work.

All under used.

A lot of potential but not much description of what might be done. How long is it since they built Canute Court? was it ever used much?

Please be aware that parking in this area will not be disabled friendly; as anybody using these will have to cross the A537 to get to the shops, where there’s currently no assisted crossing area.

As long as it stays level rather than anything higher rise.

Although I have no particular view.

Hard to improve.

No eyesores please.

Maybe the best opportunity to provide additional car parking close to the town centre.

What was the proposal? Leave things alone.

Only improve car parking if it is to be used to encourage the use of the rail station.

Not in principle, but tend to object given the overwhelming likelihood of an architectural disaster.

This could be a great restaurant development.

Sites 5, 6 and 7 need to be considered together.

Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.

This will only work if access is maintained.

Not specific about why it needs to be improved and in what way.
I would like it to be improved, but I don’t see how. Car parking is negligible.  
Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.  
As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town.  
As long as in keeping with heritage of town.  
Again no option to agree with conditions. Adams Court is already a contributor to business and employment for the town so any changes should not be to their detriment.  
The town could do with a major parking review, and any such review should include provision for workers as well as shoppers and residents.  
Funding?  
At present time a waste of space.  
Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.  
Though, as above, do more to deter the car. Where are the charge points for electric cars?  
Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking.  
Car parking is needed but access for cars to and from this area (and the area below) is difficult and can be dangerous, especially with the amount of traffic on Adam’s Hill.  
For areas 5-7 there is a need to sort out the car parking.  
not enough information to make a decision.  
Natural England consider that as the lack of car parking was highlighted as an issue within the Town Centre, then more intensified use of existing parking areas is preferable to create new parking areas.  
Agree.  
Keep off.  
Why?? Need for more detail.
Area 6: Adams Court (west area)

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 6?

- 66% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (84%); Disagree (16%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, needs work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All under used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But there isn't a lot of space for vehicles there, plus access won't be great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please be aware that parking in this area will not be disabled friendly; as anybody using these will have to cross the A537 to get to the shops, where there's currently no assisted crossing area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eyesores please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the proposal? Leave things alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only improve car parking if it is to be used to encourage the use of the rail station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in principle, but tend to object given the overwhelming likelihood of an architectural disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 5, 6 and 7 need to be considered together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will only work if access is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specific about why it needs to be improved and in what way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like it to be improved, but I don't see how. Car parking is negligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As long as in keeping with heritage of town.

Again no option to agree with conditions. Adams Court is already a contributor to business and employment for the town so any changes should not be to their detriment.

The town could do with a major parking review, and any such review should include provision for workers as well as shoppers and residents.

Funding?
Retain as car park for station.

At present time a waste of space.
Limited potential.

unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area if it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

Though, as above, do more to deter the car. Where are the charge points for electric cars?

Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking.

Already congested.

Not enough information to make a decision.

Natural England consider that as the lack of car parking was highlighted as an issue within the Town Centre, then more intensified use of existing parking areas is preferable to create new parking areas and this would reduce the pressure to develop greenfield areas.

This would be a helpful move.

Keep off.

Input error - 'agree' and 'disagree' were un-marked on original.

Why?? Need for more detail.
Area 7: Rail Station area (south of rail line)

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 7?

- 66% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (87%); Disagree (13%)

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off road bus stop. New station access. Not good car park exit onto Adams Hill. Move bus station to rail station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property is character full. Any development that involves replacing old buildings with concrete monstrosities should be resisted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All under used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will still need a dropping off zone for the station especially if the town is to expand!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to rail stations always welcome!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible construction of a multi-storey car park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing above ground level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park is pathetic at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't see what can be done here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same comment as for Area 4. Why are we being asked to comment on all these station areas in such a piecemeal fashion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eyesores please.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the actual proposal? We need quality, clear information to base a decision on. We haven't had that. Leave things alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only improve car parking if it is to be used to encourage the use of the rail station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to very restrictive height limits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Hill needs sorting out road wise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 5, 6 and 7 need to be considered together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B, parts of E, and areas 1 to 7 are included within the Area of Archaeological Potential. All development would need to be assessed in these areas for their impact on the archaeological resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

Area 7: Rail Station area (south of rail line)
| This will only work if access is maintained. |
| Not specific about why it needs to be improved and in what way. |
| Improve car parking and entry / exit to car park. |
| Again, possibly a suitable place for a multi-storey car-park. |
| Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained. |
| Access to station off Adams Hill is currently very awkward at peak times, people do drop off/collect as well as park - room for improvement. |
| As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town |
| As long as in keeping with heritage of town. |
| I would be concerned about the development of Canute Court, which although is not a building maintaining the character of Knutsford, is a source of much employment for the town. The town could do with a major parking review, and any such review should include provision for workers as well as shoppers and residents. |
| Funding? |
| Retain as car park for station. |
| Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree. |
| Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking. |
| Currently office/retail units? |
| Needs some TLC. |
| Public transport - including potential for Metrolink to Essential (top priority) be extended to Knutsford. |
| Any sensible improvements to this station area should be considered. |
| Natural England considers improvements to the rail station area to be important as this may encourage increased rail use as an alternative to the private car. |
| Agree this area could be used more and made more attractive. |
| Keep off. |
| Why?? Need for more detail. |
Area 8: Sessions House

Do you agree or disagree with the potential improvement or redevelopment within town centre Area 8?

- 68% of respondents answered this question
- Agree (80%); Disagree (20%)

Comments:

This should be fully utilised as a Crown Court. It will be the only Crown Court within Cheshire East and was historically the only Crown Court outside of Chester. It must be retained and fully utilised within the judicial system at all cost. The magistrates court currently located in Macclesfield should be moved back to Knutsford immediately. The rear of the sessions house can be redeveloped into additional offices as required.

This is a key feature of the town. Development must be in keeping with library/policestation. Get a team together to decide what is going to happen to this as court service want shot of it. Might be a good time to get some funding from them.

Concert Hall using Booths Car Park?

A unique feature of Knutsford. The existing building could be turned into a hotel, but not altered externally.

Once this is sold by Department of Justice could be focus of heritage/culture in the town.

Happy for it to be a multi use building - but character of building needs to be preserved.

Session House needs to look more attractive. So people driving through on the A50 want to come and visit. Not set out with a car park in the front. Yuck!

Reconcile the need to preserve a historic building and the long term potential for redevelopment. Again it doesn't say a lot does it!

Beautiful building and so much more could be made of it.

Definitely agree that historic building should be preserved and a suitable use should be found, perhaps something relating to the towns heritage or a cultural attraction.

Needs careful development but should be done sooner rather than later.

Maintain character but could be used for housing or light office work.

Certainly if the building capacity is underused - Could it be used for commercial offices? The potential of another car park area is good.

Provided there is no demolition of the stone structure.

I agree the building is historic and should be protected, but in its current state it is also decidedly ugly.
In some ways it reminds me of some of the old post-war communist blocks! I am sure there are aesthetic improvements that could be made. Maybe some colour in the form of greenery/flowers in front of and around it? And should there be statues in those alcoves? That at least would provide a touch of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot of potential and underused - any development have to be carefully done.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This building does need protecting but if it is underused it could be redeveloped to make best use of its space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eyesores please - no public car parks - improve the use of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read previous comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree that this building needs to be protected and given a long term function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs using and not neglecting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave our heritage alone, it's what makes Knutsford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed, iconic, prominent - a big problem if the existing use were to cease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A court is beneficial to Knutsford but is massively underutilised. This is a good location for Knutsford. The car park at the front needs to be advertised at evening and weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any re-development would need to be done very carefully to preserve the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sympathetic development there is possible especially flats for 20-30 ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a long term asset to the urban landscape and part of the town's &quot;distinctive character&quot;. It is vital that an appropriate use is found for the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should remain as a court. Why does it need redeveloping? redevelop in to what??? its a part of Knutsford heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A long term viable use must be found for this important building and site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A piece of Knutsford’s history and should remain in use as a court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knock it down and put back a public tennis court which was lost to Booths car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring back the Magistrates Court. Given the difficulty of getting to Macclesfield by public transport, courts attendees have a good excuse not to go to Macclesfield. Use part of the building as an information centre. Offer guided tours from here focusing on the historical aspects, e.g. General Patton, TocH in the old Gaol behind, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot agree to this proposal until a detailed and definitive note of the implications is obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use what we have, don’t spend more money to change when you are not using what you have. More court cases, more publicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes there could be better use of this historic building. Car park is already useful space on a Saturday - perhaps it could be even better utilised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as the developments are entirely consistent with the character of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as in keeping with heritage of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't believe that the building needs to be protected. Knock it down and develop the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new use could be found for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCHG is concerned that this highly prized and imposing building has lost favour with the courts service, and has lapsed into under use if used at all. This building must be protected. As such KCHG have written to the Lord Chancellor requesting information on the plans for the building. Redevelopment must be highly sensitive to the building and its surroundings. A development brief for the site should be prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an historic building and should not be redeveloped. The cobbles in front of the building must be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am sure the whole town would like to see this building brought back into use, and community use would surely be most appealing. This impressive building must be protected and comment sought from the Court service as to its future plans for the building.

Redevelopment?!?! Surely only possible conversion to another use if court closes. Assurances that original features such as cobbles are not removed or asphalted over please!

Would make good the Heritage Centre but would cost.

Whilst I think this is quite an ugly building, I am concerned at its underuse and potential closure. Anything to enhance its usage should be welcomed.

This historic Grade II listed building within the town centre conservation area should be protected and only put to use for the benefit of the town i.e. theatre/information centre

Frontage must be protected

This is an important historic building - need to retain - at some time no cars parked in front at defined times.

Must be retained as building and courtyard area.

Existing building need to be kept in entirety. Any development should only re-use spaces within it.

Encourage use as a community facility.

Unable to comment as this would need to be for comment of people affected in this area If it is green belt or it impinges on peoples lives the disagree.

But expanding use as a car park would have an adverse impact on the view if this important and totemic building. Any redevelopment should be very carefully considered and must not detract at all from the character of the building.

Part of the Heritage of the Town.

Preserve the building though.

Historic nature must be retained.

Not a lot of detail has been provided in the document - its a bit vague other than developments for parking

The underuse should certainly be improved, but increased parking in front may be unattractive and potentially dangerous and difficult for road users of Toft Road/King Edward Road.

Many people shop in Northwich rather than Knutsford because of the adequate free parking. This area provides free parking when the Sessions House is not in use.

Heritage building

Any changes to the Sessions House area need to protect the current historic appearance of the car parking area - as well as the historic building.

Dependent on whether it will be ever needed for Court cases. At the moment it seems to be just mothballed.

Historic Building of great visual importance requires sympathetic development

Great potential for sympathetic conversion to housing. The building of an architecturally undistinguished library and even less distinguished apartments between the Sessions House and the pleasant Victorian villa used by CEC was an opportunity lost to create imaginative Town centre accommodation

To find a use suitable to such a key site within the town, though difficult, should be pursued.

This is a historic and important building for Knutsford and should be put to good use.

But alterations here would require a very sympathetic developer, and then a very good operator. It’s likely to be expensive. I think anything else (eg. it’s tempting to put a nightclub on the spot) should be resisted.

Leave our courthouse and forecourt alone!

Exterior architecture and appearance must be retained.
if it does have increased use, the users will need the car park
I agree with all improvements to the town centre as long as they are well designed.

**Part of the Heritage of the Town.**
Natural England welcomes the opportunity to intensify usage of existing buildings; this is a more sustainable approach to development and could decrease the pressure on the natural environment and promote more sustainable development.

**This impressive building should be protected but used more.**
Keep off
Use this area for markets and redevelop Silk Mill Street area.
Keep the exterior. Find a good non-commercial use for it.
Potential theatre and community centre.
Retain and maintain Sessions House.
Lovely building which needs using and protecting.
People don’t use parking in front of here - especially if going to cinema. Not enough parking at cinema itself.
Better use of parking area - a pity if the cobbles area just become a car park with tarmac surface.
Better extend gardens in front.
Are we talking about the same session house? Is it on King Edward Rd or what is now The Red Cow
The heritage centre could move here. the tourist information centre could be reopened here
Car parking should remain free.
Priority - chance to develop and embrace other objectives for Knutsford
Hotel apartments
Q8: Infrastructure Priorities

What level of priority should be given to the infrastructure priorities identified in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Priority</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and facilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social care facilities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, pedestrian access and shared surface areas</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality, well designed car parking areas</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle ways and cycle parking</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and leisure facilities</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green infrastructure</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to greenspace</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural facilities</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety measures</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and increasing use of existing community facilities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other infrastructure:

Protection and replacement of mature trees and replacement of those lost due to felling along residential areas. Preservation of public open spaces and greens.
Tatton street to become one way system efforts to dissuade traffic on princess street and king street - traffic currently uses princess street to avoid A50 resulting in instances where trucks mount kerbs used by pedestrians

Re Sports and leisure priority yes - but unclear what is meant by 'area or town of sporting excellence' sports development should be about participation and choice with pathways to centres of excellence not one location for elite players. Positive action for people with disabilities of all ages. More land kept free for future as yet undefined community use within new development sites. Skate park 50m swimming pool. Athletics field Rugby field. Huts used by youth groups (Guides Scouts Air Cadets) on Manor Park, The Moor, Bexton Lane Play area on the Moor More play areas in existing residential areas and planned in new developments Play equipment in public places for all ages - adult green gym. Employment centre with specialist young peoples advisors Volunteering centre. Business area/park development manager. Town centre manager 20mph zones around schools and sports places such as Mereheath Lane. Parkgate new rail station More GP practices More allotments Compensation to householders for loss of Green field view. Town council building investment to develop as a community facility. Adult day care facilities New toilets on Silk mill street by market. New toilet block to replace one on Moor Car Park. Community hospital building - not necessary the same thing as medical centre!! Pedestrian/cycleway from Moor along Tatton park to Parkgate.

The Western Rail link to Manchester airport would be the single biggest project to improve Knutsford for decades and unfortunately has not been listed here which just shows how little research you have carried out.

Further road safety measures to limit the speed and volume of traffic in mainly pedestrian areas

Sleeping policemen & mini roundaboutes are a blight & often ignored by large vehicles; we should be more imaginative and selective with our traffic calming schemes. For instance, 20mph outside schools during term time ONLY.

Bypass. Plans will overcrowd Knutsford. Outlying amenities required.

Forget traffic calming and provide pothole free roads. This benefits cyclists as well as drivers of motor vehicles.

The civic centre must be kept in public ownership to ensure it is available for future genrations and not pulled down for office development. Pedestrianisation is the single most important issue that will dramatically improve our lives, as access to King st on foot with children and the disabled is currently a nightmare.

Widen the roads leading to the roundabout. Too much through-traffic is clogging up the town and making it impossible for me to run my mobile business. Frequent problems on the M6 just make things worse - Knutsford simply can't cope with the existing levels of traffic, particularly given the frequent road works around the town.

I would like to see a new swimming baths built so that the public can use it all day and night during school and holiday times. There is very limited availability during school terms at present. Also The current baths is in a bad state and doesn’t excite or look lovely. A new-build complex with a new pool and a separate fun pool with a flume and wave machine, and cafe would encourage tourists as well in all weather seasons, and encourage people to learn, continue swimming and stop obesity, creating a consistent healthy lifestyle all year round.

Yes I think that Kings Street should be pedestrianised. How about a park and ride? There should not be a Metro link - where is the space? There SHOULD be improved railway service - at least double the current frequency.

Civic Centre is under new ownership and community centre is also to be transferred.

Move the industrial estates to where decent access can be provided and where they have minimal impact ie near the motorway, then use the vacated land to build housing.

A priority must be to invest in existing community facilities, and to distribute the impact of population growth across the town.

BUILD A BYPASS!!!
Re-assignent of speed limits in areas where they simply make no sense. For example, Goughs Lane should be under a 30mph limit, the 60 limit on Chelford Road should be moved to at least 200m after the Booths Park roundabout (in the Macclesfield direction) and the 40mph limit on the A50 should be moved to at least 200m south of the end of Goughs lane to make it easier for vehicles moving between Chelford road and the A50. This is probably not in the remit of the questionnaire but would be an easy one to sort out.

Although I have the green infrastructure / access to greenspace as low infrastructure priorities, that is because I think the best thing (and the easiest!) to do in regard to "green" issues in Knutsford is to maintain the existing green belt as much as possible.

Train service to Manchester to be upgraded, 45 mins does not promote the use of it. Also, better train mainline connections beyond Manchester.

Promoting a greener town; broadband; more pathways, cycle ways that are car free.

Community facilities such as the civic centre are being let to private company...no longer can be considered multi functional space for community too late to protect this one!

Does the Community Infrastructure Levy affect the current residents of the town? How is this levy charged?

Bypass; bypass; bypass.

Traffic light type controls at the pedestrian crossings on the A50 by Canute Place.

Stop the wasteful proposals for the A556 and the Airport expansion

Yes we need more regular train services, more zealous car parking attendants and better pedestrian access in King Street.

Bypass

Resurfacing of damaged / old roads.

The unsurfaced end of Moorside ... but to benefit pedestrians and cyclists, not cars!

What on earth is Green Infrastructure?

More car parking.

Modern publically-owned swimming- and other sporting facilities, accessible by the general public at all normal opening times. Active promotion of Knutsford Little Theatre, which is one of the town's "hidden jewels". This could include, for example, more prominent and dynamic signage.

Maintaining our green belt land and the quaint feel of our town. If development is required let it be in the area around Parkgate which appears to have the least impact on local residents but potentially the biggest impact on the town - although probably the least profit for developers! Tabley Road and Manchester Road could do with some traffic calming measures. Finally, improvements to the Leisure Centre with an improved swimming pool and opening times are long overdue.

Stop trying to pre-empt the case for development by asking us about these priorities. Just because we need these things does not mean we are prepared to see the fields concreted over in the hope of CIL money. The fatuousness of asking about public realm and green spaces when you are proposing the desecration of these fields genuinely beggars belief. We must be totally wasting scores of salaries within the planning department to have concocted such utter drivel.

you can't improve the roads and have shared surface schemes - the two measures are in conflict with each other. Traffic calming will also not be helped by shared surface. the housing propositions will put a strain on the roads

There is no mention in the priorities list for improvements to the road network to cope with current and future traffic levels. This seems to be a major omission. In para. 1.6 of the intro. to the Draft Town Strategy it states that the Local Plan will 'help us to co-ordinate the delivery of new and improved roads'. The Place Shaping Consultation and the Town Plan Survey highlighted 'high traffic levels in and through the town at peak periods'(para.1.9) The National Planning Policy Framework says that at the heart of the planning system there is a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The scale of development proposed for Knutsford is quite reasonable but I don't think it qualifies as sustainable
unless provision is made to cope with the extra traffic flows which will descend upon the main road network. At times the main road network of the town becomes clogged with traffic. The problem is here already and will be exacerbated by further residential and employment growth. We are not going to acquire a by-pass any time in the foreseeable future so our efforts will need to be devoted to improving the capacity of the existing network particularly at its major junctions around the town centre. We may not be able to resolve all of our road traffic problems by the end of the plan period but at the very least we should have made a start. To take no action is likely to lead to more use by through traffic of residential side streets.

These priorities will be used as an excuse to allow development so that you can say that in order to fund these we need the development. I would rather maintain the Green Belt

The Football Club is supportive of their landlord’s plans for Sites C,D,E,G as Mr Henry Brooks cares about the town and it’s community

I strongly agree and support extending the Metrolink to Knutsford but think it should be extended right out to Chester in order to improve commuting options across Cheshire as a complementary alternative to the M56. Alternative transport options are a must if the NW is to thrive. Now is the time to do this, with rising fuel costs, people are finally beginning to see the value of public transport but there is not the infrastructure in place to support this so people have to continue to use their cars.

Traffic flow if industry and housing increase. Problem around schools at present.

I think the council should be concentrating on enhancing what is already in place and built, rather than starting from scratch. The potential size of their proposed "new Knutsford" would detract hugely from what is an attractive market town. I don’t think people have been given enough information about this - there has not been enough publicity of what is proposed- I think if there were- you would have a lot of objections.

Resistance to runway 3

A sustainable method of improving traffic congestion which has got progressively worse over the last 10 years

The rethinking of the recently approved madness of shared paving/road use for King Street, to be rolled out to Princess Street etc. This scheme was presented in a highly biased way by 1 vote, urging people to give up the idea of leaving things as they are or asking for pedestrianisation.

Pedestrianisation of King St - as in KTP

Need to provide town centre with relief from ‘through traffic’ . Not simply long distance traffic travelling along A50 or M6 to Macclesfield but also for example traffic from south of town travelling to north or M6. Link constructed as part of development providing new bridge across rail line to south west of town would assist with traffic relief.

Public transport is a priority including the train service to/from Manchester/Chester - but am not sure that extending the Metrolink is necessary

Bexton Primary and Egerton Primary Schools require urgent review and investment in improving the road and pavement safety. I know Bexton is being looked at, but some positive action is required urgently.

Infrastructure has been built haphazardly in the last century. we need joined up thinking for the next 20 years.

Please refer to my earlier remarks regarding the impact of increasing Knutsford’s resident population by up to 30% by 2030 on demand for services and infrastructure requirements.

The quality of the maintenance of the roads around Knutsford is extremely poor with large amounts of potholes left unrepaired

This strategy needs to focus more on traffic and less on housing.

Existing facilities should be improved first before building new ones.

The problem is that the existing infrastructure is not properly maintained. Would new facilities be neglected as well?
To create a very attractive / continental - main town meeting place in Canute Square.

I do not know what is meant by "the potential to create a new theatre space" Please explain this openly to the community. This statement 'on the theatre space' originates from Cheshire-East, NOT Knutsford community in so far as I am aware. If CEC means expanding the Cinema into space now occupied by the Civic Centre, then I strongly oppose such a development. The Civic Centre should be improved but remain what it was designed as - a large meeting hall for the Knutsford community. There is no other place in Knutsford that can be used in its stead.

By pass

Police presence to combat vandalism etc. A road system to cope with the increased amount of traffic.

I am disappointed that the 'infrastructure' part of the draft strategy document, which I (and I suspect many people) would see as an absolutely critical part of the strategy, actually only merits one segment at the end of the consultation (compared to all the detailed development questions) and with no space allowed for comment against each question. Key aspects of any future town strategy such as "do we want one central health care centre and where to put it?" are therefore completely ignored.

Provide a Knutsford bypass. The traffic on Adams Hill and the Chelford road is horrendous

A bypass

Pedestrianisation of King Street.

To improve and ease congestion on the roads in and through the town centre by considering introducing one way systems, off road parking on verges (e.g. on Garden road) mini roundabouts (e.g Knutsford Tatton park entrance) or other traffic management systems to ease the flow of traffic through Knutsford.

Reduce the airport infrastructure by restricting night flights

I want the Sports and Leisure facilities to be extended to include play areas for different ages of children. I would prefer this to across the town and not just in 2 or 3 areas.

Get rid of all speed humps - they damage cars and do little to slow the traffic,. Do not introduce 20 mph limits around schools because at school times there are irrelevant - the traffic is lucky to do 5 - 10 mph. At other times, not needed. Make Cranford Avenue one way, the opposite way to Stanley Road, to make the road safer. Allow residents on Stanley Road and Cranford Avenue to have free residents parking. Bring back an Information centre. Have police in the police station.

By-pass from south of Mere Corner to South of Knutsford, with exits at A50 and A537.

Knutsford's road infrastructure is in a poor state of repair for a town that is keen to attract tourism and should be a priority for improvement

Cannot prioritise the above because of the way items are grouped. For example, this is "Education - including schools, further education, training and adult education". It may be that Schools could be a high priority whilst Further Education is lower. What is "Green infrastructure"?

Preserving green belt

Sort out the traffic chaos caused by motorway traffic being forced through Knutsford. Sympathetic in tone development when needed. Maintain what is in place, improve but do not destroy.

Closure of Parkgate. It's in totally the wrong place for lorry access.

Suggested balance of separate parking for: residents, workers, shoppers and other services users.

Rates are already high in Knutsford. Any extra money should be found by CEC's working more efficiently, as private companies have to do.

High speed broadband including free and paid wifi provision is an essential for a modern 21st century business town such as Knutsford. Health services have depleted over recent years, and this must be returned to its previously good high quality provision, with Knutsford returning as a centre of excellence for care services such as dementia, especially being a town of a higher than average aging population.

Please encourage landlords to lower rents so that shops are not empty. Some rent is surely better
than none.

It is noted that the infrastructure proposals do not overtly include any support for Tatton as the major heritage resource in Cheshire East, in particular having regard to its wider multiple benefits for employment, tourism, health and well-being.

Traffic management to reduce rat-running through town centre and improve air quality. Safe routes to school programme.

Improving of broadband and other such new innovative technology to all areas of town and surrounding parishes

Mentioned the infrastructure housing levy of £3000 per house. However this does not always go to the Town /Parish Council it can go directly to CEC.

Railway station adjacent to Parkgate Lane ind estate and residents of Shaw Heath, Longridge etc.

To meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework [Framework] the Council must provide strategic policies

To facilitate the timely delivery of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and flood risk In addition, the Council [via Local Plans] should:

- Plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework; and
- Assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and its treatment, utilities, health, flood risk; surface water and its ability to meet forecast demands.

Unfortunately the plan has not taken into consideration the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply; wastewater; its treatment and/or flood risk.

