

## Alderley Edge NDP – Regulation 14 Public Consultation - 27<sup>th</sup> January - 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020

### Consideration of Responses and Proposed Amendments to the Regulation 14 Draft NDP

**Table 4 - Comments from Residents (Extracted from SurveyMonkey and hard copy questionnaires from other residents)**

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
Q1 Draft Policy AE1: Alderley Edge Development Strategy	RESPONSES Support 92.96% Object 7.04%	High level of support noted	
	<b>Comments</b>		
AE1	Please see comments set within our accompanying Statement. Although we object, relatively minor changes are recommended.	Noted.	No change.
AE1	Comprehensive, authoritative and well balanced	Noted.	No change.
AE1	Point 4 would appear to rule out most proposals.	Not accepted. The NDP has a strong emphasis in accessibility and encouraging walking and cycling and reducing reliance on the car, in line with Government and CEC sustainability objectives.	No change.
AE1	It is important to have an NDP and I am supportive of it. Without such a plan I feel that future developers would have much more power to manipulate matters to their own advantage.	Noted.	No change.
AE1	5.13 - not happy at the suggestion that green belt boundaries could be changed. this must be resisted at	Noted. Decisions about changes to the Green	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	all costs.	Belt boundary will be taken by CEC through the SADPD. There will be opportunities to submit responses to CEC as part of the consultation process.	
AE1	Overall it is well thought out and presented reflecting a clear vision but a lack of precision in some language at specific points of the strategy may become a hostage to fortune in the future by providing a greater breadth than originally intended ( such as AE8 2 C)	Noted.  Some amendments to wording of policies and supporting text will be made to the Submission Plan and it is likely that the examiner will make recommendations for further changes to improve clarity.	No change.
AE1	Green belt must be sacrosanct. Particularly need bungalows. Design needs to be good but so does building which at the moment is dire and this is because there are not enough site visits by Councils to check on the quality of work.	Noted.  The NDP sets out detailed policies on design and is underpinned by a Design Codes document. It is hoped that this work and the NDP itself will lead to an improvement in quality of design in new development.	No change.
AE1	Brownfield sites should be used, not greenfield or open countryside. This should be protected at all cost.	Noted.  In order to meet the housing requirement it is likely that some greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area will be identified for development through the SADPD. The NDP seeks to promote previously developed / brownfield land wherever possible in AE1 2.	No change.
AE1	Are you going ahead with this plan regardless of what	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	residents say? What is the mechanism to stop this plan being implemented?	<p>Most respondents to the consultation have supported the NDP policies.</p> <p>However the NDP will be published for a further 6 weeks of consultation by CEC, then subjected to an independent examination before it is put to a local referendum. Ultimately all those on the electoral role will have the right to vote on whether the NDP should be used by CEC to determine planning applications. If there is a majority No vote, the NDP will not be used.</p>	
AE1	No housing should be built on Green Space	In order to meet the housing requirement it is likely that some greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area will be identified for development through the SADPD. The NDP seeks to promote previously developed / brownfield land wherever possible in AE1 2.	
Q2 Draft Policy AE2: Design, Scale & Type of new Housing	RESPONSES Support 90.0% Object 8.57%	High level of support noted	
	<b>Comments</b>		
AE2	I support the policy in principle. However the development at ALD4, Beech Road saddens me greatly. It will affect our quality of life so significantly	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site allocations will be determined</p>	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	<p>with increased traffic through the Bollinfields estate, loss of green belt breathing space and pressure and confinement by buildings next to our allotment site, that it will probably be the catalyst for us leaving the village.</p> <p>I have been here for 22 years, my husband's family have been here for generations. The only justification I could possibly see for such a development would be if it was entirely for affordable housing, echoing the reasons for building the council estate in the first place.</p>	through the SADPD but the NDP includes policies to minimise traffic and encourage more walking and cycling.	
AE2	If anything this could be stronger but goes a long way to meeting my expectations. Developers should not be allowed to avoid local responsibilities by paying money to be used elsewhere.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 CEC comments and resulting changes to the NDP Policy.</p>	No change.