The Council should therefore redraft the plan and include comments that:

- Satisfies requirements of the Framework for the provision of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and flood risk; and
- Assesses the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and its treatment, utilities, health, flood risk and its ability to meet forecast demands.

Seek levy also for Natural Environment enhancement.

Ring road around the town to accommodate through traffic. Priority should be the repair and reinstatement of the deteriorating roads. Cycleways are low priority. Need an in depth review of the sewerage system and it's ability to cope with additional flows.

A Post Office separate from a supermarket!

The Metrolink prospect is appealing, but closer consideration reveals potential problems, for example, if the terminus is Knutsford this could make the parking situation worse. Better, I think, to concentrate on improving the present rail service and bus service

Traffic and traffic congestion seriously needs addressing in and across Knutsford.

Need for more sports and leisure facilities. If present sports sites are developed, where will sports facilities be resisted?

Provision for electric car charging.

Improving the road infrastructure!

A by-pass especially when the M6 is closed, I think this puts too much pressure on the main road through Knutsford.

From my form I am strong against the whole develop plans so the above to me should not be relevant, but I have completed as above

No

I feel there is an infrastructure currently in place that is underfunded by the council hence it not meeting the towns needs sufficiently.

Road and pavement surfaces need to be good - but a 20 mph speed limit in Princess/King Street area would be better than other 'traffic' calming.

No.
Pedestrianisation of King Street and Princess Street must be a priority with car parking capacity increased above current provision.

Train link to Crewe - west coast mainline!

Train line to Crewe and/or Manchester Airport. Treatment of roads in icy/snowy conditions. Our area becomes an ice rink after a bit of snow or freezing rain - as I'm sure much of town does. Dangerous driving (and pavement walking) conditions. Last winter, the length of pavement along the Heath was treacherous and impossible to pass with a push chair. (I'm beginning to feel like, hey, while I'm at it... but, you asked!)

Possibly include such environmental aspects as air pollution (from road traffic, especially) and noise pollution from aircraft to and from Manchester Airport.

Not a big fan of traffic calming (humps) but safety needs to be addressed.

Infrastructure improvements are key to the future of Knutsford. Public transport- improve rail services (in favour of metrolink connection, cheaper and more deliverable) consider a by pass for the town, traffic is a major issue and this should be the priority before any sites released for future development. Pedestrian improvements, i.e. greater connectivity from / to the town to Tatton Park which is a huge asset for Knutsford. Improvements around the town to the residential areas for pedestrians.

I believe that an emphasis on public transport should be prioritised, with investment in better train and bus services rather than on a new A556.

I believe that an emphasis on public transport should be prioritised, with investment in better train and bus services rather than on a new A556.

Community facilities associated with the diverse range of faith communities across East Cheshire - particularly in terms of places of worship and meeting halls.

Comment: do not waste time and money suggesting improving sports facilities when the Mereheath lane parcel provide first rate sport including; tennis, football, rugby, archery, squash, gymnastics, boxing and more. All delivered in beautiful setting and facilities and extremely well attended. We have centres of excellence already st Egerton and Knutsford Sports Club land on Mereheath rd. I strongly suggest the consortium go to these fields at weekend, and see the thousands of children and adults enjoying these facilities. Do not flatten, destroy green belt land and insult by saying building new facilities will be better. How can we justify this?

Abundance of free parking will ensure a thriving Commercial Town Centre. The Heath should be compulsory purchased and used for new tennis and maybe in conjunction with the Conservative Club (also CPO) to provide Knutsford Rugby Club with a pitch? Club house and a Football pitch for the youngsters to enjoy. It is a great space which is not well utilised. Open Spaces in many other Towns are better utilised and maintained. Dog walkers will not be effected by such use. The Moor should be redeveloped for underground car parking, commercial extension retail and offices and high density housing for first time buyers. The open space element currently existing with playground can be greatly enhanced plus some new public Realm.

As the existing infrastructure is relatively poor all the above are really high priority. Additionally, improve the state of the roads and revive the plan for the Knutsford Chelford Road to Manchester Road west of the town. It would transform the town centre and provide opportunities for park and ride for tourists and visitors.

Pedestrianisation of King Street, Princess Street and connecting roads. Better access to The Moor by vehicle to compensate for the closures. Metrolink a major priority.

Restoration and maintenance of historic designed parkland and associated features. They provide a wonderful setting for Knutsford and need to be buffered and treated sensitively.

To improve the poor state of many roads and footpaths in Knutsford in a phased way and particularly reduce certain speed limits to improve road safety - such as Goughs Lane, Chelford Road and Toft Road, for example.

Repairing the potholes in the roads in and around Knutsford.
Pedestrianise the central part of King Street. I understood that the original survey a couple of years or more back showed responses well in the majority in favour of this option. I also understand that the opinions of the shopkeepers in King Street seem to have superseded the views of the majority of residents who responded to the pedestrianisation ideas in the first place. Why is this? Without customers there will be no shops in Knutsford. Whose views are the most important? Surely the people who have to walk around and get in and out of the shops in the first place? What happened here? Shared access between pedestrians and delivery lorries = OAP killed by reversing goods vehicle....

Major major MAJOR issue is traffic flow through the town - this isn’t even listed above! Roads where parking is partially restricted should be shaped to prevent people parking where they shouldn’t (e.g. King Street). Double yellow lines should be painted on one side of some roads to (hopefully) prevent inconsiderate parking (e.g. Tabley Road next to the Heath). Some simple common sense changes would have more benefits than some of the items listed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve Knutsford Town Council relations with residents; more approachable and younger cllrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Manchester Road and Northwich Road can not take the current traffic they already have - major alterations would have to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a ring road running form Manchester Road, north of the housing area, round to Northwich Road, to Toft Road, Chelford Road and Mobberley Road. This would remove through traffic from the town centre. Should be integrated with housing developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better road junction at Mereheath lane access to Tatton Park - possible roundabout. Improve road surface - particularly for cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sleeping policeman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of better traffic flow especially when motorway closures happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More activities for our young people. What about a skateboard park! they waste time indoors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First and foremost Knutsford appalling roads and pathways need to be repaired and maintained properly. the roads and side roads need sweeping regularly. Trees need to be cut back round road signs and the signs themselves should be kept clean and not covered in green lichen!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where new schools, car parking medical facilities etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass!! or weight restriction on big lorries!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q9 Additional Comments

**Are there any additional comments that you wish to make on the draft Knutsford Town Strategy?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I do not understand the Town Centre section. It is not explained what restrictions/opportunities apply to a town centre. This strategy document as part of the process of forming the local plan should be about legitimate engagement of the community of Knutsford to agree a vision, highlight areas and items for investment and consider development. The stakeholder engagement to date has failed to engage, the investment potential is far too woolly and fails to recognise that Knutsford infrastructure is at capacity at present with years of the local authority selling Knutsford places and spaces and not returning back. The concentration within the town has squeezed nearly all the space with what's remaining being proposed offered to developers as land swaps to allow building on the outer fringes - often too far away from facilities to walk or cycle or with current bus routes. Any new initiative such as skatepark, athletics field, Rugby field, School, Health centre, church cannot get off the ground because of lack of publicly available land. The proposed development of the Green belt will lead to landowners being conservative with their leases. I view this process as having jumped to the end too quickly - focusing on development sites, generating probably nimby and anti-green belt anxiety negative thought processes when it should have been a time for positive forward thinking. Knutsford neighbours Mobberley where there has been considerable housing development and more planned this should be considered within Knutsford a it will affect Knutsford infrastructure. There is no consideration or assessment of the current utility delivery. How will power, sewerage, water, broadband be managed. Ashworth park estate suffers terribly from overhead pylons. Re stakeholder panel I think the council should declare the makeup and who attended which events then consider whether the panel it used is representative and look to make changes for the future to ensure the engagement is much higher. In particular Sports clubs were not officially represented nor were significant community groups such as Scouts and Guides, Churches School PTA’s, WI, Lions. P27 6.1 Re Potential favoured development sites and Stakeholder panel comment. Why is there no comment on sites N-T from stakeholder panel. I would have thought for balance at least one site would have been proposed as favoured. The one liner’ not considered suitable ‘will not stand up to scrutiny when the other parts of town being offered up. It jeopardises the integrity of the whole development plan process. How will you demonstrate all options have been considered.? Re Page 3 P1.9 Previous plans you fail to mention that open spaces for play and leisure facilities and school capacity had also been highlighted. Knutsford is not just about car parking and traffic. The Town plan working group on community facilities has not met recently to take things forward - hence the weakness of representation in this draft strategy. P4 Next Steps 1.14 Re stakeholders - Why have Sport England not been included in consultation for background evidence re Sustainable community strategy increasing access to new and improved sports and leisure facilities. Especially as a proposed favoured development site D contains a large proportion of the Towns sports clubs. Re page 5 pt1.20 the quote is that the Town plan suggests community wants to retain and enhance open green spaces that surround Knutsford. I put it to you that residents want to protect and enhance the open spaces within the current town. We do not want all open green space moved to the fringe. This would have an impact on car use a people would then need to travel to these places. We want to have open spaces within walking distance. Re P7 Section 2 Background Why is there no background para headed sustainable communities - seems to suggest you haven’t established a baseline and thus the vision going forward will be weak. Knutsford community facilities are at capacity at present - schools, GP practices, sports space all has demand that cannot be met - so investment is needed now and lots more in the future if you consider development. Re P7 Section 2 Background P2.6 economy - a major employer in the town is 5 primary schools and Academy plus the outlining village schools. Re P9 Section 2.11 Greenspaces. The Moor is often quoted as Green flag award winning and an environment - in reality it is a route way across town linking Cross Town, the Centre and visited mainly by families to the play area. This play area should be included in the management.
plan for investment - views other than Friends of the Moor should be sought. Re P7 Section 2 Background P2.7 Town Centre - There is no more need for convenience goods(supermarkets) the misreading of previous reports such as GOAD has continued to attract development which has added to the transport and parking difficulties. Cheshire Retail study 2011 must be wrong. ReP22 Evidence and assessment work - please refer to Open spaces assessment and consider a sporting facilities assessment possibly in with Sport England. Presume there will be an infrastructure assessment to support charging infrastructure levy. Re P37 Section 8 Infrastructure priorities these should be detailed down to specific items otherwise the levy will extract money generally for something and then get lost in a pot like the 106 monies, e.g allotments - where? Sports & leisure facilities - what - where? Access to Parkgate what - bus or new ped route along Tatton? Re P34 Section 7 Town Centre options - the Sessions house has been highlighted. Surely the Town Hall next to Library needs planning for. Also the old Council building on Stanley road. Re the economy - the issue of Business rates in the Town centre needs addressing as apparently they are higher than surrounding towns such as Northwich.

Some of your statements are contradictions, however I guess that’s difficult to avoid given this is trying to design a strategy rather than saying this is the strategy.

Regent St should be made more attractive.

Knutsford Town Centre could not cope with all the extra influx. Horizons will have to be expanded to provide employment and amenities outside the boundaries of the town. Control developers. Bypass. Development will not bring trade but trouble.

The historic town, parks gardens and surrounding agricultural and grazing land is something that needs every bit of protection available so that it remains one of the jewels in the Cheshire Crown. There are many large towns and even cities not far away that have plenty of land just waiting to be developed for housing and commercial use instead of destroying excellant agricultural land surrounding the town.

Hope it all works, thanks for taking the time to all involved, and great for public inclusion.

No further development should be allowed to take place on greenbelt land. It is a fool who thinks that development in the greenbelt is compatible with sustainability.

Don't build on greenbelt land. Simple.

Healthy living such as safe cycling and a new swimming pool complex should take priority along with pedestrianisation of the main streets for a few hours at the weekends.

I am really upset about the proposals around building houses on green belt land around Knutsford. As someone who has recently moved into this lovely area I find it really hard to beleive that anyone would want to destroy what is already a beautiful pace to live. The unique rural location of Knutsford needs protecting at all costs for future generations and I really worry that the underlying motives of the planners is around maximising any profit than actually doing the right thing for the Town of Knutsford.

Table 6.3 - several sites are described as "not suitable for development. WHY? What are the features which distinguish them from the preferred sites? Note Knutsford's Town’s Motto is 'Respice, Aspice, Prosipe', look to the Past, the Present and the Future. We only seem to be looking to the future. 6.5 What are the "exceptional circumstances" relating to the Green Belt and referred to in this paragraph?

Well done - a good start. Double the proposed number of housing units - this bring with it the extra improvements that the document puts forward. All infrastructure schools; theatre; cinema and Civic Centre; police, fire and ambulance stations to be developer built.

The preferred development sites are valid, however: a) do we need it? b) do not move Egerton Youth Club or resite Mereheath Lane allotments. I would hate the character of Knutsford to be disturbed - people like to live here as it is!

Sessions House needs to look more attractive. So people driving through Knutsford on the A50 want to come and visit. Not set out with a car park in the front. Yuck!

I felt the general tone was one of utopian wishful thinking rather than tackling long standing
problems. But I guess its best that a consultative document is a bit open ended.

6.11 and recommendations for sites for Development in table 6.2. No explanation is given for why some sites are defined and not preferred and there is no identification in the paper of the criteria for assessment/recommendation. The recommendation to create a mass of building on the North east of the Town (totalling 1700+ on minumum projections - 2000+ homes on maximum) is unfair to existing residents, affects value of their properties and does not distribute the impact of population growth across the town. Instead of spreading potential impacts, the proposal is recommending building on existing greenfield, sports and community facilities based on a premise of land swapping (of which the process will be dubious, clandestine and from a position of weak negotiation). The proposals will create bottleneces for traffic and put a mass of affordable housing next to Knutsford greatest and national attraction Tatton Park. It is also interesting to observe that there are no preferred sites to the south of the town. It would be interesting to be informed of the make up of the stakeholder group. Surely it makes economic sense to invest in existing facilities and spread the impact of homes to across South, North, East and West of the town.

It misses what for me is the most obvious problem for the town, we need a bypass to reduce the heavy through traffic. The rest seems to be ill thought out on the whole and seems to miss the nature of the town, do we residents really want an industrial type mixed usage town?

I feel that most of the town centre stuff is merely what you would wish to do not what you would actually do - lots of lovely waffle and nothing in any way concrete. This leaves you the potential to do whatever you wish regardless of the wishes of the people of the town.

I found the choice of favoured sites slightly baffling, where to me it seems like some of the higher impact sites have been favoured over lower impact alternatives. It would be interesting to see the reasons why some of the areas were deemed "not suitable for developement". Were the stakeholder meetings minuted? Are the minutes available?

Members agree that the development of housing and affordable housing will have less impact on the Green Belt north of the town. Indiscriminate all day parking is a major problem in the town. More single line 2 hour parking, and residential permit parking. Congleton appear to have been succesful in this regard but of course provide ample 50p car parks unlike Knutsford. Car parking all day at reasonable cost - station car park 0 King Street site originally suggested as a multi-storey car park. Ditto Tatton Street car park. Adams Hill side used by offices and British Rail passengers.

Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.

The National Planning Policy Framework now contains a chapter to specifically address health and well-being (chapter 8 "Promoting Healthy Communities"). Paragraphs 73 and 74 fall within the remit of Sport England as they relate to the protection, enhancement and creation of sport and recreation facilities. Paragraph 73 now requires Local Authorities to undertake a robust and up to date Needs Assessment for open space, sport and recreation facilities to identify what provision is required: Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required. This requirement will be essential when looking at allocating sites for new housing and employment. In areas where an increase in population is planned, including cumulative impacts, there will be a corresponding increase in demand for sport. The Needs Assessment will help plan strategically for sport and recreation throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan and help deliver the objections set out in the Town Strategies. Sport England has a range of strategic planning tools and advice on preparing a robust evidence base which can be found on our website: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance.aspx I am
aware the Council are beginning to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy which will form an integral part of
the overall open space, sport and recreation evidence base. When looking at sites to allocate for
development it is important paragraph 74 of NPPF is taken into account alongside Sport England
statutory remit on protecting playing fields: Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and
land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: - an assessment has been undertaken
which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or the loss
resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in
terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or - the development is for alternative sports and
recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. Where a Needs Assessment
identifies the need to create new sites for open space, sport or recreation the Local Plan should
allocate sites as necessary and in accordance with the findings of the Needs Assessment. Information
on Sport England's statutory remit and the Playing Fields Policy can be found here:
http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_applications.aspx

The failure to actively engage local residents until the final days of the consultation process is simply
unacceptable. I live on Warren Avenue, WA16 0AL, and will be severely impacted by any develop-
on area A, however, I've only been allowed to become involved with this consultation on the
19/09/12. Before we go any further with this, I believe there should be a "townhall" meeting between
the relevant members of Cheshire East Council and the people directly affected here in Knutsford. This
would give us all the opportunity to discuss our concerns in an open and constructive manner, but
more importantly for the members of the Council to meet the people their decisions are impacting.

You complain that response has been low but I would say that you have communicated it poorly.
Publishing the plan in Booths and online is not enough. You should have had posters up everywhere
around town, set up a Facebook page, get leaflets into schoolbags throughout the town and even
asked people on the street. Its pointless putting all this work into a strategy that no-one reads and
which is then onerous to respond to. Your engagement with local residents needs significant
improvement. Overall, its hard to disagree with most of the document but the proof of the pudding is
in the speed and quality of the execution of the plan. As well as what gets prioritised. It feels slightly
conservative overall - the vision is sound but not inspiring or innovative. 7/10.

There should be 100% use of ALL office and industrial units within the town and immediate local area
before any further are to be built. All housing developments should be in keeping with the towns
classification and new developments should not have any adverse impact on the current urban area
or the conservation areas.

A. COMMUNICATION/CONSULTATION: If Cheshire East Council truly wanted our opinion WHY WASN'T
THE DRAFT PLAN DEPOSITED IN THE LETTERBOX OF EVERY RESIDENT OF KNUTSFORD?? I cannot tell you
the number of people I have spoken to who are unaware of the town centre proposals and housing
development plans. Many people do not pick up the Knutsford Guardian on a regular basis, or attend
the Leisure Centre, or went to Booths on the one day a consultation was held. For such important
changes to our town, there should have been a more direct approach at reaching its residents
especially in light of the short timeframe given for a response. Also, with respect to the development
options detailed on pages 19-26 that presented a fair spread of sites, we were then presented on
pages 27-30 with those sites "favoured" by the "stakeholder panel" which are concentrated on the
northwest side of town - green belt farming plots (sites A-E). Does this fall in line with "developing a
green infrastructure plan to safeguard, manage and enhance our green assets (page 6);" "enhanc[ing] the
greenspaces within and adjacent to the town...in terms of their quality, quantity, connectivity,
biodiversity, safety and accessibility (page 16);" and/or that the priority for housing be given to "opportunities for development or redevelopment of previously developed sites with the current urban area" and "to sites on the edge of the urban area with potential for good access to services and the
town centre or where they could increase facilities and opportunities for integrated communities
(page 27)? Lastly, with respect to the lack of communication, could you please explain why site
locations F, H, I, J, L-Twere "not considered suitable for development?" How could no explanation be
given and yet we, as residents, were asked to vote for and against each site presented when it seems
a decision has already been made? B. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT - NUMBERS AND LOCATION: The

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:
Q9 Additional Comments
maxium number of houses being proposed is 1,280. Taking into consideration Knutsford's current population of 12,570 and averaging 2.5 residents per new dwelling, that would increase the population by25%! Yes, there is a need for more housing, but how could such a small town, whose centre is restricted 'for outward development and limited due to its historic layout, cope with that many? INFRATRUCTURE: May I remind those pushing for the town's expansion of the following existing problems: 1. Schools -the primary schools are currently oversubscribed with some having been forced to take on additional classes. If Egerton Primary School is to be folded into a new town centre boundary-and we are assuming used as a car parking facility - where would its replacement school go? And how many new schools are under consideration for an increasing town population? Traffic, Speeding Issues & CarParking-the current rush hour situation on Manchester, Northwich, and Chelford Roads will only worsen and, as an effect, increase run off traffic onto roads now considered a "throughway" -Sugar Pit lane, ladies Mile (which is already too narrow for twoway traffic), Tabley Grove, Westfield Drive, etc. Will a bypass be considered to get around Knutsford? The favoured development sites on the northwest side of Knutsford willalso impact the current speeding issues along these roads as cars continue to ignore speeding limits entering our town from the M6 and A56. Also, you willfind that many people will prefer to drive, rather than walk, into the town centre, therefore exacerbating the existing issue of lack of parking. 3. Medical Surgeries -I have heard no further news on the development of a "super health centre" to combine the town's existing surgeries. Is this a go-ahead? If not, what considerations are being made to increase the number of surgeries to accommodate more patients? Most of us would agree there is a need to utilize and upgrade existing facilities in the town centre and create a better mix of commercial shops. I do, however, question whether this great expansion of Knutsford will lead to its demise as a once notable charming historic town?

Shared use town centre good idea. Do not like full pedestrianisation.

The land off Kestrel Avenue owned by Randale Brooks outwith Dog Wood ( Tatton Park) accessed over existing road bridge over railway. This could be developed as 3/4 storey town houses.

This is a thoughtful well written document. Chapter 4 - Strategy - Connectivity Greater levels of town centre parking should not be part of strategy. There is already a good supply of town centre car parks, which are underused and constant illegal parking with little enforcement of parking restrictions.

A well written and informative draft strategy. Parking of vehicles in Knutsford on double yellow lines is a blight to the Town Centre. Significantly greater enforcement is necessary, with licence penalty points being added to existing monetary fine.

We have noise pollution from the airport and traffic congestion from the M6 when there are accidents. Do not add to this pollution and congestion. Knutsford does not need to increase to the extent suggested, and would in fact suffer if it did so. The primary schools at the moment are full to capacity, and the medical facilities overloaded. Even trying to sort the latter out has proved to be impossible so far. The roads are already congested, especially when there is an accident on the M6, and the East - West traffic has to pass right through the centre of town too. More traffic would lead to worsening congestion and pollution. It is a travesty of usage to build on Grade 1 farmland such as A and B, as the loss of these fields would make the farm not viable. As a dairy farm it needs the fields for grazing and for growing silage. The wildlife on that land would be affected too. Land which is less productive would be a better option to build on. Knutsford is known for its green open spaces which are an attraction for visitors. Why spoil it. There are no jobs available, so Knutsford would become more of a dormitory town than it already is.

I don't think Knutsford should be a place where many of Cheshire East's houses are built. Houses are needed (especially 'affordable' ones) around expanding industry and commercial sites in Crewe? Mobberley for Manchester Airport Enterpirse Zone.

The population of Cheshire East is expected to grow by 5% over the next 14 years - anticipate 7% over the next 20 years. Similar growth in Knutsford would be an additional 880 residents. - why does housing stock have to increase by 21% to accommodate such a number and where does it say this in
the SHMA? Such building would alter the development principle (p18, item 5.1). Why are the favoured site concentrated in the north west of the town? Why are there no reasons given by the Stakeholder Panel for their verdicts on the site. Opposed to site A, slightly less to B. Site A has a pond, well, marshy nature, no sewerage facility.

Table 6.3 “not suitable for development” What are the features which distinguish sites not suitable for development from those that are? 6.5 What are the "exceptional circumstances" relating to building on the Green belt? Heed the town Motto "Respice, Aspice, Prospice - look to the past the present and the future. The plan concentrates on the future and takes no account of the present and past.

I believe that public transport should be prioritised where there is a clear cost benefit. For example, better train and bus services would make sense rather than spending £200m on a 'new' A556

This survey was too long! I wonder how many people will have the patience to plough through it. The message about being able to save your form part way through and come back to it should have been at the beginning, not the end!!

Any intrusions into the green belt environment should be resisted as a priority. Every green belt intrusion represents one more step towards Knutsford becoming a suburb of Manchester. Every suggestion of a green belt intrusion, will, as far as I am concerned, be a vote lost for the proposer!

Everyone talks about Improving Knutsford... Well, as much as I am someone who welcomes change to improve things, I don't welcome change for changes sake. In my humble opinion, the discussions about building on GREEN BELT will detrimentally affect the main reason people want to live in Knutsford. i.e because it is a small, unique town surrounded by beautiful, countryside. We can't compete with Northwich or Manchester for shopping and parking, but why would we want to? We can't be everything to everyman. We should absolutely try and improve Knutsford and I applaud, the Knutsford Town Plan and the town Council for starting the discussion but we shouldn't change Knutsford for changes sake...Future generations will look back in horror, if we throw away their green fields.

I strongly disagree with the size and scale of the identified development areas for Knutsford. The population of Cheshire East grows by just under 5% but yet need 24% more house over nearly the same time period. Priority should be spent on developing brown field sites in towns that can support the increased load e.g. Crewe, Macclesfield as these will accommodate the changes required with less impact. Knutsford cannot support the additional houses, its infrastructure in terms of traffic, schools etc cannot support an increase. Unfortunately whilst a preference should be giving for people to get Social housing in Knutsford if accommodation is available in the surrounding areas then this must be taken. Additionally the panel, who selected the preferred sites, appeared to give no reason for the rejection of some sites. Was this a personal and prejudicial interest they have and thus need to declare it. The areas identified as favourites are mainly open green spaces and/or football fields. These should be retained for the benefit of Knutsford. Other sites rejected mainly farmers field should be used if we have to any development.

Making use of residential space within town centre should be a priority.

You do not seem to have addressed the most important - Knutsford should have a bypass.

This relates to the document, and consultation exercise as a whole. Whilst I applaud the fact that such a consultation is taking place at all, I believe it has been badly handled. The document is far too lengthy to make intelligent comment easy; and yet vital detail is missing in many areas. For example, how can we be expected to assess the impact of changing the town centre boundaries if we are not given full information relating to the likely benefits and detriments? There should have been more face-to-face open meetings in advance, and more time should have been allowed for what has turned out to be a cumbersome process. Launching such a complex exercise during the summer holidays, when many residents would have been away, surely should have necessitated a longer deadline.

 профессионально. Я также стремлюсь учесть все важные аспекты, которые могут оказывать влияние на результатах.
have completed the questionnaire on line. This in itself was a lengthy procedure. I have concerns that many people will have been put off responding, either by this, or because they do not have easy access to the Internet. I appreciate that paper copies of the form are available (how widely though?), but again, more time should have been allowed.

The KTS makes no mention of the potential sites for the much talked about enhanced Knutsford Hospital /Health Centre. It does talk of ‘mixed use’ but doesn’t go any further than that. When the site off the Mobberley Road area was under discussion for a new hospital site, the reason for the choice of land to be used in that area was given as that area was close to many homes, particularly housing people of more limited means, perhaps with no access to a car. The KTS indicates many affordable homes are scheduled to be built in Knutsford.... one could assume that the sites of these home will be taken into account should the Hospital /Health Centre be built, but this is not alluded to in KTS One of the sites for the enhanced health provision being talked about (from the Knutsford Guardian’s articles on the subject) is the present hospital site near Stanley Road/Bexton Lane The vehicular access from Stanley Road to the Hospital is notoriously bad. There are often holds ups, the road has a stretch of yellow lines, then it allows parking, all this just before the entrance to the hospital. There is no right turn lane for the hospital for cars and other vehicles, there are quite a lot of small buses taking elderly patients to/from the hospital, juggle to get in and out of the hospital entrance. The number of car parking spaces in front of the hospital is inadequate and the rear parking is fine but it is quite a walk round to the main entrance. I would like to feel confident that the hospital /health issue is to be reviewed and taken into account in the KTS but I seen no reason to believe that it is going to be. Most of the residents of the villages surrounding Knutsford use Knutsford for GP and other health needs. Most of them arrive by car. There is no other practical way to arrive in good for appointments, so these issues are extremely relevant for these CEC residents. As a second issue, we have education, fire, police and other service providers as regular attendees at AMG meetings; most residents are extremely concerned about health, particularly as this is an area acknowledged to having an ageing population, and I feel we are not serving those residents adequately as we have no regular input from health care providers

Knutsford High School (now Academy) should be much more integrated with the town. It's enormous facilities for computers, art, craft workshops, music and drama, and its teaching staff could be utilised. Until the 1990's it was used as an adult education base for the town with a wide range of courses, both vocational and recreational that were used by all age groups in the town, often leading to further qualifications. At present only the sports facilities are available to the town.

I am horrified by the prospect of the proposals building over the Cheshire countryside at locations A and B as they currently stand, and hugely saddened at the way this matter seems to being 'rail-roaded' through with seemingly unreasonably short periods of consultation with Cheshire East Council by the 1st October, when it seems that a significant number of our neighbours seem to be unaware of the destruction of the character of Knutsford that is being proposed. I am against the proposals for the following reasons: 1. Destruction of green belt is a non-reversible action. The purpose of green belt is to maintain the current definition of town and countryside. There are areas of brownfield that could be built upon without destroying the value of Knutsford as a defined town, rather than begin to envelope these market towns as part of the Manchester urban sprawl. 2. The traffic infrastructure has insufficient capacity to allow development of Knutsford. There is already a frequent problem with excessive traffic around the town and adding to the size of the town would only make this worse. 3. Building off Tabley Road would increase the traffic problem that already exists, both in terms of the speed problem that exists on this road that has been highlighted to the highways agency and yourself, and also the use of rat-runs allowing drivers to use the residential streets to avoid the traffic problems in the centre of Knutsford and the junction between Tabley Road and Manchester Road. 4. The infrastructure of Knutsford does not facilitate the expansion of the town. Schooling, public transport, local jobs etc. is insufficient to warrant expansion. Expansion of areas that already have better local public transport/jobs etc. would make more sense. Additional Letter I have recently seen the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation document and have been appalled by the proposals contained
therein. I am not normally disposed to write to the Knutsford Town Council however given what is being proposed I feel it necessary to solicit your position is on this matter and specifically on the issue of building over the Cheshire countryside at locations A1 B1 C1 D and E. I am horrified by the prospect of the proposals as they currently stand and hugely saddened at the way this matter seems to being 'rail-roaded through with seemingly unreasonably short periods of consultation with Cheshire East Council by the 1st October when it seems that a significant number of our neighbours seem to be unaware of the destruction of the character of Knutsford that is being proposed. I am against the proposals for the following reasons: 1. Destruction of green belt is a non-reversible action. The purpose of green belt is to maintain the current definition of town and countryside. There are areas of brownfield that could be built upon without destroying the value of Knutsford as a defined town rather than begin to envelope these market towns as part of the Manchester urban sprawl. 2. The traffic infrastructure has insufficient capacity to allow development of Knutsford. There is already a frequent problem with excessive traffic around the town and adding to the size of the town would only make this worse. 3. Building off Tabley Road would increase the traffic problem that already exists both in terms of the speed problem that exists on this road that has been highlighted to the highways agency and yourself and also the use of rat-runs allowing drivers to use the residential streets to avoid the traffic problems in the centre of Knutsford and the junction between Tabley Road and Manchester Road. 4. The infrastructure of Knutsford does not facilitate the expansion of the town. Schooling, public transport, local jobs etc. is insufficient to warrant expansion. Expansion of areas that already have better local public transport/jobs etc. would make more sense. I understand that in May of this year, our MP for the Tatton Constituency, Mr George Osborne, supported residents protesting against plans by Wilmslow Town Council that would lead to hundreds of homes being built on protected rural land. I have heard it reported that his response to the campaign was "a victory for local people" and "I don't think all the sites identified for housing are right". Given that the development of Wilmslow would seem eminently more sensible than Knutsford given its proximity to the industry/jobs of south Manchester and the excellent bypass this town has, I would expect that we can rely on your support to halt this crazy plan. However, I would very much appreciate an opportunity to understand quite clearly what your position is to the destruction of these fields and the character of Knutsford as a Cheshire county market town of such special character. A 30% expansion of Knutsford is just not necessary and particularly not ribbon development along the A50.

As above, I question whether development on a large scale is really required. I am concerned that Knutsford could risk losing large areas of green belt land in areas that are already thriving. Parkgate would benefit from further development and would impact on the economy of Knutsford. I strongly disagree with the level of development proposed, particularly building on large areas of green belt land. I fear it will dramatically alter Knutsford's unique selling points and in doing so have the opposite effect of that intended. The favoured areas of A, B, C,D and E are currently beautiful farmland, greatly enhancing the approach to Knutsford and the lives of local residents. I can see these would be easy to develop and offer a huge profit to the developers but I question what benefit it would bring to current residents and Knutsford itself. I would argue that Site G would be the best area to develop as it has fewer residents living directly next to it but it would obviously not provide as much profit for developers due to the railway line and flight path. This site would also benefit one of the few areas in Knutsford in need of some investment. Knutsford has improved greatly over recent years and most areas that can be developed have been. Our road systems and infrastructure are stretched already. I would question whether those involved in putting these plans into action really have Knutsford's best interests at heart. I am sure there are other areas in EastCheshire which would benefit from more investment and development, without having to build on valuable green belt land. Additional Letter Having just read the Cheshire East Local Plan for Knutsford, I strongly disagree with the level of development proposed, particularly building on large areas of green belt land. I fear it will dramatically alter Knutsford's unique selling points and in doing so have the opposite effect of that intended. The favoured areas of A, B, C, D and E are currently beautiful farmland, greatly enhancing...
the approach to Knutsford and the lives of local residents. I can see these would be easy to develop and offer a huge profit to the developers but I question what benefit it would bring to current residents and Knutsford itself. I would argue that Site G would be the best area to develop as it has fewer residents living directly next to it but it would obviously not provide as much profit for developers due to the railway line and flight path. This site would also benefit one of the few areas in Knutsford in need of some investment. Knutsford has improved greatly over recent years and most areas that can be developed have been. Our road systems and infrastructure are stretched already. I would question whether those involved in putting these plans into action really have Knutsford’s best interests at heart. I am sure there are other areas in East Cheshire which would benefit from more development, without having to build on valuable green belt land. This Plan is a joke. I will make this the one issue that I will be asking any Councillors who seek re-election to clarify their position on. Time for the elected politicians to decide if they act in the interests of Knutsfordians or for the great machine that is Cheshire east. The Council can easily fulfil its housing requirement by putting development into Congleton and Crewe - frankly they need it. We don’t but this was a sloppily thought out lazy piece of work that sought to take the line of least resistance and satisfy some local vested interests by dressing it up as public engagement. Private "secret" workshops with interested parties do not constitute Public engagement if even if you dress it up with a fluffy name like Stakeholder Panel. Totally vacuous, cynical phrasing and questioning about the environment and sustainability - massively insulting and patronising. Trying to get parts of Knutsford to "vote" each other into the firing line of development like some kind of property "X Factor" - appalling cynical Council behaviour. The proposal to develop areas A and B for housing are acts of wanton vandalism and represent the destruction of perfectly good agricultural land that is actively and responsibly farmed by the current tenant. The heart of the centre is concentrated along king street, minshull street and princess street - page 7 paragraph 2.7 - the plan proposes to take from the heart by introducing parking and shared surface schemes. Shared surface schemes may result in lonely town centre. Same paragraph - the town centre retains much of its traditional Georgian and victorian architecture - modern developments will take away from the look and appeal of such buildings and spoil the unique look of our town. Same paragraph - only 6% of 286 shops are vacant - why then do you want to keep adding more shops - focus on filling these 6% remaining. Same paragraph - scope for small scale convenience goods floorspace - we don't need more supermarkets page 10 - Vision for Knutsford you want a unique character and independent traders - you will lose this if you focus on shopping for tourism as you will encourage the high street chains forcing the smaller local shops out of business 2.9 Aircraft noise is possibly the most important single factor which impacts on the quality of life for many residents of Knutsford. Why is so little importance given to this issue in a document which looks at the future of the town over the next 20 years? I suspect that little can be done with regard to aircraft landing from the west during warm summer days (if we ever see them again) but surely this is an opportunity to tackle the issue of night flights over our territory. I cannot see Knutsford having a commercial theatre, museum etc. too small Thank you for giving us the opportunity to contribute to the Local Plan. Start again. This has been divisive and has pitted Community against Community within Knutsford by trying to use the fear of having land allocated result in people pushing other parcels into the spotlight. Appalling low handed behaviour by Cheshire East - I will be very keen to see which of our politicians stand up to be counted on this. There is no mention of the basic need to improve the roads we all use in order to access the town centre. Driving in Knutsford and its immediate surrounding areas is currently a very unpleasant experience. Funds must be spent as a priority to fill in all the potholes and repair roads in a poor state - particularly Gaskell Avenue. Thank You. The Football Club has been on its current site (D) for 80 years, its pitch is recognised as the best in Cheshire and the Club has a high profile and strong reputation as the top club at its level in Cheshire.
The history and heritage of the Club (founded in 1888) is directly linked to its local community. Its members would hope that the town’s football team had a bright future for the next 125 years.

There is very limited specific reference to car parking requirements, and no reference to making the two principal streets, Kings Street and Princess Street safer to pedestrians (partial pedestrianisation) and more vehicle friendly. Frankly, I find the whole document difficult to understand. I have tried to be constructive where possible.

Do we need more housing the roads are blocked at present. If required develop area NOPQ into a new area.

Critical to make Knutsford appealing to visitors who bring cash and jobs. Current resources are already stretched eg doctors. Increasing housing will swamp resources.

Emphasis on public transport such as the Metrolink is important and beneficial for the community, and would make more sense than expanding the A556.

Please can you extend the consultation period and please publicise this plan more- most people I have spoken to since I became aware of it, all residents of knutsford -have not got a clue that there is a consultation going on. Publicising the areas for potential development and the proposed number of houses should be enough to get their attention.

Public transport such as the Metrolink and better bus and train services should be prioritised where there is a clear cost benefit, rather than spending £200m on a new A556.

I believe that public transport should be prioritised where there is a clear cost benefit. For example, better train and bus services would make sense rather than spending £200m on a new A556.

Having taken quite some time to fully understand the proposed expansion of Knutsford I feel that I have to make my feelings felt. The expected population growth for Cheshire as a whole is 5% over 14 years however this can be extracted to 7% for the life time of the Local Development Plan to 2030. Cheshire East are planning to increase the housing stock in Knutsford by up to 1280 homes or 21%over this period requiring Knutsford to grow quicker than its fare share. On top of this they wish to increase the number of light industrial units within the town, even though 20% of those presently available lie empty, including 4 of the 6 units on the new Knutsford Business Park. The plans to build homes will be built mainly on Greenbelt land to the North of Knutsford (Nether Ward) and the prime sites are land between Northwich Road & Tabley Road and Tabley Road and Manchester Road. At present this land is prime agricultural land which is farmed by 1 farmer and represents approximately 50% of his farmland. There are no available fields adjacent to his farm to replace the lost land so ultimately this Dairy Farm would have to close, which is not good news at a time when there are farmers going out of business at a very high rate. Tabley Hill Dairy Farm has been rented by the same family, from the Crown Estates, for over 40 years and is now run by the son. If building takes place on this land the farmer will not benefit because it is not his land, all that happens to him and his extended family is that they are without home and income, with no benefits. In addition if it becomes easy to build on Agricultural Greenbelt land then if I were a farmer I would happily sell my land rather than work the 70hours a week some of them do, which in turn would result in an even greater loss of home agriculture - not good - and more imported foods!! Within the boundaries of Knutsford there are areas which could be developed which would not affect either the homeowners who back on to the new proposed areas or take prime agricultural land. The areas in question do appear to the North East on the town plan but do not rate highly, unlike the land to the North West, in fact the areas shown as

---

**Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report: Q9 Additional Comments**
GHIJK would help a side of Knutsford which is currently very poorly covered by local services, such as a large supermarket, medical facilities and sports facilities. The people living in properties on Longridge, Parkgate and surrounding areas, a number of which are Council Houses, have a long way to travel if they wish to utilise any of the current amenities in the town and often travel by taxi, at a cost to the Council if they are on benefits. Surely it makes more sense to develop this side of town providing more affordable housing for young people, shopping and sports facilities with appropriate parking, on land that is readily available and which would not only benefit these residents but the people of Mobberley. At present the infrastructure of Knutsford is full, the schools are full, the medical centres are full and the roads are full especially if the M6 has a problem, so to put any more pressure on the system is totally foolhardy, but if growth is to happen then it should be kept to a minimum and better thought should be given to the how’s and where’s. Knutsford is a great place with a fantastic community but to increase it by the amount recommended by the Town Plan would totally destroy what we have and I for one say a very big NO to the Town Plan proposals.

Its a poorly prepared proposal with very little reasoning included in it. Its difficult for many people to understand and gives the impression that decisions have already been taken and people's views are not wanted. The difficulty of accessing the information, giving feedback, lack of publicity and ridiculously short public consultation period all go to re-inforce that impression.

Objective 4: Housing It is madness to take a town of such a distinctive character and try to expand it by a random target number of dwellings. Any assessment of expansion should start with the question "what extra levels of demand can be accommodated?" NOT "where will we put an extra 1200 houses?" Table 6.3 As stated against the individual Sites in Table 6.3, it is completely unacceptable to say simply that the Site was not considered suitable for development and then ask anyone to agree to that statement. Why no are there no reasons? What are the differences between these Sites and any of the others in Table 6.2? It is impossible to give agreement to these points in the vacuum of no information. Without the complete information, the assessment of the Town Plan is meaningless.

Really concerned that the strategy has been drawn up without consultation with the residents of Knutsford. How many residents were involved in this plan? How many knew it was going on? How many know about it now? This could be life changing for so many people yet so few know anything about it. I would be very keen to hear what process was followed and what guidelines if any East Cheshire has followed to get to this stage.

When it mentions 'Community Orchard, for instance, no-one would disagree with that, but it features in Plot A's write up. It seems quite a loaded question where the good stuff is only available with the housing developments. Concerns: 1. The housing plan seems to be in isolation from any talk of increased schooling or doctors' surgeries. Before moving to Knutsford, we carefully evaluated the schools for my young family. 2. The intended land is greenbelt. This was a major factor of why I worked, saved and moved my family to Knutsford, specifically this area. I (happily) paid a premium for this house in this location and am worried about the knock-on effect of being swallowed up in a housing development. 3. Manchester Road traffic is currently congested toward Mere every morning and evening; these additional two-thousand cars can only exacerbate the problem. The air quality is noticeably poor due to this traffic and the strong fumes can be smelt each morning when I take my child to nursery. I’d be pushing for a reduction in traffic through Knutsford, not an increase. Minor roads (Ladies Mile, Tabley Road, Queensway) would be used as ratruns - these are streets were children play. Questionnaire - no 'not applicable' option. Such wording may indicate an agreement to a particular proposal, where in actuality, agreement may have been ticked due to no specific disagreement - corrupts data.

I believe that the addition of the Aldi to Knutsford would be a grave mistake as we already have a number of places to shop and a major supermarket in the form of Booths. As Knutsford is an affluent area, it strikes me that the kind of budget shopping that Aldi would provide may be pointless. I believe that area could be better used in other ways.

There has been no consultation prior to this document and questionnaire. The document is padded out with unnecessary waffle at 48 pages! It does not state any definite ideas and contradicts itself in
several places. A strategy of this magnitude should be driven by the local residents and businesses of the town, not from a remote group with no ties to the town. It should also be driven by the Knutsford town plan that many residents took the trouble to reply to and which showed a great satisfaction with the town as it is. I would suggest a strategy of getting back to basics and spending council taxes on repairing our roads and pavements and maintaining the town to a high standard. Give up on these unnecessary and expensive schemes and start listening to what we the locals actually want.

It is unfair to say no to any development, however I will say no to any development unless:- The housing units are built within the present footprint of Knutsford (Site G 480 Units) and infill. A new primary school is built before the housing units are started. The road network is improved and maintained above the poor rate it is now. There is 100% usage of office and industrial units before more are added, or planned to be added. No sports facilities are lost and extra are added within the area built. No allotments are lost and extra spaces are provided. At least 60% of the properties are affordable (less than Â£120,000) to buy or rent. At least 75% of jobs on site are given to knutsfordians with at least 20% of these being apprenticeships for our young people. Any house or land owner whose property is devalued by the loss of greenbelt due to changes in national policy is reimbursed in full by the developer.

The Strategy document is very difficult to follow and difficult to understand. It drops in issues regarding the Metrolink which is totally new on the radar to a lay person such as myself. Are we to believe that there is ongoing planning behind this. Similarly there is reference to numerous other items that have no background of substance. One maybe able to support the objective if one can see the thinking behind it. The airport and airport traffic is a massive subject for Knutsford and one that needs its own subject, consultation and strategy!

As a general comment I consider that this Strategy has been very poorly advertised for something that could have such a large impact on existing council tax paying residents. The lack of publicity and access if not online is outrageous. The feeble excuse of it being too costly to post does not hold up. You created the voluminous strategy document and lengthy questionnaire - you should have drafted it to be suitable to post. The strategy document itself is amateurish and full of buzz words. The dividing up of the land around the town seems to have been completely ad hoc and has not recognised any local specific issues, apart from some ponds and overhead cables. To base an entire strategy on this flawed at best, disengenuous at worst.

1. Poorly set out. Too jargonised. Syntax frequently poor 2. Should use more of the Knutsford Town Plan which was democratically underwritten and is more positive and specific. 3. Quality of decision-making and onward execution important. Responsibility split CEC/KTC definition vital 4. Impact of likely funding limitations and priority allocations by CEC. All crucial to what achievable

This questionnaire was not well publicised, people should have been mailshotted on this and there should have been more meetings to publicise it, you ask me questions in here that for some will not be easy to interpret and answer, if you are intelligent and computer literate then its not easy, for some members of society it will be impossible and that is not fair.

Unfortunately three fundamental comments on strategy. 1. Timing of strategy is wrong. It should be discussed after core strategy has more closely defined what is scale of development that Knutsford should accommodate. If the aim of this strategy was to help inform the core strategy by identifying what scale of development Knutsford residents want or what can be accommodated with existing or potential infrastructure improvements then i consider it has failed. The technical information included in the document to help anybody make informed decisions is minimal and where provided is often incorrect or misleading. The ability to discuss the strategy with CEC officers has been minimal. 2. Consultation on strategy is poor at best. Period of time for consultation too short. Advertising of consultation very poor. Exhibition in library not staffed by CEC hence no opportunity to discuss content with officers who have prepared the document. 3. The decision on which development sites should be favoured is arbitrary. No information is provided as to why sites have been favoured. The only information comparing sites is in the Sustainability Appraisal report. The information on the sites in this report which ranked sites is flawed and cannot be relied upon. Table 5.1 compared the sites
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under 20 headings. Only under two headings could CEC find differences between sites. These were firstly, sustainable access to jobs, services and facilities and secondly Vitality, Viability and diversity of town centres. Under the first heading of sustainable access 5 sites were classified as having +ve effect (sites D,K,M,Q,S) the remainder a - ve effect. Under the second heading of vitality of town centre site K was classified as having very positive effect the remainder only a positive effect. Why site K at Longridge should have a different effect on the town centre in comparison with any other sites i do not understand. Similarly in respect of access which my comments primarily refer to, the assessment i consider flawed. In Table 5.3 details as to how access was appraised are provided under a variety of headings, for example access to public transport. These findings are presumably based upon the data in Tables F1 and F2. There are too many errors and anomalies in Tables F1 and F2 to discuss here. However how sites to the north of the town (Sites A-E) which have the poorest bus services anywhere in the town (5 buses per day service 289,) can be regarded as having GOOD public transport whereas site K with a half hourly service doesn’t is difficult to understand. The data on accessibility of sites should be withdrawn. This appears to have influenced the choice of the north as being the preferred direction of search for new development. To highlight the inaccuracies in the appraisal I have undertaken a simple comparison of two Sites R and D, being considered in the CEC report to have +ve effect on access whereas Site R is considered to be -ve. I have considered access from these two sites to what i consider key facilities. I simply quote respective distances to each key facility (kms). To Bus Station Site R 1.1 Site D 1.2 To Rail Station Site R 1.0 Site D 1.3 To High School Site R 0.8 Site D 1.3 To Primary School Site R 0.3 Site D 1.2 To Town Centre shops Site R 1.2 Site D 1.1 To employment-Booths Hall Site R 2.1 Site D 2.6 - Parkgate Site R 2.6 Site D 3.0 To Leisure Centre Site R 1.0 Site D 1.2 It is difficult from these figures to determine why CEC reports identify Site D as being +ve in respect of sustainable access whereas Site R is -ve. The analyses are flawed and should not be relied upon. Given it is only this under this sustainable access heading where CEC found differences between sites it seems to have influenced the choice of sites being favoured. Given the data is flawed the process of identifying favoured sites is flawed. The choice of which sites to be preferred should not be influenced by the results of this strategy consultation it should await accurate and informed information being available. It should also include a more holistic study of sites, including an urban extension to the west and a study of infrastructure requirements.

The strategy is full of contradictions. For example the "Sustainable Community Strategy" states --> "increasing access to new and improved sports and leisure facilities;" BUT the existing facilities form a major part of the planned development sites (site D & E). Also a principle of a low carbon community is contradicted by many suggestions to improve car parking! The strategy appears to have been put together by a restricted set of stakeholders who have an "agenda" of one form or another. The length of time allowed for comments is too short (4 weeks). This is NOT enough time to publicise the document and provide enough time for people to reply in a considered manner.

Very little point in large scale market house provision for Knutsford as thousands of houses would be required to bring overall prices down - and in providing them, you would destroy what everyone was coming to enjoy. Should consider allocations for affordable and social housing only, to ensure key workers can live in the town, not only the wealthy.

Knutsford could be advertised more widely to encourage tourism, for example at Manchester airport.

1. Who made up the Stakeholder Panel?
2. Why were certain sites not deemed suitable for development?
3. Why does there have to be such a large allocation of housing in Knutsford? Surely there are other parts of Cheshire East where development could take place on Brown field sites. The development in Holmes Chapel is not taking place on green belt.
4. On 6 September, the Communities and Local Government Secretary Eric Pickles in Commons Questions was asked to confirm whether green belt land would always be protected. He answered yes. This does not appear to be the case in Knutsford.

This strategy seems thrown together with little thought on impact of existing residents and our wants and needs. Why do we want more visitors and housing - we don’t. The consultancy time on this
document is too short and difficult for many to respond too. It feels very sneaky.

My comments are overall to my motivation who has no vested interest in profiting from this town plan. I am passionate about my town it is extraordinary in architecture, cobbled streets green spaces in comparison to other UK towns that have become soulless as planners and developers have taken no interest in the value to the community. We have 3 significant green space in sight of the town and a parkland to walk to. I want to share it with other like minded people of any wealth bracket. exclusion or isolation are the dangers and not inclusion for all the proposed developments as we have now on the town fringes be it goughs lane or Longridge. Currently new members of the sports club are primarily out of town residents as middle class families are choosing cheaper towns like holmes chapel. The Crosby home and gated property generation neither shop, work or use Knutsford leisure facilities preferring the offerings at Handforth dean. we need to attract again couples leaving Didsbury to start a family.. sadly despite this survey, i am watching the developers circling, offering little and taking much, as the planning laws are relaxed and the onus is up to the community to oppose.