AE2	Affordable housing usually means small houses but there is also a need for affordable housing for people with young families who need space	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the NPPF definition of Affordable Housing in the NDP Glossary. Affordable housing can include family sizes accommodation as well as smaller units.</p>	No change.
AE2	Fully support environmental housing	Noted.	No change.
AE2	Should not make it too difficult for affluent housing as it will also continue to allow growth in the area.	Noted.	No change.
AE2	With some reservations! The skewed mix of housing in the village is recognised, but affordable housing requirements must reflect the local employment and	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	entertainment opportunities for potential residents		
AE2	5 bed house can be average sized houses	Not accepted.  5 bedroom houses are generally considered to be larger properties.	No change.
AE2	The design of any new building or estate should be carbon neutral or better, and should produce more renewable energy than the building/ estate uses so that in the long term it could become carbon neutral	Noted.  Policy AE3 addresses this in more detail.	No change.
AE2	Alongside new housing development it is very important to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is put in place.	Noted.  The NDP supports improvements to community and recreational facilities but more strategic matters such as roads, rail services, education and health etc will be dealt with by CEC and other appropriate bodies.	No change.
AE2	I am appreciative of the amount of work put into this by the various groups of people. It is detailed and considerate of the views of Alderley Edge Residents, ensuring for the future, the character of the village is not marred.	Noted.	No change.
AE2	While happy with the overall aims of AE2 am unhappy with 2 elements:  Why do we need any 4 or more bedroom houses given that the focus is on property for elderly down- sizers and affordable starter homes for young people?  Not happy with the "get out" clause that allows	Noted.  The housing needs survey identified a need for a small number of 4 bedroom properties but the Policy promotes a much higher proportion of smaller houses.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	<p>developers to provide the "affordable housing" on a different site or to buy their way out (if I have understood the "commuted sum payment" correctly).</p> <p>Across the country, in areas like Alderley Edge, developers are well versed in finding "exceptional circumstances".</p>	Refer to table 1 CEC comments re affordable housing and resulting changes to the Policy.	
AE2	3A There are many families with 2 or more children. I support 35% 1-2 Bedroom, 15% 4 bedroom 50% 3 bedroom. 3B to stand	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed proportions are identified in the housing needs survey.</p>	No change.
AE2	No encroachment into buffer zone between Alderley and Wilmslow or indeed towards Chelford , Chorley , Mobberley etc or along the bypass. Effective drainage provision for all new properties. There are several areas within Alderley that are suffering drainage problems at the present time without any further complications.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Policy AE9 and the proposed Green Gap.</p> <p>SUDS are promoted in Policy AE3 16.</p>	No change.
AE2	2.D not happy with wording. >10 before affordable kicks in is wrong. leave out "of 10 or more" otherwise you will have 9 big houses and no small ones.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 CEC comments. 10 units is the threshold in the NPPF for affordable housing contributions but the CEC Local Plan Strategy Policy SC 5 Affordable Homes gives a threshold of 11 dwellings or more in Local Service Centres such as Alderley Edge.</p>	No change.
AE2	As time drifts on more and more expensive properties are being built /altered. eg Harden Park. There needs to be a rebalancing of the type of property not just a % of	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP aims to provide a planning</p>	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	new developments being affordable. Builders will not build these properties of their own free will.	framework which supports more sustainable communities and housing based on need rather than developer pressure.	
AE2	Any bungalows should have planning for second storey.	Not accepted.  Such a proposal is beyond the scope of the NDP.	No change.
AE2	Comments are a waste of time unless there is an option to abandon the plan if sufficient objections are lodged opposing it.	Noted.  The NDP will not be finally made (adopted) unless there is a majority Yes vote at a local referendum.	No change.