Bearing in mind the current Green Belt designation (which is longstanding and based on established planning principles), the first options for development should be previously developed land and then land which is not statutory Green Belt. Bearing in mind that the land adjacent to the Parkgate employment area is not designated Green Belt, this land ought to be the first and preferred option for development. In addition development in the area would provide the opportunity to enable improves to access thereby increasing the attractiveness of the existing employment area as a place to work and do business. There are good reasons for developing in the east of Knutsford and for improving infrastructure and facilities in the east of town rather than encroaching on the Northern Green Belt and hence reducing the amenity value of Knutsford.

Housing ideas not thought through. Traffic flow infrastructure improvements need to be included, particularly in view of the increase that arrival Aldi supermarket will bring. The consultation period of 4 weeks was insufficient. A large majority of town residents have not had sufficient time to review the Knutsford Town Strategy. The requirement for a minimum consultation period of 6 weeks has not been met.

Chapter/Paragraph: 6.11A, 6.11E, 8.3. It is essential to retain allotment provision at Warren Avenue and Mereheath Lane. Any reduction in provision or removal to a more distant location would undermined the value and utility of an asset vital to the town and its residents. Most allotment holders walk or cycle to the allotments. A relocation elsewhere would increase car traffic or remove the possibility of allotment holding from those who do not own cars. The Draft Strategy rightly recognises the allotments as a "key feature" of current provision. The intention to create community gardens and orchards as a boundary between any new development and existing housing is welcomed. The Allotment Association would be an ideal agency through which to manage such a facility. However, the conclusion of reading this draft strategy is that the commitment to increase housing provision in line with projected demand is too heavily focused on a few sites located chiefly in one part particular of town. The impact on the green belt would be lessened if development was distributed more evenly on the fringes of the current urban area. This would be less likely to endanger the "distinctive character" of this small and historic market town.

The National Planning Policy framework which is supposed to guide this proces sets out very clearly that; Firstly - The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. Secondly - Green Belt serves five purposes one of which is ... to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; Thirdly - Once Green Belts have been established they should only be altered in exceptional circumstances From all that I have read on the Town Strategy Document it is unclear what the "exceptional circumstances" are that would create a valid reason to earmark a number of sizeable existing Green Belt areas around Knutsford as favoured sites for development. When you look at the Placeshaping Consultation that has taken place in Knutsford a lower percentage of respondents were concerned about the need to Improve the Housing Mix than in any of the other towns surveyed by Cheshire East as part of this process. In the same consultation, Knutsford residents also expressed less concern about the need to "Improve Employment Opportunities" than any other town in the Cheshire East
area. On that basis why do we need additional development that could start within a few years when residents main concerns are reducing traffic and keeping the special character of this historic market town, neither of which seem consistent with the development being proposed. Most people I’ve spoken to do not feel that the consultation process has been communicated widely enough with many completely unaware of the existence or importance of the Knutsford Town Strategy discussions. Those residents lucky enough to have heard about the consultation seem to have made their priorities very clear and they don’t include building on the green spaces that surround our town. Surely CEC cannot believe that the creation of an additional hotel and golf course being proposed for one of the northern sites can be considered a requirement that meets the spirit of the "exceptional circumstances" required by the Government to justify eroding yet another valuable part of our fast diminishing Green Belt Sorry CEC but you’re misreading the needs of the people of Knutsford with this proposal

I have seen the plans for the future of Knutsford and am appalled and more than a little annoyed. In particular the proposal to develop areas A and B for housing are acts of wanton vandalism and destruction of perfectly good agricultural land that is actively and responsibly farmed by the current tenant. I have seen little political comment or opinion and whilst I am very clear in my mind what I think â€“ I have no indication as to where you, as an elected representative of our Community, sits on this matter and specifically on the issue of building over the Cheshire countryside at locations A and B. There are plenty of other options for accommodating additional housing that do not require the expansion of Knutsford on this scale as several other Cheshire East towns can absorb greater intensity of employment and residential development. From my experience of the local schools and medical facilities in Knutsford in the past year, these community uses struggle to cope with the current population. I am also aware that whatever promises might be made about getting developers to contribute to improving such facilities, the money can only be forthcoming some time after the houses are built “ and consequently the â€œbenefitsâ€‌ (such as they are) of the cash injection to public sector uses are tenuous and the cashflow timeline is heavily out of kilter. I am concerned that these ideas have been produced and discussed in secret in workshops that have involved and gone beyond just the elected Cllrs and officers of the Council and as such these unidentified private individuals and groups have been able to unduly influence the starting point of what should have been an open and democratic discussion. I would very much appreciate an opportunity to understand quite clearly what your position is to the destruction of these fields as this will obviously form much of my own thinking about the political future of the town and I would hope that I do not have to witness my own son saying to his children in the future that he remembers when â€œall those houses are used to be fieldsâ€‌ as I cannot think that such a comment would represent a terribly proud legacy for a town of such special character.

Firstly the consultation has been poorly publicised and very few people even know its taking place. I personally think that this plan is ill thought out and rushed, probably through pressure from local government to meet deadlines. You cant have a plan that champions green space and knutsford heritage yet at the same time plans to destroy them. I also think that any development should be on Brown field sites and in areas that have good transport networks

1.1 - This whole exercise seems to have been very low profile. 1.10 - Who appointed the Stakeholders and why were they chosen - that should be made explicit. 4.3 - Objective 5 - Design quality needs to apply to all development not just 'Heritage'. 6.7 - Diagram 3 - why are some facilities (Knutsford Academy, Cricket Ground, Bexton School) not considered for development when other similar facilities are? And where are the proposed sites for new schools, health facilities etc. Everything seems to be focused on housing options. 10.1 - Mixed use should be defined.

I do not agree with the proposed development sites on the following basis: 1. The preferred development sites will create a mass estate and is disproportionate on one area of Knutsford (North and East). 2. I do not believe we should be building new sporting facilities and relocationing but invest in existing. This is more economically viable and we are not held to ransom by Randell Brooks. It seems to me - through the suggestion of landswap - that the Council has already been in negotiations - therefore this appears a subjective, leading and flawed exercise. 3. The plan does not address any
---

facilities such as schools or other community facilities required to support new developments. 4. The developments proposed will ruin the heritage and country feel. 5. I believe the consultation exercise is divisive - setting one part of Knutsford against the other. This is because the proposed developments are not fair or distributed in a way that means the community can support economic development. 6. There is no business case for new housing is flawed and Knutsford does not need new developments. It seems to be a proposal by which Cheshire East can offload problems in other areas onto Knutsford. I would also like to add that the consultation seems to be a subjective and biased exercise. For example: the infrastructure priorities is biased - as it leads the reader to agree to proposals. For example: "Cycle ways and cycle parking - particularly to new development areas, the town centre, sports facilities, to the existing networks and surrounding settlements" - suggests that we have agreed to new development areas. We have not. Whist "maximising use of existing community facilities such as civic centre" - is not applied to existing sport facilities. I agree that the town has to improve and extend, but we need to keep the small town aspect and community of Knutsford

While I appreciate that such a document must provide a high level view of Knutsford in the future, the document plays down many of Knutsford’s current problems and gives no insight on how the town can move forward on these problems. I have four major concerns: 1. The traffic situation in Knutsford has been out of control since before I moved here in 1983, and worsens every year. The recent gas pipeline work in the town has highlighted just how badly served the town’s residents, workers and visitors are. The road closures have led to chaos on the town centre streets with extended journey times and residential streets on many of Knutsfords estates turned into rat-runs and parking zones. Pedestrianisation of the town centre would certainly help, but only if there is a viable plan to provide vehicular access and parking nearby. There are NO viable areas available around the town centre which could provide roads or parking facilities around the town. The situation is particularly bad around the Knutsford entrance to Tatton Park. Any further developments which impinge on the town centre should be carefully examined to ensure that there is no impact on the surrounding roads until the traffic problems have been addressed. 2. Traffic flow on the M6 has reduced considerably during the recession, but we (meaning you!) have to assume that it will pick up, that congestion and blockages on the M6 in the Knutsford area will return and that Knutsford will once again become the link route between the M6, the M56 and the Cheshire area. This can bring Knutsford grinding to a halt on its own; add it to any roadworks or other congestion (e.g. tourists) and the town again becomes a nightmare for residents and tourists alike. Movement must be made on the M6/ M56 link as a priority. 3. The economic benefits of the link between the town and Tatton Park must not be at the expense of the amenity of Tatton Park. The commercialisation of the Park is already changing its character from a quiet refuge to an adventure park. I appreciate the need for it to become self-financing, which will not be achieved by alienating its many current supporters and visitors. This does not preclude development; BeWilderWood and other theme park type activities (e.g. bungee jumping) should be located on the edge of the park with direct access rather than across the existing route through the park. This will ensure that the current tranquil nature of the main park is not endangered by high speed traffic across Knutsford Drive and loud music bouncing across the park. 4. Your strategy pays lip service to the provision of affordable housing but performance in recent years and your short term plans show just how committed to it. With 6,000 homes in the town and a waiting list of 450, the plan to provide 64 affordable homes each year is pathetic â€“ especially as none have been provided in the last two years.

---

Knutsford is surrounded by greenbelt countryside and inhabited by people who love it. Many visitors come to our town, they like the shops, the pubs and eating houses, and comment on the locals’ friendliness. Tatton Park is a very popular place that we are fortunate enough to have on our
doorstep. We cope with the aircraft that fly overhead. Our town is relatively unspoilt. The state of the dreadful roads is common knowledge, and certainly not as when we arrived here. How anyone living in this area could contemplate building developments involving even more traffic amazes me. This plan can only have been conceived by people who have no clue as to existing conditions. Where are these extra residents going to send their children for schooling? Where do they seek medical and dental health from already oversubscribed surgeries? Where are they to park in the town? How are they going to exit their new estates onto a main road with traffic frequently exceeding speed limits and crashing into our garden? Will protected trees remain protected or will they be cut down overnight mysteriously, with a paltry fine imposition? Shops and offices within the town remain closed due to excessive rates and rents demanded by avaricious landlords. The landowners are already losing out because of their greed. Houses remain unsold for months. Do we really want more empty premises? Whenever there is a road traffic incident on the nearby M6, or when the roads in the town are being dug up, travel through our town is at a standstill. Even on a normal Friday afternoon there is a huge tailback into the town. I attended a meeting many years ago at our Civic Centre regarding the development of Manchester Airport. Loud cheers came from the audience when I asked those dignitaries, “experts”, on the platform who lived in the town to raise their hand, not one hand appeared! Please do not be mislead by so called professional consultants whose sole purpose is to make money for themselves. They have jobs to do, but not at my expense. If the Council does have money to pay these people, reconsider your budget then please spend it on what the residents want, namely decent roads and pavements.

The strategy emphasises the importance of Knutsford’s heritage. Section 2.10 should mention the important archaeological heritage of the town (mentioned in Domesday) and the Area of Archaeological Potential in the town (covering the 3 areas of Nether Knutsford, Cross Town and Over Knutsford). 10. Glossary The following should be included: Area of Archaeological Potential An area where archaeological remains are highly likely to survive. Development within an AAP is likely to require archaeological evaluation prior to the determination of any planning application and a conditioned programme of mitigation to address the impact of development.
We feel that significant prominence should be given to river corridors, for example the River Weaver, River Dean, Birkin Brook, many of which have no wildlife designation but have huge potential for environmental enhancement. Rivers are also important wildlife corridors and should be integral to green infrastructure in the Borough. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) is a wide-ranging and ambitious piece of European environmental legislation. Its overall objective is to bring about the effective co-ordination of water environment policy and regulation across Europe. (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/wfd). In exercising their functions, all public bodies and statutory undertakers (that is most reporting authorities) have a duty to have regard to the objectives of the River Basin Management Plans or their supplementary plans (section 17 of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003). In developing plans you should be aware of WFD. In particular the requirement that nothing be done to a water body which would cause its condition (in WFD terminology - chemical status or ecological status) to deteriorate. Measures should be in place to ensure that no part of any development should affect a waterbodies ability to reach “good ecological status/potential” by 2027. As part of future scheme design there may be an opportunity to improve the waterbodies and remove some of the redundant modification from the watercourses, i.e. remove any existing redundant retaining walls.

I wish to make a positive suggestion for the new local plan. KEEP THE GREENBELT. The continued erosion of the greenbelt will leave us and future generations poorer. Let us conserve the precious green areas of our country. Already Cheshire East has allowed building on two sites (to my knowledge). Please let there be no more.

Knutsford contains one Air Quality Management Area (A50 Manchester Road) and a number of areas where levels of pollution are close to the Air Quality Objective. Transport: Improve and safeguard air quality in the town (particularly on the A50 Manchester Road) Car Parking: Develop low carbon incentivised parking / Infrastructure within the Town Centre

I would like to see something said in a positive light to have towns take a fresh look at parking management. As it stands, Civil Enforcement Officers and the Council has a bad or less than favorable reputation, and it would be nice instead for the general public to see what Parking Enforcement does and how it truly benefits each township and the Borough as a whole. I would not like to see some slight effort at just putting a positive spin on things, but really show all that Parking Enforcement is good for all.

Stockport Council has a number of concerns relating to the six town strategies that you are currently consulting upon. These concerns are most pertinent in relation to the Poynton and Handforth strategies which have the greatest potential impact upon Stockport and the wider Greater Manchester sub-region but are also of relevance to those being prepared for Macclesfield, Knutsford, Crewe and Nantwich. More specifically: Infrastructure / Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) It is noted that the strategies each contain details of infrastructure that may have to be provided in support of new development. Consultees are asked to rate how important they consider each element of infrastructure. However, no assessment appears to have been undertaken as to what infrastructure would have to be provided to ensure that any of the options could be brought about sustainably. An understanding of what infrastructure improvements local people would like to see is not evidence of what infrastructure improvements are required. This is particularly relevant to transport infrastructure and (specifically but not exclusively in relation to Poynton and Handforth) the certain cross-boundary impact that development of any of the options would result in. Before deciding which options may be worthy of taking forward for further consideration (as part of the Cheshire East Local Plan) it first needs to be determined what infrastructure improvements are necessary to enable them to be brought about sustainably and how those infrastructure improvements will be put in place. If the necessary improvements cannot be put in place then the Local Plan would be at significant risk of being found unsound on the grounds of deliverability; it is essential, therefore, that consideration is
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given to such matters at the outset, rather than after preferred options for development have already been established through the town strategies process. Each of the town strategies sets out a degree of prioritisation as to how contributions made under a future community infrastructure levy (CIL) would be spent. It is important to note that infrastructure funded under CIL has to be linked to the additional needs created by new development. To impose the levy the Local Planning Authority must first identify any shortfall in infrastructure required to enable the envisaged level of sustainable development; the charge placed on development is calculated based on meeting that shortfall rather than on meeting a wish-list of locally determined “benefits to local residents”. We have specific concerns relating to the (as yet unassessed) impact of the various options in both the Handforth and Poynton strategies on existing and proposed transport networks in Stockport and the wider Greater Manchester area. We would welcome a discussion on these concerns. Green Belt Several of the strategies set out options which include the significant release of land currently allocated as Green Belt. It is asserted within these that it is necessary to release Green Belt to meet development needs and that by considering a variety of options the necessary requirements (established by case law) are met. We consider this assertion to be flawed: 1. There is no apparent evidence of the housing need of each individual town or a reasoned/justified apportionment of the district wide housing target; 2. It is necessary to consider all reasonable options on a wider basis (including whether development needs might be met by neighbouring / nearby districts) not just a variety of options within the Green Belt or within the immediate vicinity of a given town. It should be a sequential approach with the development of greenfield sites in the Green Belt being the final option. The approach set out in the strategies is essentially the reverse way to that which is required by case law: the first step should be to identify (with clear evidence) what the essential objective is (for example, the need to meet district-wide and more locally defined development needs); the second step should be to consider how those needs might be met outside of the Green Belt or as ‘appropriate’ development within the Green Belt as defined in NPPF paragraph 89; and finally (and only if the essential objective cannot be met through the second step above) establishing which is the most suitable land that might be released from the Green Belt. Unless it is to meet very specific local needs the final step amounts to a strategic review of the Green Belt and should only result in the most suitable land (i.e. that which is not subject to other policy constraints, is available/deliverable and which contributes least to the purposes of the Green Belt) being released if it is clearly demonstrated that achievement of the essential objective outweighs the harm caused. Whilst it is acknowledged that the town strategies will not form part of the statutory development plan for Cheshire East they will, nonetheless, have some weight in informing the Local Plan as they are being formally approved by the relevant town councils who are statutory consultees on the Local Plan. We consider it imperative, therefore, that Stockport MBC is afforded more time to fully consider the implications of the strategies and (given the statutory duty to co-operate) need to agree a proper dialogue process with yourselves. That dialogue needs to reach mutually acceptable conclusions on the matters above (amongst other things) without that, as things stand, we consider that if any of the options set out in the various town strategies are taken forward into the Cheshire East Local Plan then that plan will be at considerable risk of being unsound on the grounds of deliverability and conformity with national policy, as well as failing to accord with the duty to co-operate. Given the potentially significant implications for Stockport and our partner authorities in Greater Manchester we may have no choice but to consider objecting to the plan on that basis. Stockport Council was not consulted on the already approved strategies for Alsager, Middlewich, Sandbach and Congleton, or on the strategy for Wilmslow which is currently being finalised. These comments, therefore, are also of relevance to those strategies and should be taken into account if and when any of the options they contain are taken forward into the Local Plan. Knutsford is a small town that has grown over the years and has reached a point where the infrastructure is seriously strained. The Cheshire East Local Plan proposes more of the same, which implies expensive infrastructure investment that, at best, will only slightly ease the problems, and more likely will not be implemented due to its high cost. I would therefore like to propose an alternative which aims to create the areas of growth we need, whilst not exacerbating the problems
we already have. The thinking behind this is the consideration of the engineering practicalities of such new developments. The alternative I propose involves creating new development 'villages' around Knutsford at strategic locations for work and communications. Such an option would leave Knutsford Town largely untouched, but enable the new locations to be purpose built. The ease of construction, the cost savings and the superior facilities would be considerable. Many of the objections to the Plan, such as the building on green belt land, unsuitability of roads across town for any increases in traffic, etc., could be answered if the developments were moved slightly outside of the town. The character of Knutsford would largely be kept; the green areas around town would still be there, whilst the new developments would impinge much less on Knutsford and be more suitable for longer term expansion, particularly towards the north and west. Knutsford has already been expanded beyond a convenient size for its centre and infrastructure. Tacking even more large developments onto the outskirts would make it even worse.

Section 8 - Access to Parkgate - road access is through town which at peak times is a nightmare, Knutsford can not cope with big lorries.

- Tatton Park must not be included in Knutsford Town Plan - I would not be surprised if you get very few of these filled in maybe that’s how you planned it!

The consultation should be extended to 6 weeks, the period originally promised and to which I believe the council is legally committed. Questionnaires should have been distributed to every household. Cost is not a valid excuse. The Knutsford town plan organisation of volunteers distributed copies of the town plan questionnaire, using a distribution company, to every household at an affordable cost, supplemented in the immediate town centre by volunteer distribution. Cheshire east must smarten its act on the process of effective consultation. At present the council is afraid of it - afraid what the community will say. It is also afraid to call public meetings. The council has to learn to put these fears behind them and to make consultation really meaningful and believable. Calling meetings and have police posted inside the building is no way to carry on.

A road system to avoid motorway traffic i.e. heavy lorries and general traffic in the case of the M6 being closed - passing through Knutsford causing gridlock.

If the use of greenbelt land is approved by the current government and is used to provide additional housing / employment sites I would hope that the proposals by Tatton estate are considered more favourably than those submitted by other developers as they have a vested interest in the town, in it's past, present and future as well as the interests of the townfolk to ensure their development will be sustainable and successful. They also offer to increase and improve the leisure facilities for the town, including a permanent home for rugby and archery and a residential home for the elderly in an area that has little impact on existing households in Knutsford. (i.e. using plots C,D and E)

Why do planners need to increase housing in Knutsford by 20% when expected population rise in Cheshire is 7% over period of development plan? There is a disproportionate focus on favoured sites in Nether Ward which is unacceptable. How can there be improvement in traffic and road safety in Knutsford by proposing further housing which will only increase volume of traffic further?

Very disturbed that the Green Belt, which brought many of us to Knutsford, is being abandoned. The town is congested with traffic now, this increase in property will make it a nightmare. We had something unique are we throwing it away for profit?

A key issue in Knutsford is traffic flow. The town frequently descends into gridlock. Yet there is nothing in this strategy document anywhere about traffic prediction or plans for improving traffic flow. What is the anticipated traffic flow by 2030? Is it time Knutsford started reconsidering the case for a bypass? How would this play into the development options? Do we really want such a major and still increasing traffic flow through what is essentially the centre of the town all converging at one small roundabout? I am interested in how Knutsford can contribute to the sporting legacy and develop as a town of sporting excellence but there is no real mention of this legacy and how to exploit it. Tatton Park is mentioned in several places - I would like to see the park fully integrated as part of the town strategy, not just a recreational resource which happens to be adjacent to the town.
I strongly disagree with the housing plans for Knutsford. They are at odds with your objectives on the environment and will add to traffic issues, strains on our schools (children are taught in portacabins already!).

It strikes me that all the areas adjacent to the more affluent parts of Knutsford have been ruled out in the early stages of this process.

I wish to express in the strongest possible terms my dissatisfaction about the way in which this Local Plan has been presented for public comment. From my brief research it is clear that the very great majority of those affected by these proposals (at least 90% of the residents) have not been aware that they even exist or that comments have been sought before a deadline. I was only made aware of the consultation document on a visit to Knutsford Library the other day. I consider that the ‘hiding’ of this report by an almost total lack of publicity is either a deliberate attempt by the Council to prevent Knutsford residents knowing what is proposed or is a disgraceful failure on the part of some of the Council’s officers to carry out their duties to their residents properly. AT THE VERY LEAST COPIES OF THE REPORT SHOULD HAVE BEEN FULLY DISTRIBUTED AROUND THE TOWN AT SUITABLE POINTS WITH POSTERS EXPLAINING THE NEED FOR COMMENT. Extend the deadline.

Cheshire East need to concentrate on what is already here, roads and pavements a mess, no mention of extra schools being built yet the primary schools are bursting at the seams, and just an extra train service instead of one an hour!! We do not want our green belt destroying. The traffic that already runs through Knutsford is at its limit. Changing Knutsford is destroying what makes it what it is.

1.9 and 2.9 Traffic congestion and parking are highlighted as issues of concern. Improvements to traffic congestion are not directly addressed or stated clearly in any of the future proposals for the town. New housing development will increase the pressure on the roads in Knutsford. 1.21 indirectly suggests that each new house may have two or three new vehicles coming to Knutsford. There appears to be no provision stated for addressing the current congestion issues let alone the increased pressure that new development will bring to the roads through Knutsford. Congestion, stress and pollution are not consequences that are in line with the vision that is stated at the outset of the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy. The issue of traffic congestion in Knutsford needs serious consideration and a solution implemented before any new development plans are even considered.

I think the consultation has been very poorly advertised and the consultation period has been too short. I think each home should have at the least had a flyer through advertising what the plan was about and where they could seek further information. The idea that this would be very costly is nonsense. From experience this can be done for less than a few hundred pounds. I believe a large proportion of Knutsford residents are unaware that this consultation is even occurring. Has any thought been given to how residents, with limited access/knowledge of computers or can’t get to the library, for example some elderly residents can have their voice heard? I think the consultation is full of loaded questions, for example asking if you are for or against the provision of more orchards and allotments. Or course it would be nice to have more of these but at the cost of the existing environment? The information given for each proposed site is sketchy. It feels like these sites have already been selected on you are just asking us to say yes we want all these lovely facilities which then gives the developers a license to demolish the countryside and build x amount of houses around all these fantastic new facilities we have been itold that we want. When really the existing ones just need a bit of help. I think our road network is completely inadequate for the number of houses proposed by the plan. Our schools are at capacity. We certainly do not need a big out of town supermarket built on green belt, this would be a complete disaster for the environment and Knutsford and Booths. Please dont destroy the green belt surrounding Knutsford.

This is an important document and it is appreciated that complex issues are raised. I think the document would have been clearer if there had been attention to the concepts of Vision, Objectives, Strategy and principles. These are all used in very loose ways that don’t follow conventional strategic planning principles. What I don’t agree with, is why the majority of sites that were originally listed as potential sites have so easily been dismissed? Presumably it is nothing to do with the fact that Sites A, G and K are adjoined by public housing developments and therefore it is less important to retain their
character and restrict building in these areas? I cannot see why sites L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S and T are so easily dismissed. It is notable that "near Legh Road" conservation site is mentioned several times - is this exclusion of sites that are near Legh Road a co-incidence? Limiting the potential expansion to the 7 areas identified would seem to have the potential to have much more impact on these areas and I don't therefore accept the premise why so many areas have been excluded. The explanation - not considered suitable for development seems inadequate and I feel that a full explanation as to why needs to be given. There needs to be a full explanation as to why areas have been potentially excluded or included, that is impartial and open to public scrutiny.

This is an exercise to pick a field to build 500 houses in. There is no credible planning in here especially around health and welfare. There is an imbalance of detail in the options to build houses but no detail options developing sports facilities etc. The focus is on house building to comply with the requirement to have stock of land to develop on in East Cheshire, all dressed up as a town plan. There is no credibility that any of this can be delivered and no detail.

I tried to comment on the Knutsford Town Plan before, but the site crashed - too busy? The document is very wordy, and I still do not expect that the council will take any notice of people's views. You seem very keen to build on green belt land, and that is not and should nor be allowed.

Questions 4a and 4b Our overriding concern is that productive agricultural land should only be taken as a last resort - so any areas to be taken for development should treat this as a priority. We are not familiar enough with the current use of land in options A to T to be able to agree or disagree with most of the options listed, since this would be our basis for answering each section in Q4a and Q4b. Some further survey would be required to establish which of the parcels of land are being used for productive agriculture.

Please take all the points below in context. In my opinion the strategy is a very useful chance to engage with the community and for us to have an input. It seems to be a well considered piece of work and and I am happy with time, vision, and vast majority of the content. I live in Knutsford because it is a nice place to live and I want it to be nice in 20 years time. Some specific points: 1. I have children. From what I can see there is no provison for additional play areas. One free park on the moor (the one at Longridge is on the other side of town) is sparcie to say the least. The popularity of the park should tell you there is an unmet need (by the way the park is good and thanks to friends of the moor). 2. On a similar vein to above (i.e. more outdoor provision for children would be great) more outdoor provision for adults would be good. We cannot all afford gym memberships, how about outdoor gyms? This would benefit the entiriety of the local population, regardless of their age (within reason). I can go running at the minute but would love to be able to vary my attempts at a healthy lifestyle. It would also likely encourage my children to do so. 3. There seems to be no mention of safety (for children and adults). I want Knutsford to be safe - Is the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership still in existence? If not, who has this remit? Why is this not in the plan - especially when considering design of the town centre and the importance of defensible space? 4. The leisure centre is ridiculous. The last time I enquired I was told it is not open on a weekend. I am a working father with two children - when else am I supposed to take my children to the leisure centre? your business is lost to private gyms or Altrincham. 5. Please connect us with Manchester via the metro! More than happy to expand on any of this further but I need to cook my tea thanks p.s. apologies for spelling - no spell check facility

If all these things come to pass, we hope that a better job will be made, unlike the characterless Regent Street, and the ridiculous siting of Aldi (which could create traffic jams at Hollow Lane). We also hope that the long drawn-out decision-making on King Street pedestrianisation and the provision of a super-surgery will not be repeated. Please note that this was a joint-effort with my wife, Pamela.

Concerns over the lack of infrastructure and facilities in Knutsford to cope with further development, i.e. roads and public transport, road safety, pressure on schools, medical centres and car parking. This would also have a negative impact on the green belt and prime Grade 1 agricultural land, which should not be destroyed. Further analysis of brown-field sites must be undertaken. Tatton estate would provide ample space for new housing, green space, and education.” perhaps doubling up as a...
shared development of sports facilities. However, if green belt land is to be used, then the proposal to develop land around Egerton Boys Club, either side of Mereheath Lane would seem to be the most sensible course of action. Concerns over apparent lack of consultation with Knutsford residents about local plan, and a feeling that surveys should have been posted out to all residents. In general, a well thought out plan

Whilst some of the earlier work on the town plan tried to highlight the things that mattered to ordinary Knutsford residents, the finished strategy document is a huge disappointment. Not sure how the "panel of stakeholders" have jumped from the findings of the earlier consultations which suggested most residents wanted traffic congestion tackling, and Knutsford's status as a "small" historic market town protected, to a document that presumes throughout that development is a foregone conclusion. If as the Vision states the aim is to preserve the unique character of Knutsford then development on the scale proposed is incompatible with that position as it would alter Knutsford's character and surely not for the better. We are asked to comment on which site should be considered above another and yet I see no clear evidence from surveys that the people of Knutsford want or need significant development. Worse still we have a process where certain sites have already been marked as favoured and others have been ruled out with no rationale or reason given or shared with the wider community now being asked to comment on the overall strategy. If the reasons for the position taken on the various sites proposed in the document are reasonable, logical and consistent then surely these could have been shared with all of us - Their omission when so much else is included in the lengthy narratives in the document seems a significant failing in the consultation process that I am sure will raise questions within the community In addition to that we have a meeting the week before this consultation process completes at Brook Street Chapel where Tatton Estates present their plans for some of the favoured sites in the North which include a hotel and another golf course, which cannot be high on the priority list for anyone in Knutsford outside of the developers themselves. But of course CEC continue to assure that nothing has been decided at this stage....... I have read the comments of many other people responding to this survey and feel the majority are totally against large scale additional development in the town. If this is really about listening and consulting then I expect to see that strength of opinion being reflected in a more considered final proposal

A disappointing document: vague, full of jargon and with no justified proposals. If genuine consultation with the residents is wanted then do the whole thing again, this time giving details of the reasons for the proposals clearly, unambiguously and without using jargon. As a side issue, perhaps your quality control processes should be reviewed to prevent re-occurrence of wasting of cost in preparing the current document.

Please consider improving areas that have been previously developed NOT taking away our green areas

Not a long enough consultation has been given to local residents and therefore it will not be a true reflection of what local people really think.

This strategy is just an excuse to free up land for developers profits, and increasing council tax revenue to the Cheshire East Council. The council has not maintained the assets it has, and should not be allowed to destroy our heritage and our green belt by allowing further extensive development to the detriment of our town and our lives. If more housing is needed in the county, please concentrate on the re-development of run down areas, brown sites etc, and not chopping down our beautiful oak trees to build over. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE SAVE OUR BEAUTIFUL TOWN

All 4 members of our family wanted to complete this questionnaire however it was time consuming and we only learnt about it late on due to lack of publicity. The views in this questionnaire should be taken as being the views of all members of our household.

(6.2) Your figures are too high compared to the information supplied, population up by 4.5%, households up by 24%? Why? (6.2) 2026 or 2030 make your mind up on one set of figures. (6.5) Are you only doing the plan to review green belt boundaries? If so stop it we love our green belts, there is far too much brown site in East Cheshire not yet used. Where is the consideration of agriculture?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9 Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm sure I have, but to be honest, I'm losing the will to live! Needs some imaginative and bold planning to achieve stated objectives. This is just tinkering. Major problem that affects quality of life is traffic. Most traffic is just passing through between M6 and Macclesfield so build access road from south of Knutsford and ban HGVs especially on road between station and Legh Arms pub where there is only one pavement and in places it's only a few feet wide. Someone, probably a toddler will be killed soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re Q8 Sports and leisure facilities we obviously consider this a priority but seek clarification as to what is meant by â€˜to potentially create an area or town of sporting excellenceâ€™ We (KSC) were not party to any consultation by Cheshire East Council prior to the release of the draft Town Strategy. We respectfully request that we are involved in any considerations of site C,D,E and indeed sports needs in Knutsford from this date on. We understand that as part of the evidence documents required for the Local Plan, a Sports and Leisure Needs assessment needs to be made and we would be happy to help with that. The Knutsford Town plan and the Cheshire East Snapshot report and Open spaces assessment concluded that there was demand for improvements to Sports facilities in Knutsford. We would like to highlight that the four week consultation period has proved very difficult for us to respond within as we meet on a monthly cycle with a summer August break. This has also hampered our ability to publicise the consultation to our members for their individual responses. Knutsford Sports Club (KSC) is a Community amateur Sports Club (CASC) with Membership around 450 adults and children. It leases its land from the Tatton Estates Brookes and recently agreed a 40 year term. It is run by a volunteer committee of members elected each year at its AGM in March. The sports club consists of a number of sections; Squash, Tennis, Cricket, Archery and Rugby. The Tennis and Rugby sections have Clubmark status accredited by their governing bodies. The function room is available for hire and we have regular bookings from a martial arts group, pilates, mums &amp; babies, Brownies, Yoga and parties/celebrations of all types. Membership is open to anyone and subject to a membership fee. The Club, is known to Cheshire East Council Leisure Dept through its officers for Sport and Play (Keith Rogers) and Club Development (Andy Molyneux). We participated in the local Embrace the games events and members help with the volunteer team for events such as the torch relay. We have links with Cheshire Sport and Sport England as well as the different sports national governing bodies. The Tennis and Rugby sections have strong links with local schools hosting the annual primary school events and liaising with the High School/ Academy School Sports coordinator. We have recently established contact with Cheshire East Councillor Raynes Earlier in the Year Cllr Gardiner as Town Major officially opened our Floodlights. Knutsford Town Council was reminded of our full facilities and volunteer committee basis at its September meeting after the Town Strategy Consultation started. KSC provides employment opportunities for a Tennis Coach, Physio, Bar staff, Catering staff, Grounds maintenance, and Building maintenance people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't believe that this is being consulted properly. I discovered the plans by chance. That is not consultation under any definition. The vast majority of people in Knutsford have not been consulted properly. Please stop and do the job properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be a public consultation on the future of a health and wellbeing centre. Current GP practice buildings don't allow GPs to employ the full range of their skills and result in more individuals having to go to hospitals elsewhere. The best way to preserve health and wellbeing services in the town is to make them efficient and meet current and future needs. The two main options that will be put to public consultation will be the current town centre site, with the best access for all but a small site and with possible parking and traffic issues and a near town centre site (e.g. Areas D,E or F) which would allow for a reuse of the city centre site (for housing?). There is a radical option for a full re-design around the area of Booth's, Bexton Road, Library, Town Council Offices, Police Station, Sessions building, Primary Schools etc. and an integrated set of pubic services but this may be unaffordable or too disruptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 'Knutsford is a small market town.........' and so it should remain, with the maintenance of the Green Belt around it and the existing road system. 2.8 There is no NEED for extra housing in Knutsford - there may be a 'requirement' which is a totally different thing. Even if new houses were to be built Knutsford will remain a small market town with a rich heritage and history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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constructed around the Town, most people could not afford them. Taking land for development would take it out of food production. The Plan, as envisaged, would take out a number of amenities such as the Boys Club, the Sports Club, the football club and the allotments. I cannot see how the loss of these parcels of land and the above amenities together with the ensuing increase in traffic, could possibly improve the environment of the town.

Please note, in this submission, KCHG has confined its comments to that of its remit, that of the protection of the Heritage and Conservation of the town of Knutsford, which is why some questions have remained unanswered. 1. In June 2012, comments were conveyed to CEC as requested, to help inform its early consideration of matters for the draft Strategy. Those comments, derived through consultation with KCHG members, included the following: - What is important to the residents of Knutsford? Included Ensuring future development is of a scale, at locations and is of a design quality which complements and does not prejudice Knutsfords existing natural and built environment and heritage, nor the character of the place - What needs to be maintained? Included Knutsford’s size as a town integral to its character and Green Belt around Knutsford - What would the new homes or jobs need to provide? Included Agreement that the location of new homes or jobs need not necessarily be at a Knutsford location and may be better located elsewhere. 2. Having given further consideration to its previous opinion that all the Green Belt around Knutsford should be retained as of that designation, KCHG recognises that the town will evolve and that it should do so constrained sustainably by the Green Belt, with green belt release carefully considered on a site by site, and need by need basis with the benefit to the entire town in key focus when all such decisions are made. That said, KCHG recognises and supports Green Belt policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), noting in particular that: - (paragraph 80) the purposes of Green Belt include â€œto assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment [and] to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; - (paragraph 83) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. KCHG is aware that the draft Strategy forms part of the Local Plan preparation process. However, if development is proposed in the Green Belt, it will be required to be demonstrated whether or not there are â€œexceptional circumstances. KCHG suggests the evidence base is relevant if such an analysis is undertaken, including assessment of need for the development proposed. 3. To reconcile these perspectives, KCHG has adopted the position that: - the future 'natural growth' of Knutsford may not be possible to be achieved without some release of land from the currently designated Green Belt, but that such release should be the minimum necessary to accommodate that 'natural growth' (however, the term 'natural growth' requires very careful definition and consideration in being applied); - development in the Green Belt and elsewhere in Knutsford should be managed to accord with, as the Draft Strategy puts it, Knutsford’s distinctive and unique character, but also the benefit to the town as a whole that such development would bring. In this way, Knutsford’s future size would continue to reflect its role as a small market town (Draft Strategy, paragraph 2.2). 4. KCHG recommends that such a balanced position is progressed in the working up of the Knutsford Town Strategy and adopted as policy in the Cheshire East Local Plan. 5. It is not appropriate for KCHG to express an opinion as to all the locational options for development as set out in the Draft Strategy. Reference is not made to SSSI or Ancient Woodland in the table 6.1 list of Potential Development Use of Sites A - T. Assessment of actual and potential SSSI and Ancient Woodland status is required to, and as an element to be taken into consideration in, any of those (or other) sites being considered for potential development. 6. KCHG attempts to contribute positively towards the better planning of Knutsford, and is willing to engage with CEC as the Draft Town Strategy is progressed. In particular, KCHG has identified the following issues on which it is able to assist: - consideration of CEC’s draft design template for Knutsford - consideration of CEC’s draft planning briefs for the former Courts and other sites - identification of potential additional listed buildings - consideration of a draft specification to help inform proposed policy by CEC on the protection of long-distance views in Knutsford and Tatton Park.
community ignorant of its existence. Parts of the community either through age, mobility, culture or natural ability have been excluded risking the division of a town through the creation of a "them & us". 2) 4 weeks for the exercise to be completed is inadequate 3) questions in the survey do not allow for qualified replies. 4) The strategy ignores the fact that in the 2010 Knutsford Town Plan Survey referred to on Pg 3, local residents rated least important the need for new housing and business land or buildings. 5) The Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group in 2012 stated that what was important to residents was that any development is of a scale, location and design as to complement the town and it is essential to maintain the town’s size as integral to its character and to preserve the Green Belt. The strategy seems to fly in the face of these principles. 6) What is meant by affordable housing? While not disputing the need for many people to have access to housing, it is questionable whether property built on already highly priced land around Knutsford would be affordable and how can this be maintained once sold at a later date. Developers will pass the cost of the land on to buyers and the housing will become part of the open market and sold at considerable profit at a later date. Genuinely affordable housing might be better placed elsewhere but with improved links to Knutsford allowing access to the towns facilities. 7) Much of the development described requires extensive improvement to facilities such as roads, parking, schools and health care. The town struggles to cope with these issues with its current population which can only get worse if excessive new housing was approved. 8) the need to develop new employment is questioned - 50% of the population travels away from the town to work given its proximity to Manchester etc. Opportunities and income will always be greater in cities and new business opportunities in Knutsford would have to be of a nature to cope with that competition. There are already office and light industry spaces developed and under utilised so there is no need to develop more. This is particularly so in relation to developing Green Belt land for the purpose - see point 9. 9) Development of the Green Belt - the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 said the characteristic of Green Belt was for " safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" and should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Knutsford is unlike many other towns in that it is flanked on all sides by GB and this has large extent influenced the style and character of the town. This must be preserved unless there is absolutely no alternative and all other avenues excluded. GB should be sacrosanct - that is its purpose in preserving and protecting our open spaces. To push those principles aside should be avoided if at all possible. The need for its use as housing must be on the basis of evidence and justifiable minimal specific site and quantified. Using it for other uses such as employment, retail etc must only be under exceptional circumstances,. Neither of these can be seen in the proposed plans. Decisions must be made about schooling and the health centre and their accommodation as close to the town centre as possible before any consideration is given to use of greenbelt land. 10) With specific regard to the proposed use of Site B - this would only create a sprawling conurbation. At present the employment/retail/leisure facilities created by the Land Rover dealership, Cottons Hotel and Fryers Nursery stand alone and distinct from the town. The field separating them and the town boundaries serves to enhance the feel of entering a distinct town with borders. To build either houses or further business sites to both in that area would blend the areas, destroy the sense of boundary and create a conurbation so common elsewhere. If the vision for Knutsford truly is to retain "a historic town with a unique and distinctive character" then this type of development must be avoided. 11) The present road systems cannot cope with existing volume especially when M6 users divert through the town. Developing as proposed will only compound these problems. 12) The Community Infrastructure Levy is only a sweetener intended to fool residents that the necessary infrastructures will be put in place by the developers . It talks of a meaningful proportion but does not define that nor can we be assured that its cost will not be passed on to those who buy property or that the cost of the levy will be offset byt poor design or quality. There had been very little publicity for this consultation and many people with views are no doubt unaware of it. Further time should be given for responses to be submitted.

I am very concerned that more events and publicity has not taken place within Knutsford. Only one CEC organised event way out of the town centre at the leisure centre was laughable. Thankfully, local
volunteers organised their own events at Booth and Brook Street Chapel. Future consultations must be far better promoted and organised, with a longer time period for response.

One of the great things about Knutsford is that you can walk everywhere if you are able bodied. If significant housing is built, this will no longer be the case - there will be more traffic problems which leads to safety and health related issues. Do we really want people to have to get in a car because they live too far out? We should be encouraging people to walk - especially to school. I love Knutsford and improvements are needed, but a lot of extra housing will detract from its character and make it less attractive.

The beauty of Knutsford is it's size and community. People come to live here to be away from the city/urban areas and be in green belt area. Let's protect our green belt and our existing sporting facilities which have been developed spending £10,000s in recent years. We have a great town, let's keep it that way for our children and grandchildren. The primary schools are already full, where are we going to school these new children with the proposed favoured sites when e.g. Egerton and Bexton are currently full?

The TS is based on Town Plan of March 2010, whose priorities include: - Open green spaces - Public open space and conservation of the natural environment The source document explains why this is comparatively well-researched and comprehensive TS, with more representative and wider community engagement than the other TS. Background (page 9) This section is much the most comprehensive of all the draft TS (presumably due to the involvement of the Knutsford Town Plan team). It provides a brief but informative survey of the town’s economy, centre, housing, connectivity, built and natural heritage, greenspaces and Tatton Park. Greenspaces: Note the following additional information on greenspace elements: The Heath and Little Heath are a Local Wildlife Site (SB1) (and potentially a future wildlife haven managed by Cheshire Wildlife Trust (CWT)) The Moor Pond is managed by CWT (and potentially a future “flagship nature reserve) Sanctuary Moor is an SBI and Nature Conservation Priority Area (Macclesfield Borough LP Policy NE 16) St John’s Wood is an SBI Tatton Park is a SSSI. (Tatton Meres) Knutsford TS is a comprehensive document with accurate background information and a fairly clear distinction between objectives and strategies. CWT welcomes the fact that biodiversity and GI are both mentioned under more than one heading and given suitable weight, apart perhaps from a lack of references in the Vision statement.

The Woodland Trust is the UK’s leading woodland conservation charity. Our vision is a UK rich in native woods and trees enjoyed and valued by everyone. We own over 1,000 sites across the UK, covering around 20,000 hectares and we have 300,000 members and supporters. Ancient Woodland Protection. We would like to see the town strategies avoid any adverse impacts on ancient woodland. We have identified two ancient woods which could potentially be affected: Site C in diagram 1 on page 16 of the Macclesfield Town strategy: Land north of Prestbury Road. This site is adjacent to Upton Wood, which we have identified as being ancient woodland. Also in the Macclesfield strategy, site I: Land between Congleton Road and Chelford Road. This site is adjacent to Cock Wood, which is ancient woodland. Henbury Parish Council published a landscape survey in 2008, which includes Cock Wood: www.henburyvillage.org.uk Ancient woodland is, by definition, an irreplaceable natural resource and takes centuries, even millennia, to evolve. As the habitat most representative of original, natural, stable conditions, ancient woodland is home to more threatened species than any other habitat in the UK. It contains a unique assemblage of plants and animals, and has ecological, landscape, amenity, historical and cultural associations. It is an irreplaceable habitat that should be protected from adverse development impacts. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 118 bullet 5) states: planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland...."We have concerns that development adjacent to ancient woods will have a negative impact on them, causing damage and potential loss. Plant and animal populations are exposed to environmental impacts (edge effects) from outside the woodland site and these external impacts increase with the intensity of land use. Detrimental edge-effects penetrate woodland and it is known that changes in microclimate extend up to three times the canopy height in...
from the forest edges. Creation of new areas of woodland or buffer zones around semi-natural habitats and ancient woodland in particular will help to reduce the impact of damaging edge-effects if their sustainability is to be improved. We therefore request that if the sites are to be allocated that sufficient buffering between the development and woodland is identified in policy at this stage to allow it to be built into any development plans. A buffer zone of at least 50 metres of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect the woodland from the change in land use on the site. Research has indicated that disturbance can have a significant impact on woodland. A study of 40 forest fragments in Delaware, USA, found that human effects penetrate a considerable distance into woodland from exterior edges. Heavy recreation and disposal of garden or household waste caused 95 per cent of local damage in the first 82m from the woodland edge.[1] There were also important interactions with other factors, for example, campsites, vandalised trees, and firewood gathering were negatively correlated with distance to the nearest road. In the absence of roads, penetration by recent dumping was reduced from 82 to 16m. Several forms of effect were clustered near houses (discarded Christmas trees, dumping of grass clippings and hacked trees), and footpaths (hacked trees, grass piles, pruned limbs, tree-houses, and woodpiles). Woodland Creation Several of the town strategies list enhancement of the local environment as one of their objectives. For example, in the Knutsford strategy it refers to the importance of quantity, quality and connectivity of greenspaces, alleviating flood risk and encouraging renewable energy. We would like to see the town strategies refer more specifically to the role of trees and woodland as an important component of green infrastructure. For example, woodland can help in improving water quality and alleviating flood risk and burning wood as a fuel can be play an important part as one of a number of possible renewable energy types. The Case for Trees (Forestry Commission, July 2010) states: “There is no doubt that we need to encourage increased planting across the country “ to help meet carbon targets “ and every tree can count towards those targets as part of a renewed national effort to increase the country’s overall woodland canopy. But it’s not all about carbon; there is a growing realisation among academics about the important role trees play in our urban as well as the rural environment. It has long been accepted and confirmed by numerous studies that trees absorb pollutants in our cities with measurable benefits to people’s health such as reducing asthma levels. Yet trees also deliver a whole host of other extraordinary economic, environmental and social benefits. We would also recommend that the town strategies could make use of access standards, although you may prefer to include these elsewhere in your suite of LDF documents. The Woodland Trust has produced an Access to Woodland Standard, which aspires that everyone should have access to a wood of at least 2ha in size within 500m of their home and a wood of at least 20ha within 4km of their home. We would be happy to talk further with the Council on how this access standard could be used in you LDF documents to develop woodland creation targets based upon clear evidence of need.

Comments have been submitted, a summary of which may be found below: Generally - Concern raised over lack of consideration or landscape character - in particular formation of an evidence base related to landscape character. Para. 2.10 Heritage resources are not limited to the Grade 1 listed mansion but extend to other Listed Buildings across the estate. Paras. 2.11/2.12 Inconstistencies on the extent on the Registered Historic Park. Paras. 2.12 - 2.15 Support for inclusion of the section. Suggests acknowledgment of wider landscape and views out of the site. Paras 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 - text suggests Green Belt is undefined. The Green Belt is defined buy the adopted Local Plan and supported by core principles of NPPF. Para. 6.8 concern that assessment of sites has not considered landscape character and historic landscape character. Natinoal Trust considers there are question marks over sites A-H Para. 6.11concern raised over preponderance of sites considered to be favoured whcih would impact on the setting of Tatton Park. Need for a full landscape asessment. Para

In addition, as with all development proposals in all of the town strategies impact on the setting of heritage assets should be assessed. I would refer you our guidance on Heritage in local plans:how to create a sound plan under the NPPF. see http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/content/imported-docs/f-j/heritage-local-plans.pdf

Reference is made here to the distinctive identity for which the town is well recognised. A unique
Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

Q9 Additional Comments

opportunity may be presented with the southern entrance to Tatton Park lying in proximity with the town centre. This could offer a better chance for reducing journeys made by private car through the strengthening of connections between Knutsford and this major outdoor visitor attraction via all transport modes, including cycling and walking.

I believe this strategy should have proposed a number of growth scenarios (i.e. ranging from zero to doubling the population) for consultation, instead of presenting a piecemeal selection of sites which has the potential to set one side of town off against the other. I seriously think a step was missed out and the lack of engagement with the community (could we please have a planning weekend?!) means there is likely to be a predictable rejection of any growth. Simply issuing a plan with random red lines around disconnected fields has upset a great deal of people needlessly. There is also a clear lack of information with regard to the sites and why they were preferred or not by stakeholders. I understand proximity to town centre was the main reason, but this could and should have been communicated through the strategy (also, there is no information on at what point would a new school be needed or the impact of traffic at different levels of growth for example). I cannot see how a rational strategy can come from the random collection of preferred sites that could result from this process. I do not have an issue with the town growing, but it must be done in a sustainable way. I also have concerns that CEC will not ensure design quality and the town will be left with more disconnected 'anywhere' suburban development that does not create a suitable settlement edge. There should be a strategic masterplan and code created for all new development so that any growth is managed and reinforces the character of the town. Even a design guide for wider Cheshire East would be useful (see Essex Design Guide or Harlow for two good examples) to ensure design quality is a priority.