AE2	I still believe mix should be balanced more towards smaller/affordable properties aimed at first time buyers/elderly. Do we really need more 4 and 5 bed properties?	Noted.  The housing needs survey identified a need for a small number of 4 bedroom properties but the Policy promotes a much higher proportion of smaller houses for the young and elderly.	No change
AE2	I still feel mix is wrong and should be more in favour of smaller/affordable properties.	Noted.  The housing needs survey identified a need for a small number of 4 bedroom properties but the Policy promotes a much higher proportion of smaller houses for the young and elderly.	No change

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
Q3 Draft Policy AE3: Sustainable Housing Design	RESPONSES Support 91.3% Object 7.25%	High level of support noted	
AE3	Retain green spaces, gardens and ensure off street parking is sufficiently provided for.	Noted.  The NDP identifies and protects recreation areas and Local Green Spaces - see Policies AE 10 and AE19.	No change.
AE3	This is crucial NOW	Noted.	No change.
AE3	<p>I support AE3 in general subject to the following: AE3: Paragraph 9. Housing Development on Land that was formerly Green Belt: sets out a target reduction of energy use of 19% compared to standard new build construction for schemes of 10 or more units. The Draft Policy AE3.9 was originally formulated before the UK became the first major economy in the world to pass laws to end its contribution to global warming by 2050. The new national policy will require the UK to bring all greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050, compared with the previous target of at least 80% reduction from 1990 levels. See: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/news/ukbecomes-first-major-economy-to-pass-net-zero-emissions-law">https://www.gov.uk/government/news/ukbecomes-first-major-economy-to-pass-net-zero-emissions-law</a></p> <p>The energy used in the operation of buildings represents the most significant carbon impact from the built environment contributing 30% of the UK's total</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NDP planning policies have to be in general conformity with strategic (here CEC planning Policies) and have regard to national planning policy - see the NPPF. Currently it is difficult for NDPs to set high targets and technical standards for sustainable design.</p> <p>Refer to CEC comments in Table 1 for some changes to the supporting text and policy.</p>	



Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	emissions in 2017. (source UKGBC). New housing that is built within the lifetime of the Alderley Edge NDP will be still in use in 2050 and therefore setting ambitious energy and carbon targets for new housing in the NDP represents an important opportunity to help meet the Government's 2050 Net Zero Target. In the light of the Government's 2050 net zero target it would be appropriate to go further than the 19% improvement proposed in AE3. paragraph 9. and instead increase the ambition of Policy AE3.9 in order that any new housing built on former Green Belt land should be required to achieve energy standards compatible with Net Zero Carbon emissions. Net Zero Carbon for operational energy is achieved when a building's total annual net CO2e emissions equals zero. See definition by UKGBC here: <a href="https://www.ukgbc.org/ukgbc-work/net-zero-carbon-buildings-aframework-definition/">https://www.ukgbc.org/ukgbc-work/net-zero-carbon-buildings-aframework-definition/</a>		
AE3	keen to support environmental housing	Noted.	No change.
AE3	within the constraints of existing proven technology	Noted.	No change.
AE3	Carbon neutral in the long term	Noted.	No change.
AE3	Lazy builders park without regard to verges and other residents. In so far as possible any development plan should contain provisions as to how contractors' vehicles will be parked (preferably within the curtilage of the site). Planning officers will note the miscreants which will may affect future development applications (recent examples are Hough lane and Macclesfield Road.)	Noted.  This is more a matter for enforcement / development management than planning policy.	No change.
AE3	A good policy that reflects current climate change	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	concerns very well.		
AE3	Bat and swift boxes to be included in design proposals. No felling of mature or protected trees. Housing plans must work around natural features e.g. ponds and take into account existing trees and hedgerows. Who will be monitoring / inspecting the builders or contractors who have a habit of doing what they want once planning has been granted?	Noted.	No change. It was agreed that swift bricks and bat boxes were too specific and detailed requirements and that the prerogative for these details should lie with the council's ecologist. Enforcement of what is included within any approval lies with the council's enforcement officer.
AE3	House design must include features to encourage use by wildlife eg bat roosts and swift bricks. Certain species should be written in eg swifts. If you don't tell them they won't do it.	Noted.	No change. See above, also as time goes by the concern over specific species may change.