Chpt 4 - housing is increasing population substantially would have a serious knock on re-infrastructure and would upset the fine balance existing at the moment. Roads are very busy, primary schools are bulging whilst realising shops could always do with more customers.

need to look at providing flats over shops and conversion of existing buildings. The KTS does not set out what size Knutsford Town should be. Where are the boundaries for Knutsford. Should there be a new town in Cheshire West rather than keep expanding Knutsford? Main issues not addressed in the strategy are: ‘Parking’ to encourage use of bus and train services The Hospital/Medical Centre Improvement of bus services

Summary of attached letter: Support for the vision. Suggest reference to the promotion of economic potential of Knutsford is made Support for acknowledgement that some greenfield sites may be required to achieve the requirements of Knutsford. Support for the promotion of the town centre and town projects identified in the strategy. On behalf of our client, Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, we have reviewed the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy consultation and would like to take this opportunity to comment on it. Vision The Council’s vision sees the town as being a place which ”will still be a historic town with a unique and distinctive character, and strong community spirit, rich in heritage and brimming with variety, where... the town centre is vibrant, with an unique character and independent traders and those offering speciality products are thriving and contributing to the strong sense of place” by 2030. Sainsbury’s broadly support the Council's vision for Knutsford and wish to highlight the important economic contributions that their existing local convenience store in Canute Place makes to the local area and the viability and vitality of the town centre. Sainsbury's suggest that the vision also include reference to the promotion of the economic potential of Knutsford as set out in Objective 2 of the draft Town Strategy. There should be an acknowledgement of the contribution that all scales of retail development can make towards the vitality and viability of centres. Furthermore, Sainsbury's is committed to ensuring that the Knutsford store continues to complement the activities and facilities of the town centre. Development Options Sainsbury's support the Council’s acknowledgement that some greenfield sites may need to be developed to achieve the development requirements of the town. As expressed by paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Sainsbury's advocate the benefits of mixed use developments in creating sustainable developments. Town Centre Objective 2 seeks to promote the town centre and support existing retail and commercial provision, directing retail development within the town centre. In addition, it states that schemes to enhance
and/or extend independent shops and specialist retailers will be given positive consideration.

Sainsbury’s support the promotion of the town centre and the Council’s aim to focus new retail and leisure development within the Town Centre, in accordance with NPPF guidance and to ensure sustainable development. However, they question the “positive consideration” to be given to schemes relating to independent and specialist retailers; it is considered that all schemes for sustainable development (regardless of the end occupier or applicant) should be considered in a favourable light as per the presumption in favour set out in the NPPF. As advocated by Paragraph 23 of the NPPF, local planning authorities are required to undertake an assessment of the need to expand town centre boundaries to determine whether a sufficient supply of land is available for future retail development. No such evidence has been published by the Council to support the potential extension of Knutsford town centre. It is understood that the Council’s draft Knutsford Town Strategy has been informed by the findings of the Cheshire Retail Study Update (2011). The Retail Study Update identifies capacity for future retail development in Macclesfield, Congleton, Crewe and Nantwich but recommends that a further study is required to review the need to update existing town centre boundaries in accordance with national planning policy guidance. In light of this, Sainsbury’s recommend that the Council should commission an updated study to support the growth proposed in the identified areas and which also assesses any change in circumstance in other centres in Cheshire East which could impact upon retail capacity. This approach would ensure that the Cheshire East Local Plan is informed by a robust evidence base. Town Projects Sainsbury’s support the town centre projects identified in the draft strategy, in particular the potential for improvements in the Canute Place area and the support for the extension of some of the town centre units in this area.

It is our recommendation by the submission of this representation for the area known as Knutsford Golf Club to be considered to be removed from its ‘Green Belt’ status under criteria stipulated within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Having considered the site constraints and opportunities presented by parcels A and B and as The Crown Estate owns both sites outright and is actively promoting them for development, parcels A and B are capable of being delivered independently or jointly as part of a larger development, forming an allocation or as part of an allocation and safeguarded land.

Infrastructure - new or improved roads are missing from p37. In the 1960s a ring road was mooted when Knutsford was smaller and traffic was less. Since then there have been several large housing development yet the roads in and out of Knutsford are the same (Toft Road, Manchester Road, Mereheath Lane, Chelford Road, Brook Street and Hollow lane. The only road to have significant modifications in Mobberley Road. Before any grand schemes are started the present infrastructure should be brought up to 21st century standard. Examples of third world roads in the town - Gaskell Avenue and the junction of Tabley Road and Ladies Mile. Housing - Poor map. Draft strategy states 450 people of the waiting list, but this could mean only 225 houses and flats (misleading). According to Right Move (12/09/12) there were 19 houses/flats to rent and 137 houses/flats to buy in Knutsford, so are the new houses needed? Sewerage - sewers can’t cope now and therefore won’t if hundreds of new houses, hard-standings and roads (all of which prevent rain water soaking away) are built, as well as the 5,000 adults and children using Bewilderwood. Tatton Park has nothing to do with Knutsford, it is owned by the National Trust and funded by CEC, but CEC require Tatton to be self-funded by 2014/2015. You may or may not know the Knutsford Conservative Club is to close before the end of the year. Having recently read the Knutsford Draft Plan where it stated a new Tourist Information Centre would be required, the Knutsford Conservative Club would be ideal being centre of town and plenty of parking. Also the building would I think would be suitable for the Heritage Centre. The bowling green have I believed been allowed a minimum of another twelve months, why cannot Cheshire East take the bowling green over long term, for the benefit of the town.

Housing in Knutsford should be kept to a minimum and include affordable homes. The green belt should be protected where possible. Farmland should be protected. Supporting infrastructure should be in place to accommodate any increase to housing numbers including roads, schools, medical facilities etc.
I tried to submit comments via internet. Forms are impossible to complete. I am a CITP (Chartered IT Professional) with 50 yrs experience in the computer industry. The web site is NOT USER FRIENDLY AND UNFIT FOR THE PURPOSE of putting it to the general public.

Green Belt land should NOT be built on under ANY circumstances. Neither should there be any loss of, or disturbance to, Safeguarded Land, Listed Buildings, SSSIs, Sites of Biological Importance, and Nature Conservation Priority Areas, woodland, trees with Preservation Orders or any other wildlife habitat. Utilise all brown field sites and empty derelict buildings. Do not build on flood plains. There is no need for any further housing, and Cheshire East should challenge housing targets specified by local government as opposed to accepting them. Macclesfield - Do not build on Danes Moss. People want this area to remain preserved as wildlife habitat. Poynton/Handforth/Macclesfield - Please consider the effect that the 1000 new homes planned for the old Woodford Aerodrome site will have on the infrastructure of the surrounding area.

Shared space on King St - what we need is pedestrian priority - you must remove the rat run through King St 400 cars/hr! Increase footpath width on Westside disabled access must be considered. Create obstacles for through traffic - uncover cobbles (remove tarmac). Need to segregate traffic from pedestrians. I do consider that the deadline in NOT ACCEPTABLE. People in Knutsford are only now waking up to knowing about this consultation. Meetings should have been held in town to discuss. E.g. like proposed central medical centre.

Do not agree with Tatton Park being run by CEC for the National Trust to whom it was left in Lord Egerton’s will.

Objective 7 - Connectivity. Single biggest improvement could be made to Knutsford’s public transport links would be the long considered repairing of the railway from Northwich to Sandbach via Middlewich. This would provide links to South Cheshire and mainline rail network at Crewe - the Council should support any moves in this direction.

Ob 4 - There are a number of elderly people living singly in large houses - include in new housing developments desirable residences to appeal to them within easy access to town centre facilities and amenities, which could encourage them to move and release housing stock for families. Ob 6 - Rangers/volunteers to lead organised walks exploring the local environment for older people and families at weekends and school holidays.

No comments to make at this stage, until the following development data is known: i,§ Scale i,§ Type i,§ Location i,§ Timing i,§ Discharge rates and location i,§ Water demand and connexion points United Utilities PLC can confirm if there any water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure capacity issues is information details is confirmed. No comments in the plan for the management of: i,§ Climate change i,§ Flood risk i,§ Capacity of water supply and wastewater [sewage] capacity i,§ Treatment of water supply and wastewater [sewage] i,§ Provisions for the protection of existing and future infrastructure for water supply, wastewater and its treatment. National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF] The presumption in favour of sustainable development LPA should adopt proactive strategy priorities in their Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver: i,§ the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); i,§ the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and i,§ climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape. Crucially, Local Plans should: i,§ plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF; i,§ be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date; i,§ be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public, voluntary and private sector organisations; i,§ indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map; i,§ allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate; i,§ identify areas where it may be necessary to limit freedom to change the uses of buildings, and
support such restrictions with a clear explanation; i,§ identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance; and i,§ contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, and supporting Nature Improvement Areas where they have been identified. Infrastructure NPPF 162. Local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to: i,§ assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and i,§ take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas. To ensure key sites and strategic locations are deemed sustainable, plan-led and co-ordinated, strategic solutions should be developed and defined for supporting infrastructure. An example would be the development of a joint working group [lead by the LPA] that identifies a strategic drainage solution/s for each key site and/or strategic location. The joint working group will include the LPA; EA; infrastructure providers; developers; landowners and any other key stakeholders such as Natural England etc. The aim of the joint working group will be to develop a sustainable strategic drainage solution that: i,§ protects the existing customer and maintains their service and quality of life; i,§ protects the environment; i,§ is a robust and deliverable; i,§ proactively not reactively delivered; i,§ meets the needs of the not only the key sites/strategic locations but also the neighbouring LPA; and i,§ is conditional for future developments within the key site and/or strategic location. Future development must be sustainable; prevents environmental damage and preserves the quality of life for the existing and future generations; therefore, developments should not be permitted until infrastructure capacity is available. United Utilities PLC cannot confirm if capacity is available until the connection point/s, flows and completion dates are available. If additional supporting infrastructure is required then the LPA should work closely with United Utilities PLC [and other utility providers] to ensure a sustainable cross-boundary solution is identified and approved by the appropriate Regulators bodies before granting planning approval; failure may result in the deterioration of the community’s quality of life and/or environmental damage. The scale and type of development needs to be defined so the appropriate infrastructure is in place to ensure growth is sustainable. United Utilities PLC has a number of recent examples where infrastructure has been provided based on identified growth, but not delivered; this has resulted in major operational issues; the treatment process is under loaded; it is failing to operate because it cannot reach its operational capacity. Additional temporary engineer solutions are in place; this represents a significant risk to the exiting customers; the environment and United Utilities PLC; not forgetting the additional financial burden on United Utilities PLC customers. The Council has a number of capacity issues; any additional developments in these and/or adjoining areas without firstly ensuring infrastructure solutions are implemented could result in an increased number and frequency of sewer flooding incidents. The Council should also consider the constraints [are not limited to, but include] that are outside the control of United Utilities PLC and may influence the timely delivery of supporting infrastructure: i,§ Regulatory approval i,§ Environmental constraints Û–« Does the receiving watercourse/environment have the capacity to accept additional flows without causing environmental damage? Û–« Small river : large development i,§ Environmental consents and permits Û–« Timescales in involved in the construction/delivery of new processes to meet new consents and/or permits i,§ Planning approval Û–« The LDF process has not highlighted and/or specified land for infrastructure use, therefore future planning applications for future supporting utilities infrastructure may be thwarted or a prolonged process Û–« Historical local resistance to the expansion of utilities assets Û–« Planning application approval restrictions/conditions delay implementation of supporting infrastructure assets i,§ Land acquisition Û–« Timescales involved in the purchased land needs Û–« Land may not be available for expansion due to the encroachment of development i,§ Access into the highway Û–« Limitations from the highway departments for road works i,§ Environmental restrictions Û–« bird breeding and/or nesting seasons; great crested newts; badgers etc i,§ Implementation and commissioning restrictions Û–« Planning application approval conditions; working hours etc. Û–« Environmental consents/permits conditions Û–« Its psychical
delivery [Reason: Ensure timely delivery of development and infrastructure to protect the good quality of life and the environment] Surface Water Site drainage should be a major consideration for LPA and developers when selecting possible development sites; ground conditions; local flooding issues; development layout; design and planning policy. The treatment and processing of surface water [storm water; rainwater] is a not a sustainable solution; the sites current natural discharge solution should be continued and/or mimicked; if the existing surface water does not have an existing natural solution, United Utilities PLC questions the development of a flooded site. Surface water should be managed at source and not transferred; if not this will only transfer the issue to another location; generally to a single pinch point, generating further problems in that location. Developments must drain on a separate sewerage system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewerage network. Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network. Connecting surface water to the public sewerage network is not a sustainable solution and LPA should discourage this practice. The priority options for the management of surface water discharges are: i,§ Continue and/or mimic the site’s current natural discharge process i,§ Store for later use i,§ Discharge into infiltration systems located in porous sub soils i,§ Attenuate flows into green engineering solutions such as ponds; swales or other open water features for gradual release to a watercourse and/or porous sub soils i,§ Attenuate by storing in tanks or sealed systems for gradual release to a watercourse i,§ Direct discharge to a watercourse i,§ Direct discharge to a surface water sewer i,§ Controlled discharge into the combined sewerage network ~ this option is a last resort when all other options have been discounted. Development on greenfield sites shall not discharge surface water into the public combined sewerage network and shall not increase the rate of run-off into the public surface water network ~ this statement does not replace the priority options for surface water management above. On previously developed land, a reduction of at least 30% will be sought, rising to a minimum of 50% in critical drainage areas ~ this statement does not replace the priority options for surface water management above Any discharge to the public sewerage system must be via approved SuDS and will require an approved discharge rate. Consideration should given for green infrastructure, low carbon, soft engineering SuDS solutions, such as ponds; swales; wet land areas and detention basins etc. http://www.ciria.com/suds/index.html A discharge to groundwater or watercourse may require the consent of the Environment Agency. [Reason: To ensure that the surface water is properly discharged to prevent flooding or the overloading of the public sewerage network] Green Infrastructure The Council should seek opportunities to use developer financial and/or resources contributions to meet common objectives. Use green and open spaces, sports and recreation facilities to address surface water and climate change issues. Building green infrastructure assets such as ponds, swales and wetlands will not only meet the Council’s Green Space needs but also their local existing and/or future surface water/ climate change issues. Artificial pitches; cycle paths; play areas multi-use games areas and skate parks can be used to local underground civil engineering SuDS solutions. SuDS solutions that incorporate irrigation systems will help support and maintain the Councils allotments, parks and garden areas. The Councils should identify opportunities for the installation retro fitting SuDS. [Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable, properly drained; prevents flooding and environmental damage] Climate change adaptation Climate change is a major consideration on the future available capacity of sewerage networks; wastewater treatment works and watercourses. Planners and Developers should consider that the impacts of climate change on future development, existing infrastructures, and the environment. Developments to be designed to reduce the impacts of climatic change on the development itself, the existing infrastructure and the environment; with consideration for hotter, drier summers, greater flood risk and more severe weather events. To reduce the impacts of climate change on the existing infrastructure LPA should seek a significant reduction in the discharge from developments. Urban creep has a significant impact on capacity; the paving over of gardens contributes to flood risk and should therefore be discouraged. [Reason: To ensure that the development is properly drained; prevents flooding and environmental damage] Water Resources Planning On 12 March 2012, seven water companies [Anglian Water, South East Water, Southern Water, Sutton and East Surrey Water, Thames Water, Veolia Water Southeast
and Veolia Water Central] announced they are consulting on temporary restrictions to be in place by 5 April 2012. The number of drought measures highlights the need to manage water resources effectively, given increasing pressure on water supply because of population increase, changing household usage patterns and by climate change. All this despite the UK having a reputation as being a rainy country, we may face a future with less rainfall and less certainty about when that rain will fall.

United Utilities PLC Water Resources Management Plan published in 2009, sets out our strategy for water resources management for the next twenty-five years and highlights areas where there is likely to be a supply deficit and what activities will be put in place to mitigate any shortfall in supply. The plan can be accessed here: http://www.unitedutilities.com/WaterResourcesPlan.aspx United Utilities PLC would encourage all developers and planners to contact United Utilities PLC at the earliest opportunity to enable identification of points of connection with least cost to the developer. [Reason: To maintain the public water supply and to provide satisfactory/sustainable development] Increased Water Capacity The developer is required to pay for their increased capacity (up to the point of a treatment works) and they are only allowed to connect at specific points identified by United Utilities PLC and following approval to connect. Planners and Developer should obtain local capacity information from the United Utilities PLC Area Teams. Connections who would be able to identify areas where there is current capacity for development; this would be on a case by case basis and developers are required to pay a fee for this service (a pre development enquiry). [Reason: To maintain the public water supply and to provide satisfactory/sustainable development] General Water Efficiency Guidance United Utilities encourages the use of water efficient designs and development wherever this is possible. There are a number of actions developers can undertake to ensure that their developments are water efficient. The most up to date advice for water efficiency and water efficiency products can be found at Waterwise who have recently published a best practise guide on water efficiency for new developments. United Utilities PLC would encourage utilisation of the following water efficiency activities: i. § Installing of the latest water efficient products, such as a 4.5l flush toilet instead of the 6l type. i. § Minimise run lengths of hot and cold water pipes from storage to tap/shower areas. This minimises the amount of waste during the time the water goes from cold to hot. i. § Utilising drought resistant varieties of trees, plants and grasses when landscaping. i. § Install water efficient appliances such as dishwashers, washing machines. [Reason: To maintain the public water supply and to provide satisfactory/sustainable development] Responding Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment [SHLAA] Responding to an individual site identified in a SHLAA will not give a true reflection on impact on the existing infrastructure or provide a clear investment plan for the future. A single plot will not be constructed, a number of plots will and therefore numerous build scenarios can be created from the list of sites identified in a SHLAA. What if: Plots A, B, C and Z are constructed or Plots B; C; D; Y and Z are constructed. United Utilities PLC can not provide a true impact assessment on the development plots identified in your SHLAA, United Utilities PLC would prefer to meet a member of your team to discuss this in further detail. [Reason: To ensure that no foul or surface water discharges take place until proper provision has been made for their disposal and to provide satisfactory/sustainable development] Development adjacent to infrastructure assets The future expansion of infrastructure assets to meet the needs of future development and changes in legalisation could create a potential conflict with development plans, this may result in millions of customers money being spent in building a new infrastructure outside the locality; therefore developments adjacent to United Utilities PLC assets should be discouraged by LPA Water and sewerage companies have a legal right of access to their assets; this can be for their operational and/or maintenance therefore United Utilities PLC will not permit the building over and/or near its infrastructure assets. By their nature, wastewater processes generate odour levels, which the public may deem to be unacceptable; in addition, the filter processes attract flies. To avoid any conflict historically these facilities have been sited away from the general population. To protect the public from these by-products United Utilities PLC would ask that the Environmental Health Authority be consulted in any future developments adjacent to wastewater infrastructure assets. In most cases, the distance of 400 metres from the WWTW is used as a guide, but this can differ due to local topography,
climatic conditions, size and nature of the wastewater infrastructure asset and development in question. The Council must ensure United Utilities PLC is kept informed of any waste management related development and/or planning application within 500m of a Large Diameter Trunk Main (LDTM). Prior consent will be required from United Utilities PLC before granting approval. It is also essential that this information is included in future planning policy United Utilities PLC would seek the support of LPA in the LDF and planning application processes to protect/secure land for infrastructure use. Failure could mean United Utilities PLC cannot provide the additional capacity required to support your growth plans therefore a failed and/or unsound development plan. [Reason: To protect existing and future infrastructure and maintain service] Infill land You should be aware that, on occasion, gaps are left between properties; this is due to the presence of underground utility assets. United Utilities PLC will not allow the building over or near to these assets and development will not be acceptable in these locations. [Reason: In order to allow sufficient access for maintenance and repair work at all times] Carbon impact LPA and developers should consider to the total carbon impact of future developments; not only the footprint of the development but also the carbon impact for additional infrastructure assets; their associated treatment processes and their future maintenance and operation requirements. To meet future reduction targets LPA and Developers should considered the wider carbon impact when determining the location of future developments. [Reason: Satisfactory and sustainable development] Windfall Sites Windfall sites siphon investment and resources away from defined development plans; sabotaging infrastructure investment identified to address specific water and wastewater infrastructure needs. For LPA this could greatly impact their development plans to address areas of deprivation; poor housing; high unemployment; education and health care issues. A single development site [windfall] must not impair and/or sabotage the time; resources; infrastructure investment and partnerships developed to support the future growth of a LPA and/or number of LPAs. [Reason: Protect investment, well being of the community and deliver sustainable development] Greenfield Development Generally green field sites have limited or no supporting water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure assets; they may be adjacent to existing infrastructure assets that are located on the fringe/limits of the existing water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure networks which are of a small diameter and have limited capacity to support additional capacity. Providing supporting infrastructure to greenfield development sites could result in the upsizing of the existing assets to support the additional capacity needs; therefore disrupting to the existing community, which would see little or no benefit for their reduced quality of life during the construction, and commissioning phases The existing community and new residents may also experience a reduced quality of service until the new supporting infrastructure is commissioned. [Reason: To protect the quality of life for the existing community by protecting and maintaining the public water supply and sewerage services and to provide satisfactory/sustainable development] LIABILITY United Utilities PLC does not promise that the data will provide any particular facilities or functions. You must ensure that the data meet your needs. You are entirely responsible for the consequences of any use of the data, United Utilities PLC give you no warranty about the fitness for purpose or performance of any part of the data. If an electronic format has been used, United Utilities PLC do not promise that the media on which the data are provided will always be free from defects, computer viruses, software locks or other similar code or that the operation of the data will be uninterrupted or error free. You should carry out all necessary virus checks prior to loading the data on to your computer system. United Utilities PLC does not guarantee that the data will always be accurate, correct, complete, up to date or valid. United Utilities PLC gives you no warranty about the condition or satisfactory quality of any part of the Data. United Utilities PLC is only able to undertake to use reasonable endeavours to ensure that United Utilities PLC is providing you with an accurate a copy from our records. United Utilities PLC are not in any circumstances (including if United Utilities PLC have been negligent) liable for any damage to property, loss of business capital, earnings, profit, reputation, goodwill or enjoyment or any other indirect or consequential loss or damage at all arising out of or in connection with this Agreement or its subject matter. You accept that United Utilities PLC shall not be under any liability to you of any kind, which arising directly or indirectly, for any
Re cultural facilities: They need to be inclusive for the healthy (and not so healthy) elderly. One large or several smaller town centre units must be able to be used for food drink, socialising, learning, library volunteering, pointing towards various health & social care appointments where necessary, one large vibrant centre would be preferable and large vibrant centre would be preferable and should be the aim - once it can be afforded.

I attach for your consideration an input re: the above, which I hope you find helpful. I am submitting this on the following bases: - this letter format responds to Question 9 of the consultation questionnaire, seeking "any other comments".

It is referenced, as requested at Question 9 - at a meeting on 26 September at which the draft Knutsford Town Strategy was discussed (with the public being able to attend), Peter Raynes said that it is acceptable for the format of letters to be received by Cheshire East Council with comments on the draft Strategy - a note at the head of the attached explains that those agreeing it may be submitting also their individual responses to the draft Strategy, separately. (For clarity, I am not doing so) - The people named in the attached are long-term residents of Knutsford. Several of those people will be known to Cheshire East Council and/ or Knutsford Town Council but it is not suggested that this represents an objective sample survey response - the people whose names are listed agree the content of the attached. If required to verify this, if necessary I will ask that they confirm direct to Cheshire East Council that they have agreed the content of the attached.

The comments are agreed by several people, each of whom has consented for his/ her name to be included below. Individual comments of those people may have been submitted separately to Cheshire East Council, including in respect of items in the draft Strategy not referred to below.)

Strategic consideration (re: Chapters 1 - 8)

a) The size of Knutsford (population approximately 12,570) (Para 2.2 of the draft Strategy) is appropriate to its functions as a small market town. The fact that, as with other towns, some of its services and facilities are used by the population of other nearby settlements is regarded as relevant no more than that the services and facilities of towns other than Knutsford are used also by Knutsford residents.

b) As evidenced by responses articulated so far to the draft Strategy, many residents say they like Knutsford "as it is" and favour the status quo.

c) Moreover: Headline Results of Cheshire East Place Shaping Consultation (July - September 2011) record, inter alia, Knutsford respondents rating as a "least important": "Providing more housing" and "More business land I buildings". This has not been referred to by Cheshire East Council (CEC) in the draft Knutsford Town Strategy, despite the reference (at para 1.9) to the Place Shaping Consultation; the Knutsford Town Plan organisation states: "Beautiful historic Knutsford [is] A wonderful place to live, work and visit. We aim to keep it that way, developing the community for the future, whilst preserving our great heritage."http://www.knutsfordtownplan.org/ ; Tatton Estate Management has commented: "Knutsford is our home town, and we don’t want green belt development unless it’s entirely necessary, justified and appropriate" (Knutsford Guardian, 26 September 2012); the June 2012 opinion of the members of the Knutsford Conservation and Heritage Group (KCHG), consulted prior to the confidentiality rating being accorded by CEC to its preparation of the draft Strategy, was conveyed to CEC, as: "What is important to the residents of Knutsford?" included "Ensuring future development is of a scale, at locations and is of a design quality which complements and does not prejudice Knutsford's existing natural and built environment and heritage, nor the character of the place". "What needs to be maintained?" included "Knutsford's size as a town - integral to its character" and "Green Belt around Knutsford". "What would the new homes or jobs need to provide?" included “Agreement that the location of new homes or jobs need not necessarily be at a Knutsford location and may be better located elsewhere". These are important initial principles. In the absence of the provision of land for sufficient social housing provision, genuinely affordable housing
to serve the Knutsford community may be best located where market values of land are sufficiently low to achieve that. Arguably "failed" Knutsford examples are of "affordable" housing at the Longridge Estate where property prices increased threefold after they were sold-off privately, and "affordable" properties at Pevensey Drive (part of the former Chattels site), which have included the June 2012 sale of a terraced house at over £250,000. Moreover, there is a vast supply of new employment units and employment land already within sustainably accessible distance. Why add to that (other than if required for Knutsford's "generic growth"? What about, for example, land allocated for employment use near Northwich, or Manchester Airport Enterprise Zone, or Warrington (Omega and Birchwood), or Media City (from which some employees already visit Knutsford)? The Cheshire East Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 records, amongst Cheshire East towns, Knutsford as having the lowest percentage of self-containment as a housing market, with only 53.3% of moves (migration and travel to work) taking place within Knutsford. That Assessment records strong commuter flows to Greater Manchester. The implications include: - the proximity to Knutsford of employment opportunities elsewhere; - the effective transport links between Knutsford and elsewhere, enabling such movement.

d) The argument advanced by CEC, that of Knutsford accommodating "its fair share of housing growth" is flawed. The strategic reason why Knutsford should not do so is that Knutsford's settlement boundary is bounded by Green Belt (with the exception of land adjacent to Parkgate Trading Estate, SHLAA Â— Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) site 3433 with a potential capacity of 350 housing units - a greenfield site, not in the Green Belt). In Wilmslow the suggested level of additional housing has been reduced significantly, from a possible 1,500 additional homes to a possible 460 (a reduction of 69%). Wilmslow Town Council has played an active role, being "responsible for redrafting "the Wilmslow Town Strategy document. http://www.wilmslow.co.uk/news/article /7058/town-council-responsible-for-redrafting-Wilmslow-vision

e) Notwithstanding discussion as to the future of national Green Belt policy, as the March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states (para 79 and 80):"the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence" and the purposes of Green Belt include "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment [and] to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns".

f) As is recorded in the draft Strategy (para 6.5), NPPF states also (para 83): "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan." Although the draft Strategy forms part of the "Local Plan preparation" process, the question remains as to whether "exceptional circumstances" have been demonstrated. g) As for the future provision of housing, the draft Strategy notes (para 6.4) that "the housing requirement must be evidence-based" whilst referring to a range of 460 - 1,280 additional dwellings in Knutsford from 2010 - 2030 (para 2.8). The evidence-based assessment of need should include consideration of provision in local planning authorities nearby, in particular in Cheshire West and Chester, Trafford and elsewhere in Greater Manchester. Except where to do so is contrary to sustainable development principles, it is recommended that priority is given first to town centre sites and then to sites within settlement boundaries, and to brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites. It is probable that the potential housing capacity at sites in the town centre, sites within settlement boundaries and at the land adjacent to Parkgate Trading Estate would exceed in total the lowest figure (460) within CEC's range of suggested additional dwellings in Knutsford to 2030. In that respect it may be concluded there is no need for the release of Green Belt land. However, it is not considered that this conclusion is sound (paragraph 2, below). Instead, it is recommended that any release of Green Belt land should be on a minimal site-specific basis, as should (if identified on an evidence basis) any provision for land to be safeguarded for future housing development in the Green Belt (draft Strategy, para 6.13), the amount of which should be quantified and location(s) identified in the finalised Town Strategy. It is recognised that need for affordable housing is difficult to quantify (as said also by CEC at the 9 July 2012 meeting of Knutsford Town Council's Planning and Licensing Committee). –
h) As with housing provision, it is argued so too for other land uses (including employment, retail, leisure, health and education), their locational requirements should be evidence-based, in particular if a Green Belt location is proposed requiring "exceptional circumstances" to be demonstrated. It is recommended that no additional land is safeguarded in the Green Belt for those uses, it being assumed that to do so is not supported on an evidence basis. i) To attempt to balance the perspectives above, it is advocated here that Knutsford’s future development is limited to evolutionary, minimal "natural" growth only, with genuine provision for affordable housing; and that Knutsford Town Council encourages CEC to endorse and implement this strategy for Knutsford in working up its Local Plan. Detailed consideration (re: Chapters 1-8) Housing 1. In considering future housing provision, of relevance is future educational land provision. (i) It is understood that Knutsford Academy has a requirement for both the sites of the Upper School (at Sexton Road) and Lower School (at Westfield Drive). Presumably this depends on Knutsford's future educational policy, in particular whether to educate non-Knutsford children at the Academy - which also raises sustainability issues of the transport to and from Knutsford of pupils living elsewhere. It is suggested CEC and Knutsford Town Council should consider the Academy's land requirement policy. It was said formerly by the then Chairman of the Knutsford High School Governors that there might not be a need for the Lower School to remain in educational use. (ii) Possible changes to the designated town centre include Egerton Primary School and area (draft Strategy, para 7.4). It is agreed that Egerton Primary School (but not residential areas adjacent) should be included in the town centre, but only if the site is re-developed for a future health centre for Knutsford, possibly plus car parking provision additional to that required for such use. It is recommended that the Egerton School site is considered for possible future health centre use, maybe plus car parking provision, but consideration of a town centre boundary change at this location seems premature, pending consideration of the possible provision of a health centre in Knutsford and its location. On grounds of prematurity, it is recommended therefore that the designated town centre boundary should not include Egerton Primary School and area. It is understood that there is a need for three state primary schools in Knutsford. The re-development of Egerton School would require therefore an alternative location for the School. Such would be influenced by the location of future housing development in Knutsford, and it is possible to consider land for a future Primary School might be located in currently designated Green Belt land in close proximity to the centre of the town (interpreted as the Council Offices, Toft Road), as for example currently in the Green Belt in sites A or D (Diagram 3, p21). Re-development of the current Egerton School for Health Centre use might offer the opportunity of residential re-development of the current Cranford Hospital Site (SHLAA site 3160, with potential capacity of 20 housing units) and GPs' surgeries at Toft Road, Manchester Road and Mobberley Road (each with potential residential capacity). However, it is not agreed that the site of Egerton Primary School should be included in the town centre simply to enable its more favourable consideration for other development, such as retailing or another use including solely for car parking. 2. Subject to the above considerations as to need, evidence-base and location in the town centre and within settlement boundaries, and brownfield priority, it is recommended that housing development at Green Belt locations at sites in closest proximity to the centre of Knutsford (as defined above) should be considered first amongst potential Green Belt locations (sites A - E in Diagram 3 (p21)) and, on grounds of sustainability, before possible housing development at site G (which is distant from the town centre, albeit most of that site is greenfield but not Green Belt). To the extent that parts of sites A - E are in use for other purposes including leisure provision, alternative locations for those uses would need to be provided elsewhere.

Employment use

3. It is not agreed that there should be any release of Green Belt land for employment use. 'Paragraph c) above refers. Moreover, the case has not been made, let alone agreed, for the re-development of Parkgate Trading Estate, referred to at p31 of the draft Strategy. In an ideal world, land near Knutsford for employment use might include land west of the town, in proximity to the M6 and A556. However, the planning of Knutsford should respect the grain of existing development and is neither a 'blank
canvas’ nor 'clean slate'. CEC has informed KCHG that the through traffic currently passing through Knutsford is expected to be better managed through future improvements comprising the construction of the SEMMMS link (South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy) (A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road) and the signing of M6 traffic via/ round Congleton. (In CEC’s informal opinion those improvements also make any further consideration of a by-pass around Knutsford "like a sledgehammer to crack a nut"). It is suggested that CEC gives consideration to an additional access to Parkgate Trading Estate (over or under the rail line) and improvements including the provision of vehicle parking on currently vacant land there, increasing its potential access by articulated vehicles. In particular with the proximity of Parkgate Trading Estate to the densely populated and socially deprived residential areas of north east Knutsford, it would not be sensible nor logical for those jobs and training opportunities to be relocated elsewhere.

4. Informal inspection of Stanley Road Trading Estate suggests that it may not be viable, contrary to the assertion at p12 of the draft Strategy. It is recommended this is considered further by CEC. (The site is SHLAA site 3162, with a capacity of 23 housing units.)

5. It is not agreed that "there may be potential for ... redevelopment of Canute Court" (draft Strategy, para 7.6, site 4) and it is recommended this is not considered further. There are different opinions as to the architectural design of Canute Court, but its visibility is limited from some directions. Canute Court provides employment for 220 people in a town centre location and in high-technology business involving a blue-chip employer with multiplier benefits for Knutsford including in catering, restaurant and other trades. In short, precisely the kind of business which Knutsford should encourage. It is noted that the draft Strategy seeks "to promote the economic potential of the town" including by "supporting existing employers within the town"(p12). Other issues Aircraft noise disturbance at night

6. It is recommended CEC includes as an "Environment Strategy" (at p16) that Manchester Airport pic introduces and implements at the earliest opportunity a changed night flight operation which produces quantifiable and effective benefits in noise reduction, additional to benefits in noise reduction which would occur anyway (for example, through aircraft design improvements). Aircraft noise disturbance at night is an issue affecting the quality of life of many residents of Knutsford and elsewhere. The draft Strategy states (at para 2.9): 'Whilst Manchester Airport does offer economic and transport benefits local residents of Knutsford often raise the issue of impact on their amenity, particularly in terms of noise." Â· It is noted that the draft Town Strategy refers (at para 1.22) to the Cheshire East Sustainable Community Strategy including: "Driving out the causes of poor health". Night noise disturbance is documented, elsewhere as being detrimental to good health. Â· CEC’s descriptive references are not action-oriented and are not followed up in the draft Town Strategy, notwithstanding that the Knutsford Town Plan has also identified as a priority the reduction of aircraft noise, especially at night. Possible extension of Metro link to Knutsford

7. It would be unsafe and unsound to draw any conclusions from the double-barreled question in CEC’s public consultation questionnaire, which unfortunately asks for the rating of two variables in one question (at question 8). Moreover, advantages and disadvantages for Knutsford of a possible extension of Metro link to Knutsford have not been set out, nor have alternatives (such as the tram/train potential referred to in the Knutsford Guardian on 12 September 2012). Although it is not now possible for such a conclusion to be drawn, and notwithstanding the already effective transport links between Knutsford and elsewhere (paragraph c) above), some stakeholders might favour a Metro link extension to Knutsford. However, there would be potential disadvantages of pursuing this option, including increased development pressures on the town, the need for car parking provision if Knutsford is a terminus at the end of part of the Metro link system, and increased playing into the wider Manchester city-region agenda to the potential detriment of Knutsford’s loss of individuality.

Objective 2: Economy (p12)

8. It is recommended an additional strategy should be added: "providing planning briefs for locationally significant sites and buildings to facilitate their alternative use". Such briefs should be prepared by CEC for sites including the former Courts, Toft Road (Sessions House, site 8, referred to in para 7.6 of the draft Strategy).

Draft Knutsford Town Strategy Consultation Report:

Q9 Additional Comments

Page 373
Objective 3: Town Centre (p13)
9. It is noted that references are made to "shared surface" schemes, whereas it would have been correct to refer to "pedestrian priority" schemes for King Street and possibly elsewhere.
10. It is noted that reference is made to consideration of the potential for improvement and redevelopment in ... "Red Cow Yard". That area should correctly have been included also in Diagram 5 (p34), paragraph 7.6 (site 1), and question 7 Area 1. The potential improvement and redevelopment at both Canute Place and Red Cow Yard is agreed. The potential redevelopment of the north of Canute Place is required as a priority in architectural and town planning terms and for the potential improvement of the town centre. It is agreed widely that the existing development at the north of Canute Place is of poor design quality which recent improvements have failed to address adequately.

Objective 5: Heritage (p15)
11. It is recommended that the Heritage Strategy "Creating and applying a Design Template for Knutsford" is more appropriately for inclusion as an Environment Strategy (p16), after "Ensure new development supports Knutsford's unique character, its sense of place and rural location". The strategy of "Creating and applying a Design Template" is welcomed as of potential fundamental importance in the management of future development in Knutsford.

Objective 6: Environment (p16)
12. - see paras 6 and 11, above. Objective 7: Connectivity (p17) 13. The strategies of this objective need redrafting, along the following lines: bullet 1: add after "leisure": "and other uses;" [these would include, for example, residential and educational] 1 1 bullet 3: omit "for those using it to access education, training, employment and health and social care services" [the "convenient service" should be for all uses] bullet 4: after "Support the extension of the Metro link to Knutsford" add "if the disadvantages of doing so are outweighed by the advantages “add additional bullet: "Provide additional road safety measures, including reduced speed zones near schools, and traffic calming schemes." Development Principles (p18)
14. Instead of as at para 6.11, development principles should include a correct sequential approach to future housing development, as follows: firstly, to sites and adaptation of buildings within the town centre; secondly, to opportunities for development or re-development of sites and buildings within the settlement boundaries; thirdly, to opportunities for development or re-development of sites and buildings adjacent to the settlement boundaries, with potential for good access to services and/or where they could increase facilities and opportunities for integrated communities; - - with appropriate brownfield/greenfield and non-Green Belt/Green Belt priorities. (t Town Centre options (chapter 7)
15.- see paras 5, 8 and 10, above.
16. It is not agreed that Area C (The Moor and car park) should be included in the designated town centre. It would serve no useful purpose for that area to be so included, other than to potentially increase its development potential. That is to be avoided. Infrastructure Priorities (chapter 8)
17. There is a risk that the community may be overly attracted by the theoretical carrot of the Community Infrastructure Levy. The draft Strategy should make it clear that: an undefined "meaningful" proportion only of the levy is to be made available to the neighbourhood in which the development takes place; as the imposition of a levy by CEC on new development will result in an additional cost to the developer, CEC will attempt to ensure that:
(i) this additional cost is not passed on to residents of new housing and occupants of other development
(ii) There will be no reduction in the design quality of new development, nor in the quality of materials used.
18. In recognition of the importance to the town of "Knutsford in Bloom" and of the relevance of planting to the mitigation of vehicular traffic emissions (as recognised by CEC), it is suggested also that the list of potential infrastructure priorities is added to by the inclusion of an "Environmental improvement programme", that being accorded an "Important" priority. Process Responsibility for the draft Strategy and supporting documents (the consultation questionnaire and draft Sustainability Appraisal)
19. Responsibility for the documents remains ambiguously stated. The draft Sustainability Appraisal
states incorrectly (at paras 1.2 and 2.9) that the draft Strategy was developed by the Stakeholder Panel in partnership with CEC. The correct position is that the draft Strategy was put together by CEC working with representatives of the local community (as stated at para 1.1 of the draft Strategy).

20. It is recommended Knutsford Town Council considers whether, like Wilmslow Town Council, in its role of serving the community it should assume greater responsibility for the finalised Town Strategy.

Paul Webster (signed, as submitted by him) Brian Chaplin Sylvia Chaplin Val Dawson Alec Guthrie Steve Litherland Jan McCappin Anna Smyth Charles Watson.

Knutsford Town Strategy We acknowledge the acceptance that the Green Belt will have to be reviewed in order to accommodate Knutsford’s future growth at paragraph 6.3 of the Town Strategy. However, we believe that the exercise that has been undertaken through the Town Strategy consultation is premature as there has been no formal Green Belt review undertaken that considers all of the parcels of land surrounding Knutsford in order to assess their Green Belt function. All of the sites listed as potential development options need to be subject to a full site appraisal in order to establish their suitability and achievability. Whether they are considered favoured or other options should be based on an evidence base that fully addresses the constraints and opportunities of each site, including an assessment of the Green Belt function of the sites which is yet to be undertaken. When ranking all twenty identified sites in terms of sustainability Site P is ranked seventh whereas Sites A, B, C, E and G are all ranked significantly lower. This highlights the need to fully assess the potential of each site to ensure preferred sites are realistically achievable. Sites A, D and E are considered to be favoured sites by the Panel however these sites are not identified in the Cheshire East SHLAA 2011. Site P was considered unsuitable for development by the Panel; however there is no justification as to how this decision was formulated. The justification for these decisions needs to be evident in the Town Strategy in order for the process to be clear and transparent. The sites that were considered by the Panel to have potential for future development are given several points to justify the reasons why they should be included in that category. In order for an informed decision on the suitability of each site to be made, there should be further information on each site. Site P is suitable, available, achievable and therefore deliverable. There is no technical reason why the site could not accommodate future residential development, and a full suite of supporting documentation is being prepared to support the promotion of the site through the formal site allocations process. The inclusion of a detailed description of the background of Knutsford is beneficial and this approach should be included in all of the Town Strategies in order to provide conformity and further information relating to the context of the town.

Chpt 3 - have all we need in the town now. On the evidence presented in the document (which is sometimes contradictory) the vision neither will nor can make matters better than they area at present.
Chpt 4 - If the towns extended then you first need to give more attention to what infrastructure is needed to accommodate the proposals (in more detail than in the Strategy). It will be substantial and costly to be beneficial. Road network is stretched to the limit. Drainage and sewerage systems have not been updated for decades. What steps will be taken to ensure the character of the town will not be lost?
Chpt 5 - Some aspirations are absurd and seem at odds with what is said elsewhere.
Chpt 6 - Need a ring road as the road system has not changed since 1936, but the population has increased. Why have the names and occupations of the Stakeholder Panel not been made public?
There is an unfair concentration on the Green Belt area to the north west of the town, where access would be by Tabley Road (which joins the A50), the A50 and the A5033 - they all suffer as much congestion at peak travel times as elsewhere. There could be sewerage and drainage problems arising from their location, elevation and relative distance from the sewerage treatment works.
Chpt 7 - Only beneficiary is CEC. Stakeholder Panel wears 2 hats.

Response to 6.5, 6.6, 6.3. I care passionately about the Green Belt, and I feel that its protection should be our over-riding concern. However, I (and I imagine most of the public) am confused by Government Policy which seems to be constantly shifting, and recent ambiguous statements from Osborne add to
this confusion. It seems that to improve the economic situation (the result of a toxic mix of lax regulation, unchecked greed and promotion of a relentless consumerism) we have to destroy the environment. I feel that if any building on the present Green Belt is countenanced it should be examined on a case-by-case basis and subject to rigorous aesthetic standards. Only residential housing should be allowed, not commercial, industrial or leisure facilities. However, I would prefer to see the present Green Belt boundaries remain undisturbed. On another issue (Section 8), you dissemble by implying that the Community Infrastructure Levy is an unqualified benefit to a local community when only a (probably) small proportion will be thus applied. Comment on 2.10: A key priority for the town is, in my opinion, to safeguard the heritage buildings and their surroundings. Several properties on King Street are in an appalling state of repair, including the former Canvas Lounge (which probably has a 17th century core, The Royal George has been closed for many years, a disgraceful state of affairs. Regent Street needs urgent re-vitalising and serious thought needs to be given to this. The street is bland and, in my observations, does not attract many passers by. When the area was re-developed not so long ago, the Planning Department ignored criticism of the proposals - perhaps the planners can now suggest some redress for their lamentable lack of foresight. Comment on Objective 6. The problem of traffic has hardly been touched on, but it is one of the most serious problems affecting the town. The volume of traffic is increasing steadily; the size of vehicles is also increasing (leading to an exacerbation of parking problems). All this is bad for the environment and for the well-being of the town's inhabitants. There should be a discussion concerning the desirability of reducing traffic and discouraging car use. A balance must of course be made in order to minimise impact on businesses etc. I would like to see Knutsford adopting at least some principles of the cittaslow UK movement: www.cittaslow.org.uk/, with it's emphasis on quality of life.

4 - How has the figure of requiring 450-1280 new houses in Knutsford by 2030 been calculated? 6 - A lot of thought and expense has gone in to investigating potential development sites but no consideration has been given to the transport infrastructure and schools that would be required to support these developments. There is a significant dependency on improving roads around Knutsford if these proposed developments are to have anything other than a negative impact on the town. I believe a lot of the transport issues are caused by commuter traffic passing through Knutsford therefore I do not believe that improved public transport links to Knutsford would have any significant reduction in the amount of congestion that the town suffers from. Additional 'temporary/emergency' classrooms have had to be built at several Knutsford schools this year causing significant disruption to the pupils at those schools. 6.2 - Of the 450 people on the housing waiting list for Knutsford how many of those work in Knutsford? I think the strategy has been put together with little consultation with the people of Knutsford and with nearly half the document focused on the development of houses, its primary focus is clearly on the attempt to get planning permission to build on Green Belt land. This is inconsistent with the vision set out at the start.

We strongly disagree with your housing policy (objective 4) for the following reasons:
* All of the identified sites are located within the Green Belt
* The expected population growth for Cheshire is 5% over 14 years (pg 19). However, the vision implies that Cheshire East will increase the housing stock in Knutsford by 21% - this seems a truly unfair distribution of the housing especially when other towns are much more ripe for development
* Increased population without improved and increased facilities may bring more unemployment and crime
* Knutsford's infrastructure currently struggles to cope under the current number of houses, adding more will prove disastrous - the roads are already far too busy, there is not enough parking, there are not enough leisure facilities or health centres and the primary education sector is currently full with Egerton Primary having to install an extra classroom just to cope with the new intake
* There will be a massive impact on local biodiversity and food production
* There are currently around 400,000 housing units in the UK that have planning consent but have not even been started or finished. Surely these should be identified as a priority before considering new options
* If new housing is to be built, it should be built out of the green belt area e.g. site G
* East Cheshire’s strategy for housing is in full contradiction with its objectives and strategy for environment (objective 6) - building upon greenbelt decreases green spaces, removes woodland and open countryside, affecting wildlife and biodiversity.
* The introduction of housing will provide a negative impact on the value of properties near, or within, direct contact. Such price fluctuations could place families, already struggling during the UK’s and Europe’s financial uncertainty to fall into negative equity. This would then have a hugely detrimental effect on, not only the families but the community as a whole. By removing the available equity will reduce spending by theses families or result in families having properties repossessed or force them to move.
* 13 of the sites which were considered were subsequently not considered suitable for development - for many of these a reason was not given. It is vital for an explanation to be given as to why these were disregarded. Surely for such a major decision all facts should be made available.
* Why has the consultation not been delivered by other means to members of the community and residents that would be affected by your site choices, not all residents have access to computers or the internet or purchase the local Guardian. We spoke to several of our neighbours and they knew nothing of the proposal with less than 48 hours to go until the 1st of October deadline! Without all residents knowing about the proposal, this results in an unfair reflection. In conclusion, I believe it is a sad state of affairs that the beautiful green countryside surrounding this town is under proposal for development. No longer is the treasured British countryside safe and protected - its truly heartbreaking and deeply upsetting.

Link Alderley by-pass (A34) to junction 18 M6 (Holmes Chapel). This would remove a lot of traffic using Knutsford to access Macclesfield, Wilmslow and Poynton. The volume of heavy traffic is increasing and the foundations of the town are being affected (i.e. railway wall).

This whole process is a joke. I don’t shop in Booths and I only visit the library with my four children when my priority is to sort them out with no time to look around the various displays. This means that I am apparently not eligible to receive a questionnaire?! Totally random distribution and as a result the results will not be representative of the town. Who designed the questionnaire? It is not user friendly. My Mum gave up. It is contradictory in parts. Unclear in parts and requires a huge amount of research to complete. I wish I had more time to research the various areas proposed for development and understand better the implications but I only got wind of this whole process this week via the Guardian. A shambles! Do not pass this off as being a consultation of the people of Knutsford. It is not!

Bearing in mind the current Green Belt designation (which is longstanding and based on established planning principles), the first option for development should be on previously developed land and then on land which id not statutory Green Belt. As the land adjacent to the Parkgate Employment Area is not designated Green Belt, this land ought to be the first and preferred option for development. In addition development in this area would provide the opportunity to improve access thereby increasing the attractiveness of the existing employment area as a place of work and to do business. There are good reasons for developing the east of Knutsford and for improving infrastructure and facilities in the east of town rather than encroaching on the Northern Green Belt and hence reducing the amenity value of Knutsford.

This web site is rubbish. It has taken me hours to do this as twice all my comments were erased for no apparent reason. I am now tired and fed up, hence some typos I cannot be bothered to correct - sorry. Please keep Knutsford small and preserve the sports clubs we've got that are an easy walking distance.

Chapter 6.11/Table 6.3 - For sites listed in table 6.3, no reason was given as to why sites were considered as not suitable. Providing reasons here may have influenced the perception of favoured sites - i.e. why favoured sites were deemed better than those listed in 6.3. Leaving such reasons out could imply the use of personal agendas or conflicting interests, even if this was not the case.

Other than what I have said before, both myself and my partner feel this will be devastating to the whole area and it will be a great shame for this to happen I know of so many individuals that grew up
in Knutsford return to bring their families up, this will change I only knew about this development the other day which is a shame, the council appear to have done just enough by law to inform all residents

In my opinion the proposed plan will start to change Knutsford from a relatively small town to what will eventually become a large town. I believe that this is the first step towards using the prime location Knutsford enjoys, close to the M6, M56 and M62, to turn Knutsford into a busy centre for industry with a much increased population. I believe that should the plan go ahead, Knutsford will start to lose its character and charm. It will start to become a town that is a sprawling expanse of houses and industrial parks. I do not want Knutsford to become a typical motorway town that expands in the way that places like Warrington, ST Helens, Widnes and Runcorn already have. Is Knutsford about to become the nation most central location? Having read many of the comments already submitted. It would appear that those people who will not be affected by the current proposals are quiet happy for the development to go ahead and similarly those who are, wish to see the plan changed or scrapped (not exactly a surprise). To those people who are not opposing this plan. It may not affect you at the moment but by not opposing the plan you are setting a president and eventually the plans will expand and so will Knutsford. My advice to people that currently enjoy a view onto open countryside is object to this plan or to sell now before town planers decide to develop the formerly green belt agricultural land at the bottom of your garden into a housing estate or even industrial units!