AE3	Although I support the policies around housing design, there is an indication that Greenfield sites and open countryside may be targeted for new housing developments. This should be resisted.	Noted.  Site allocations will be determined through the SADPD and representations about these should be made to CEC.	No change.
Q4 Draft Policy AE4: Rear Garden & Backland Development	RESPONSES Support 91.18% Object 7.35%	High level of support noted	
AE4	Trees already protected in conservation areas	Noted.	No change.
AE4	Should be strongly resisted.	Noted.	No change.
AE4	really worried out big houses on small plots	Noted.	No change.
AE4	retention of established trees and hedgerows is currently poorly supported by planning approvals	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
AE4	This needs to be controlled very carefully.	Noted.	No change.
AE4	Much thought and consideration has been included for those who could be affected by such development.	Noted.	No change.
AE4	very much agree.	Noted.	No change.
Q5 Draft Policy AE5: Encouraging Entrepreneurship	RESPONSES Support 94.12% Object 4.41%	High level of support noted	
AE5	Para 7.2 - we are no longer 'well represented by national multiple banks'.	Noted. The paragraph goes on to note that in 2019 only one bank and the PO remain.	No change.
AE5	Crucial	Noted.	No change.
AE5	Need faster broadband	Noted.	No change.
AE5	need more digital investment	Noted.	No change.
AE5	The rear of some restaurants is disgusting	Noted. This should be referred to CEC Environmental Health.	No change.
AE5	It could make clearer the need to maintain a mix of businesses whose nature help foster and maintain the character of the village. It is important to maintain the range of businesses that are intrinsic to a village. For example an entrepreneur bringing a sushi bar to the village would be no substitute for the loss of a traditional 'village pub' like the Drum and Monkey.  Similarly a new vodka bar on London Road would not compensate for the loss of the De Trafford Arms. A correct balance including 'anchor' business that are	Noted.  Permitted development rights allow some changes of use without the need for planning permission and therefore controls are limited.  A sushi bar would fall into A3 Food and drink (Restaurants and cafes).  A3 have a permitted change to A1	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	essential to a properly functioning village is important	<p>(shops) or A2 (Financial and Professional services) and temporary permitted change (3 years) to A1, A2, B1 (Business), public library, exhibition hall, museum, clinic or health centre (interchangeable with notification).</p> <p>Pubs and vodka bars would both fall under the same use class - A4 Drinking Establishments (Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments).</p> <p>Uses within A4 have a permitted change to or from a use falling "within Class A4 with a use falling within Class A3" ("drinking establishments with expanded food provision").</p>	
AE5	<p>Why do we want to grow the business economy in Alderley Edge which is primarily a residential village. How does that enhance our local community? Already the growth in the restaurant/bar etc trade means that the village attracts many visitors, particularly in the evenings with no added benefit to local residents. your text refers to the "vitality of town centres". We are not a town - yet. Any growth in workspace/business development will bring more employees people into the village at least during working hours. The car parking problem referenced elsewhere is exacerbated by such commuting staff.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP has a role in supporting employment opportunities and economic growth appropriate to Alderley Edge's position in the settlement hierarchy of a Local Service Centre. The planning system has 3 overarching objectives including an economic objective to help achieve sustainable development.</p>	No change.
AE5	No more restaurants, cafes and the like. The make up	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	of the village is not balanced, no matter what the map on page 46 shows.	The NDP recognises the recent growth in the food and drink economy and this is reflected nationally. However the village centre still retains a range of local shops and services and this is recognised in the NDP.	
AE5	Sounds right	Noted.	No change.
AE5	Small businesses that don't add to the housing burden and school and other facilities. Yes. Mass influx of new residents because of attracting new businesses, No.	Noted.	No change.
Q6 Draft Policy AE6: Supporting existing businesses	RESPONSES Support 95.52% Object 2.99%	High level of support noted	
AE6	Whilst there is a range of businesses there are too many estate agents and too few independent creative and diverse retail businesses	Noted.  Refer to Policy AE5 which supports new business space and entrepreneurship.	No change.
AE6	Would be nice to have some individual shops in the village.	Noted.	No change.
AE6	including small shops	Noted.	No change.
AE6	Further growth of existing businesses will not enhance the village	Not accepted.  Increasing opportunities for local employment should help to reduce the need for travel, and support a more sustainable community with a mix of residents.	No change.
AE6	It is important that the range of businesses in the retail	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	and leisure sector necessary for a village to really call itself a fully functioning village are in place. Consideration could be given to describing 'anchor' business types that are seen as essential. For example village pubs, independent butcher etc	Planning policies are reactive - they are used to determine planning applications. Shopping habits have changed rapidly in recent years nationally but the NDP aims to support a vibrant village centre with a range of shops and services which meet local needs. Proposals to enhance the environment and protect traditional shop fronts will hopefully attract investment from more independent shops and retailers including those selling food.	
AE6	This is important if we wish to retain our bustling main street.	Noted.	No change.
AE6	I hope expansion to existing businesses does not mean expanded restaurant space. The noise in the village centre at night, created by such establishments, is already disturbing for those living nearby.	Noted.  Please refer to comments relating to Policy AE5 above.	No change.
AE6	We have too many eateries, none of which are suitable for me, so must encourage a diversity of other businesses.	Noted.  Please refer to comments relating to Policy AE5 above.	No change.
AE6	Some apparent existing businesses are either closed or barely functional (two cafes). Not a good image.	Noted.	No change.
AE6	Yes, provided the support is to benefit the village and not just businessmen.	Noted.	No change.
Q7 Draft Policy AE7: Encouraging Visitor	RESPONSES Support 94.12%	High level of support noted	

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
support for local businesses	Object 1.47%		
AE7	Limit night time business	Noted.  This is a matter for CEC's Licensing department.	No change.
AE7	Business visitors will mainly come to AE by car, so requirement for additional accommodation is uncertain. High occupancy rates are essential for financial viability.	Noted.	No change.
AE7	The night time business is too large	Noted.  The Policy does not address the night time economy.	No change.
AE7	Emphasis should be placed on the daytime economy not the night time one that seems to fare well on its own	Noted.  The Policy does not address the night time economy.	No change.
AE7	We must recognise and value visitor support, whilst at the same time safe-guarding the village.	Noted.	No change.
AE7	What is the definition of "local economy"? Most of the people working in the village don't live here - hence the car parking problem. Many of the businesses, notably restaurants and bars are utilised by customers who don't live in the village adding to the car parking problem. Most of the businesses are owned by those from outside the village. What "local" mean?	Noted.  The local economy refers to the economy of Alderley Edge.  The NDP has been prepared with the involvement of representatives of the local business community. The NDP Regulations require consultation with those who live, work and do business in	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
		<p>the area and it is appropriate that the NDP responds to local business's concerns and ideas as well as residents'.</p> <p>The NDP seeks to address car parking in other policies and proposals - please refer to Access and Infrastructure section.</p>	
AE7	We need to improve the station environs. We also need more bus routes. It would take me over 12 mins to walk to a bus stop. I can be at the hospital or Handforth Dean in that time by car. Mind you I can't get to Handforth Dean by bus.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Please refer to Access and Infrastructure section for policies and proposals relating to travel.</p> <p>However the NDP has little or no control over bus services.</p>	No change.
AE7	The station entrance and access ways need improvement	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Access and Infrastructure section.</p>	No change.
AE7	That's what Wilmslow is for.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Alderley Edge is a Local Service Centre and some appropriate economic growth is supported in CEC policies.</p>	No change.
Q8 Draft Policy AE8: Supporting a vibrant village centre	RESPONSES Support 95.52% Object 4.48%	High level of support noted	
AE8	No more bars and restaurants please	Noted.	No change.



Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
		Please refer to comments relating to AE5 above.	
AE8	We want a vibrant village centre and, in some way, the presence of supercars adds to this. However, there is a real problem of cars (all sorts) being driven in a dangerous and discourteous fashion. There is a risk to life and it does spoil the atmosphere	Noted.  The policy supports traffic calming measures but NDP planning policies cannot control individuals' use of cars and driving.	No change.