In the event that more housing is built it is essential that the transport and other aspects of infrastructure be improved BEFOREHAND

Many people consider this plan to be about the development of the town centre and are surprised by the depth of the residential plans. I consider that this will undermine our community as the plan is placing one area against another and there is no coherent approach that will judge the impact of this. The said consultation has been far too short and we need to know the full extent of who will benefit from this.

Chapter 6 Development Options: I do not agree with the development of B, C & D for housing because of: 1) Traffic Congestion caused by disruptions on M6 with traffic diverting though Knutsford. 2) Congestion caused by functions held in Tatton Park. 3) Traffic speed down Manchester Road. 4) Workers parking cars for the day on side roads

I am not convinced of the need to plan for up to 1,280 new homes in Knutsford, and increase of around 21%, The increase in population to 2026 (paragraph 62) is estimated at 4.58%, and if this continued at the same rate until 2030 would be 5.72%. Why do we need to plan for 21% - this seems far too many for Knutsford, even allowing for some increase in single occupancy dwellings. Also, although the improvements in the infrastructure suggested are desirable, it is most unlikely that these will be carried out - with such an increase in homes planned it is probable that the infrastructure would not cope.

I feel that this whole document is meant to lead the person answering to accept the proposals, this consultation has not been carried out correctly in my opinion, it has failed to engage the local community fully and there are many people who had no idea that this was happening. I feel it is damaging and detrimental to the character of Knutsford...as a draft I feel it actively encourages opposite sides of Knutsford to have a not in my back yard approach. I feel the decision to build at Parkgate has already been made, and that this consultation is merely lip service, the road has already been built at Bentleys as have the traffic lights and interestingly traffic calming measures have appeared on Higher Downs and Manor Park near the schools, anticipating further traffic perhaps? Consultations should be open and transparent and this has not been, there has been no direct literature through peoples doors identifying local developments giving those in a community affected all of the facts so that they could come to decisions based on full information, I do not believe this is acceptable and has certainly damaged the standing of Cheshire East in the eyes of the local community, might I suggest that the appropriate thing to do is reconsult the community, drop flyers through the door, you can purchase a thousand for less than Â£50, let people know all the facts not in jargon but in a clear, concise way...This would be the honourable thing to do. The questionnaire seems
very loaded in the sense that it pits one end of Knutsford against the other" the not in my area" mentality, is difficult to fill in and presumes computer access and literacy. We are in the process of setting up a community wide forum to object to any development of the green belt in the Knutsford area. I feel that it is a short sighted policy and do not accept the necessity to eat into the green belt when there are thousands of brown belt sites across the country that could be developed instead, the only reason they are not developed is because there is not so much money to be made by the developer, additionally there are whole estates boarded up, purchased by land developers prior to the recession, these properties are standing empty Why?.I would say to build in brown belt and insist on properties being utilised properly is a far more sensible approach given that part of the UK's bread and butter is the tourist industry, many of whom come to England for its beauty and its greenery. The major concerns raised thus far are the increases in traffic Knutsford wide, the impact on local schools, amenities, health services and the rural environment; I presume CEC will be receiving a significant increase in budget to deal with the road quality as it degenerates due to the increase in traffic? I would urge the government to rethink this policy, just who are going to buy all these properties when we have publicly funded banks that are unwilling to lend to new buyers?

- Knutsford is on the edge of Cheshire East, therefore there should be reference to plans in Cheshire West - i.e. Northwich provides employment and housing complementary to Knutsford - also Altrincham and surrounding villages. - Low-rise attractive flats wit

Knutsford still needs a bypass and any development that takes place will underscore this need.

I do not agree with the plans to provide for up to 1,280 new homes in Knutsford by 2030 - this seems far too many. The present infrastructure is currently inadequate in many areas - for example car parking provision, pedestrian access to shopping areas, and social care facilities, and the priority should be to improve these services before any expansion in the number of homes in Knutsford.

Most people who live here are very proud of Knutsford just the way it is.

1.9, 2.9, 3.1, 4.3 Connectivity with the villages surrounding Knutsford is important as many of these residents use the town as their service centre for shopping , health care, education and employment. The town relies upon the rural population just as much as the rural dwellers rely on the town. 6.6 Greenbelt Whilst appreciating the need for the town to expand in a controlled manner the problem with alterations to the green belt boundaries comes in identifying new boundaries that are "defining boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent" Some of the sites that have been look at are beginning to encroach upon surrounding parish boundaries e.g. Bexton, Mere and Tabley and would leave little green belt within the town boundaries.

Is there any need to expand Knutsford? The charm of our town is its size and community spirit. People choose to live here because it is surrounded greenbelt land and is near the countryside.

p 6.2, Development options. Justification as to why Knutsford needs up to 1,243 new homes. This is far greater number than town’s infrastructure can handle. 6.11 - Favoured sites. Retention of existing leisure facilities in their current location as opposed to relocating. In particular sites C&D. Site E - mature hard trees exist in this location, TPO's

I believe that an emphasis on public transport should be prioritised, with investment in better train and bus services rather than on a new A556

I believe that an emphasis on public transport should be prioritised, with investment in better train and bus services rather than on a new A556

It is important that the CELP considers the requirements for community uses and developments (in particular places of worship for a diverse range of faith groups), which will often be dispersed across the East Cheshire area. The policy framework has to be flexible so that it can respond to specific development type and locational requirements. In terms of NPPF such a flexible approach is essential to the provision of local community facilities (including places of worship). This feedback is part of the process of creating a shared vision with communities (including faith communities) of the facilities they wish to see (NPPF paragraph 69).
The document requires a complete overhaul to shorten it, sharpen the objectives and the means of achieving them and the criteria by which their achievement or otherwise can be judged. At present it is too woolly and full of jargon and buzzwords. It then needs to go out to a proper consultation i.e. a summary to all households to invite comments not give notice in low circulation local newspaper and then Booths ten days before the deadline for responses. How frequently in such consultations as these do the stakeholders’ preferred sites coincide with an already worked up concept for development that had been amended in the light of comments from the planning authority?

A good consultation document but if the ideas come to fruition, Knutsford may lose its unique small town identity.

I think I have stated my objections throughout this survey

The plan has not been sent to every household and many residents are unaware of its existence because unless they buy the Knutsford Guardian or use the library how would they hear about it. This is particularly true for those who commute to work out of town. The results of this so called consultation process are unlikely to give a true indication of the strength of feeling that residents have for our beautiful and unique town. Every home should have been leafleted directing residents to the website or the library and I strongly believe that residents should be informed what percentage of replies to this questionnaire has been received.

Don't overdevelop the nice town that we have - in relation to the whole strategy. Concentrate on improving what we have.

If there is to be an increase in the numbers of houses in the town, it is imperative to give far greater consideration to transport issues than appears to have happened in the strategy. It is unlikely that Knutsford will command enough of the budget to ensure that any expansion does not ruin the town. We are still waiting for our new Health Centre

I have just moved back to the town after being away for a few years and it all seems so crowded and busy with traffic jams. It feels like the town can’t cope with any extra housing. Also I couldn’t get my children into my choice of school - all of them seem full already. My biggest concern is how dangerous it is walking around the town. I don’t walk my children along Chelford Road because it is so busy with narrow pavements and traffic fumes. There is not one pedestrian crossing along the road and there isn't adequate street lighting. I would love to be outside more but I feel I need to drive because there aren't enough safe places to walk.

Because the 11 Town Strategies have been tackled piecemeal, it has proved difficult to follow the over-arching strategy that Cheshire East Council has been adopting in relation to housing numbers and employment land and this situation has been exacerbated by the fact that the up-dated Strategic Housing Market Assessment is still awaited and so is the analysis of employment land. That said, it is apparent that high housing numbers are sought â€“ but not sufficient in town centres â€“ and there is clearly an aspiration to increase employment land even though the Regional Spatial Strategy panel instructed Cheshire to release employment land for mixed use and housing. All the Town Strategies have development aspirations outside the town centres concerned, many into surrounding Green Belt, Green Gap or undesignated countryside and many into adjoining parishes. In the case of Crewe and Macclesfield, there are stated intentions by the principal authority to redevelop and improve the town centres but there do not appear to be master plans which commit to delivering large numbers of housing units within those town centres. Nowhere does there appear to be a target for delivering housing on brownfield land. Based on the RSS targets, which were being met, there ought to be an overall target of 73% in Cheshire East. We would urge the principal authority to commit to a sequential land use policy, brownfield first, and to achieving a high brownfield land target.

Prohibit all development in Tatton Park especially Bewilderwood. Protect all green space especially ancient woodland.

National Trust and CEC are stewards and custodians of Tatton Park. The plan must prohibit all development of the Park such as Bewilderwood

Objective 3 Town Centre: Most visitors and locals come in by car so: 1. Provide more adequate car
parking 2. Streets to be made more comfortable to shopping 3. Shared road scheme. Does it work? If not - 4. No street parking except for drop offs and pick ups

May I ask who were the Stakeholder Panel, how were they chosen and are they Knutsfordians? Most of the population seem unaware of these plans and you must remember not everyone has the local paper. Do you not think people should have been better informed as it is only now starting to filter through when objections have to be in by 1st October? In the strategy it mentions that the A50 is 'busy at peak times'. I can assure you that this is not the case. Whenever the M6 is closed all traffic is diverted along the A50 on a regular basis. The whole plan is just not viable as the infrastructure of Knutsford as it stands just can not take any more developments. Sites C & D - I understand at the public meeting last night (26/9) Tatton Estate has wonderful plans for these sites! The land is totally unsuitable being very wet and having subsidence. I am strongly opposed to these plans as the approach to the Warrington side of Knutsford will have no Green Belt at all.

I fear that the only beneficiaries of this will be the big business development companies who will swoop in to capitalise on a golden opportunity to make money on our green belt land and we need to ensure that we do not just rush headlong into destroying the green belt before all the options are fully investigated. Please reconsider your strategy as we can not make more land and once it’s gone, it’s gone forever.

At every stage of development plans local residents need to be informed with plenty of notice - no rushing through, rubber stamped by the back door. Think Regent Street - lets not make the same mistake - what a planning error.

This has been poorly advertised

I also think the Council haven't publicised these proposals properly. For something like this I would have expected something through my letter box. In addition the development is going to destroy the green area on that side of the Longridge area - and I strongly object to that.

4 D & E: I do not think you should consider swapping the playing fields or allotments to another location. They are conveniently located near the centre and are less likely to be used and will generate traffic if moved.

The National Trust and CEC are stewards of Tatton Park so they should prohibit any developments such as Bewilderwood and similar and keep it as it is

I believe that public transportation should be prioritised where there is a clear cost benefit. For example, better train and bus services would make sense rather than spending £200m on a new A556.

I believe that public transportation should be prioritised where there is a clear cost benefit. For example, better train and bus services would make sense rather than spending £200m on a new A556.

Don't spoil this historical town and the green belt space surrounding it. It does not need to grow, it will lose it's community potential

David Brown speaks of Cheshire East as a 'great place' why then change it? I do not agree with building on green belt at all

Green belt should be just that!

Demand that the proposed BeWILDerwood application at Tatton Park, and the park in general, is not taken into consideration as part of the Knutsford Town Strategy. There are references to Tatton Park within the document which infers Cheshire East will safeguard the estate’s heritage and environment. However, I am concerned the existing planning application submitted on 4 April 2012, on which no decision has yet been taken, should be decided as any other commercial application should be and not somehow swept into the overall future plan for Knutsford. I also believe that many councillors are unaware of the sheer numbers of Knutsford and Mobberley people who view the planning application as highly contentious. That Cheshire East is itself spending £240,000 on supporting the application only adds to the controversy. There was no proper public consultation when the Council approved its own Tatton Vision. Even the Council’s own 'press conference' only attracted representatives of two local newspapers. There are some very positive aspects to the Draft Knutsford Town Strategy but planning for the future of the town should not be a backdoor through which the Council sneaks through.
BeWILDerwood into Tatton Park.

The suggested building of houses by the Stakeholder Panel on sites A-E &G &K is totally unacceptable. ALL these areas are GREEN BELT; historical woodland &wildlife sanctuaries. The Plan indicates (Strategy: Environment page 16) "Protect greenspaces within and adjacent to the town. Enhance the greenspaces. Preserve &enhance the green infrastructure". (Development principles page 18) "Consideration given to the social, economic &environmental performance. Multi-functional public green spaces .... & support wildlife". What Merlin type strategy have they thought up in order to maintain this AND build houses on GREEN BELT? The area "K" Land to the south of Longridge (page 24) is "Adjacent to a flood risk area. There is a pond on this site. Adjacent to a nature conservation priority area"

Demand that the proposed BeWILDERwood application for a development (comprising a 340sq metres train station, 4 food outlets, shopping space in an ancient woodland and historic farmland) should definitely be rejected. The trouble is that although there are many positive aspects to the proposed "Knutsford Plan" for the future it should not be a backdoor through which the Cheshire East Council sneaks BeWILDERwood into Tatton Park.

Public transport should be prioritised where there is a clear cost benefit e.g. better train and bus services would make sense rather than spending £200m on a new A556.

Site A - if developed the radical change of view from allotments and beautiful countryside to an estate is unsettling and unfair. It would be an eyesore with more traffic, noise air pollution and devalue properties. The extent of new building on A, B, C, D, and E would close the gap between Knutsford and Mere. The farmland is fertile and the wildlife is special to the area - bats and lapwings. Site G is close to jobs. Are not the waiting list figures for Knutsford housing closer to 300 - potentially 3,000 more cars on the road, plus more LGVs serving the other potential industrial outfits. The plan is very bad for Knutsford - people are upset about it. It would destroy Knutsford as a market town and make some people a lot of money for the wrong reasons.

An expansion of residents by 10-20% requires a significantly stronger plan of how to cope with the traffic increase from the extra 1,000 cars on the road. Alternative is to keep the character of the current town, which is loved by residents and consider a smaller, more realistic extension.

- There are currently 424 applicants on Cheshire Homechoice who have selected Knutsford as their first choice, these applicants require - * 118 x 1 bed (65 would consider a flat) * 175 x 2 beds (67 would consider a flat) * 87 x 3 beds * 7 x 4 beds * 37 ap

Knutsford in its present state cannot cope with an increase in the volume of traffic due to its proximity to the A556 and M6 any problems there (which are often) causes gridlock through the town.

8 - Get the public transport etc. nigh and car parking General - Adjusting the Green Belt when doing
Planning is a bit of a fiddle isn’t it? Still I suppose we’ve got to if we need housing.

Proposed development is too big for existing town to cope with. Already huge traffic problems when there are holdups on the motorway. No way to expand the size of the town centre unless you knock it all down - loss of heritage town. Local congestion around Longridge Trading Estate and Higher Downs are already a problem and would be exacerbated by development on sites G and K.

Roads and footpaths are in a poor state.

Bring back the old court house back into use

It is so important potential changes will be planned and implemented intelligently to enhance the town and benefit its inhabitants. Obviously big money is at stake here and there are always going to be winners and losers. I would hope that any 'losers' would be adequately compensated by the 'winners'. It is sometimes difficult to trust those making decisions as many mistakes have been made in the past I'm not just referring to Cheshire East - and many town and cities have been blighted by bad planning decisions made by those who don't have to live with the consequences.

More detail needed to be added.

The essential character of Knutsford as an ancient market town would be seriously compromised by the type of development described. Favour small units disparitively placed too small and inconspicuous to alter the essential character. Deplore the Government's scrapping of the affordable housing element.

The livelihoods of farmers and horticulturists need to be considered and safeguarded when decisions are being made. Additional Letter With reference to the proposals in the draft plan for Knutsford's future, I am totally opposed to the assault on greenbelt land specifically in the areas from Northwich Road across to Mereheath Lane, known as areas A B C D E in the Knutsford plan. It is extremely unfair and divisive. The projected increase in housing stock to 21% is out of proportion to the predicted demand, which will adversely affect our infrastructure i.e. our already fully subscribed schools, medical services and inadequate social care. The loss of agricultural land will devastate our farmers and impact on food production, let alone what affect it will have on the wild life. We already endure congestion on the ASO and Northwich Road made worse by regular incidents on the M6 and A556, when diverted traffic is directed into Knutsford via these roads. What about health issues? Pollution is made much worse by extra emissions produced by traffic virtually at a standstill. Tabley Road is a route to the A556 and M6 and the cemetery should remain a peaceful place for all. Mereheath Lane is home to various youth and sports clubs and is a route to Altrincham via the A556. Also events at Tattoo Park frequently add to the normal traffic. This area already contains 'light industry units’ e.g. Cottons Hotel, Landrover and Rolls Royce, Fryers Nursery and the Brookdale Centre plus the McLaren showroom in the town. Some units in Knutsford are currently under-used thus negating the need for more provision. Knutsford is a pleasant, historical and treasured environment of which we are justly proud. There are many opportunities for cultural, leisure, business and tourism. It should remain a small market town and the existing borders retained as they are. Expansion is totally unjustified.

Have to move and adapt to the times but old market town Knutsford has gone forever - people could shop in the town for most things, but now have to go outside for things such as bedding, crockery, footwear etc.

Where's the mony coming from for the new infrastructure - needed before new houses are built. Learn from Wythenshawe when houses were built with no amenities - social behaviour issues. Taken years for Longridge to be integrated with the town. Keep Knutsford small.

6.2 - would like to factors that were taken into consideration and the reasons for many sites being categorised as unsuitable for development e.g. the entire southern side of Knutsford.

Knutsford needs to maintain its cultural heritage to attract more visitors who will spend money whilst they area here. More houses and people will detract from this and stretch the services available. The loss of sports facilities along Mereheath Lane would be particularly detrimental.

Knutsford's narrow street and footpaths area overcrowded. Additional of retail like Sainsbury's and Waitrose have only increased the congestion and increased parking problems. Do not need additional...
7.1 - Same comment re ugly and out of keeping shopfronts applies to newer developments in King St. and Princes St.

The most important thing is car parking to help Knutsford survive. If I could afford it I would build an underground car park below the one on bottom street, on top gardens and seats! It would help if Knutsford owners who rent out shops could lower rents. Some occupants are strangled by high rents and business rates we arrived 52 years ago - Knutsford was more prosperous.

6 - Have not had time to consider.

6 The Plan identifies the potential for increasing the population of Knutsford by 20% I do not believe this could be achieved without significant improvement to the road networks, parking and public transport.

I have already commented on renewable. This is an example of what we don't want. They are costly and ineffective. Better insulation in new housing is more effective i.e. triple glazing and wall insulation.

ALL Not enough time has been given for the public to review and comment on this strategy. This is not consultation. This is a token gesture to tick a box.

6.7 Crucial to maintain areas C, D & E (Egerton playing fields) in their current use. They are hugely important to the local community, utilised by children and adults alike and will negatively impact on the promotion of sustainable lifestyles within the community. It is a going concern that has worked well for years - why change?

Substantial house building explained but don’t touch where children will be educated and where schools will be built. Roads are jammed now - encourage healthy environments. Jobs- once housed are built where are the jobs?

The National Trust and CEC are stewards and custodians of Tatton Park. The Plan should specifically prohibit development of it and projects such as Bewilderwood.

6 To reinforce my objection to housing development in areas C,D,E as should remain as it is with no development of any kind.

The National Trust and Cheshire East Council as stewards and custodians of Tatton Park should specifically prohibit development and projects such as Bewilderwood

Chapter 6: Development options for A, B and C to be favoured areas is contradictory to the strategy. Development should be around Parkgate and Longridge trading estates for businesses. There are already a large number of empty units. Additionally areas R, H and I are ideal for homes.

Green Belt should not be built on especially before sites infrastructure has been identified. The streets and roads in and around Knutsford are not made and are suitable for any further traffic. It is irresponsible not to give the public the plans for all the amenities that would be needed.

The paths and pavements are in a very precarious state and some of the road surfaces are no better than a third world country!

An attached letter has been provided relating to site D, the key points of which are: The area is used for sports activities, left as it is the area would become a 'sporting green belt' within a built up area. Comments are made observing the range of housing numbers and the different combinations of sites that could achieve and exceed these numbers.

Consultee attached a letter addressed to Cllr Brown. the below is a summary: The following issues should be given attention: Road repairs Drains and sewers Traffic control Unemployment

Submissions have been made in support of sites in north west and north east Knutsford under the ownership of Tatton Estate. The north west site covers sites C, E and D. The north east sites cover sites F and G The Estate supports the visions for high quality design requesting that references are made to materials in keeping with the character of Knutsford The Estate requests that the protection of all property at Tatton Park, including woodland, be safeguarded as heritage assets. Support is made for development in towns and larger villages with a request to include 'other appropriate locations'. The Estate supports the vision for Knutsford and supports the inclusion of design 'in keeping' with Knutsford’s existing character. Objectives and Strategy: Sustainable community: the Estate requests
the inclusion of enhancing mobile phone coverage and 4G Economy: The Estate supports the release of land at Parkgate for future development Town Centre: The Estate requests the inclusion of enhancing the convenience retail offer in the town centre. Housing: The Estate expresses concern that the level of housing proposed by 2030 is not sufficient to accommodate the needs of Knutsford and that figures are not based on a robust evidence base. The Estate would like to see an increased housing supply target for Knutsford and references to require future sites to connect with the town centre Environment: The Estate supports the Environment strategy Connectivity: The Estate supports the Connectivity Strategy and requests references be made to enhancing connectivity between the town and its employment areas. Direct access from the A50 is also noted. The Estate recognises an overall shortage of appropriate housing, affordability issues and demographic change as factors influencing the proposed levels of growth for Knutsford and suggests the promotion of a diverse mix of housing to respond high levels of demand. In addition the Estate promotes a level of growth higher than the higher level of growth identified in the Knutsford Town Strategy. The Estate sets out its case for future development of Knutsford, including Green Belt release in it’s Development Framework.

| I am writing in response to the Cheshire East Town Strategy Draft for Knutsford that has been circulated this month. My first reaction is that Knutsford does not need to increase to the extent suggested, and would in fact suffer if it did so. The primary schools at the moment are full to capacity, and the medical facilities overloaded. Even trying to sort the latter out has proved to be impossible so far. The roads are already congested, especially when there is an accident on the M6, and the East-West traffic has to pass right through the centre of town too. More traffic would lead to worsening congestion and pollution. It is a travesty of usage to build on Grade 1 farmland such as A and B, as the loss of these fields would make the farm not viable. As a dairy farm it needs the fields for grazing and for growing silage. The wildlife on that land would be affected too. Land which is less productive would be a better option to build on. Knutsford is known for its green open spaces which are an attraction for visitors. Why spoil it. There are no jobs available, so Knutsford would become more of a dormitory town than it already is. Would you let me know what your position is as to the development of areas A and B. |
| A lot of money has been spent producing these documents; no doubt the Council will do what it wants anyway. Why not concentrate on repairing roads which are in a deadly state. More houses and more people in our town in the last thing we want. |
| Development of the Eastern Lane sports facilities with an interested, co-operative group - golf, rugby, football, tennis, bowls - is a real asset and could do with more cohesive development and access. |
| Bexton junior school is far too big for the local area. Too many children are attending from out of the area. Would like a cap on pupils living further than 1 mile away. Blackhill lane is a bottleneck around school times. |
| I consider that this whole document and its proposals to be ill considered, unnecessary and a wicked waste of rate payer’s money. Considering the present state of long standing requirements for maintenance of footpaths and roads and observance of speed restrictions in our area. |
| Who is "stakeholder panel"? No councillor has spoken to me or my neighbours. We need regular updates and details of people making recommendations (e-mail and papers), posters in town? |
| I am supportive in principle of plans for sustainable development, which aim to preserve the character of Cheshire and it’s individual towns and villages, but not for twenty years ahead. Realistic plans for the next five years are what are required. Concerns that plans for the South East Manchester Multi Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road could increase the already high levels of congestion in Knutsford and the surrounding area’s A and B roads. Green belt should be preserved. Concerns that greater residential development will not match employment opportunities. |
| Already high levels of acute traffic congestion and need for more car parks. A new road bypass and a complete pedestrianisation of the core of the town between Princess and King streets are needed. - the latter perhaps with peripheral car-parks and park- and- ride on the Continental model (viz Zermatt in Switzerland)? A further threat to the town is from noise, pollution, and safety issues of aircraft. |
overhead - this is hardly touched on in these documents. Concerns over plans to build more housing. Questions whether this housing is really necessary for Knutsford’s development, or to simply meet Cheshire East targets borough-wide?

Poor advertising and distribution of the Local Plan to residents. Not properly consulted with. People are losing patience and trust with Cheshire East Council. Concerns over ability to meet the levels of mixed and affordable housing without destroying greenbelt land. In addition, additional housing and an increased volume of traffic would place serious strain on the town’s infrastructure. The definition of the term “mixed uses” was not given in the document, which would have been a useful inclusion.

The car park at Moorside, Knutsford comprises previously developed land in a highly accessible location. We consider that it should be included as a potential residential development site in the Local Plan.