AE8	However the bar culture, which has brought a welcome level of life to the village has got out of hand. I think the number of venues with after midnight licences means we have too many visitors to the village that should really be in a local town. Restriction to midnight would reduce the level of undesirable behaviour without affecting too many bars' profits.	Noted.  Licensing matters should be referred to CEC.	No change.
AE8	need more Bars with Character.	Noted.	No change.
AE8	7.23 The bypass and slow traffic in the village enhance the pedestrian experience. 7.27 Current closure of George St to parking during building work is bizarre!	Noted.	No change.
AE8	Whilst the overarching sentiment is praiseworthy, AE8 2C provides unconditional support to extensions to CCTV without the requirement of any need or benefit.  Alderley Edge has a population of just under 3K, it is not an inner city hotbed of crime. Its crime rate is low and not all these crimes are detected by CCTV.  Surveillance cameras may be justified by the night time economy along London Road but they are not justified	The policy refers to the primary shopping area within Alderley Edge as identified in the draft SADPD Policies Map (ie London Road and adjacent streets).  Any improvements or extensions to the current CCTV system will be subject to evidenced need and working in partnership with the appropriate	Amend NDP Policy AE8:  <u>'Improvements and extensions to the existing CCTV coverage will be supported within the village centre of London Road and adjacent streets, linked to evidenced need.'</u>

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	<p>by need or value across the whole Parish. As written, supporting the unthinking unjustified implementation of CCTV in the Plan is wrong and contrary to the Parish Council's duty as a public authority to comply with human rights and data protection legislation. It may well not be the Council's intention to support CCTV cameras in every residential street or CCTV with ANPR on every leafy lane or road leading to the village but the wording as drafted says it is the Plan's intent to give unconditional support to turning Alderley Edge into a mini surveillance state and gives the impression it is currently a crime ridden Parish .</p> <p>This aspect of the Plan should be reworded to say that 'implementing and supporting CCTV or other security measures will be supported where well justified and proportionate to the nature and level of crime'.</p>	statutory agencies involved.	
AE8	Alderley Edge is a well maintained village to be proud of. However, going forward, I support the proposals put forward to improve and progress the village.	Noted.	No change.
AE8	AE8 C development of 'a pleasant, relaxing village environment which is not dominated by though traffic' - still getting show-offs tearing through the village, revving engines in cars only fit for a racetrack not residential and shopping areas . Also anti-social behaviour still occurring in the evenings, evident the following mornings especially weekends.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The policy supports traffic calming measures but NDP planning policies cannot control individuals' use of cars and driving.</p>	No change.
AE8	1.B Much approve - Gustos is a mess in the morning when they put bins on the pavement and the bin lorry	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	blocks the main road emptying them. Less waste, less bins! 2.A Yellow paint round that awful new eatery. 2.C and number plate recognition and action. There is no point filming something if nothing is then done. CCTV has to be become proactive not reactive.		
AE8	There are increasing volunteer groups helping around the village. There could be some central hub for these where others can see where they can help/join in.	Noted.  AE8 2B supports proposals for temporary community uses of vacant units.	No change.
AE8	What on earth is a vibrant village centre? It sounds like bureaucrat speak. Why can't you stop meddling in things?	Not accepted.	No change.
AE8	However I strongly believe that more effort and thought should be put into enforcement of existing regulations in terms of inconsiderate parking and speeding, particularly at evenings and weekends.	Noted.  The policy supports traffic calming measures but NDP planning policies cannot control / enforce against individuals' use of cars and driving.	No change.
AE8	Irresponsible behaviour with respect to speeding, parking and litter must be enforced, specifically in evenings and weekends.	Noted.  The policy supports traffic calming measures but NDP planning policies cannot control / enforce against individuals' use of cars and driving.	No change.
Q9 Draft Policy AE9: Landscape Character	RESPONSES Support 94.12%	High level of support noted	

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
& Access	Object 1.47%		
AE9	I support this policy in principle. I cannot, however, see how the development of ALD4 Beech Road sits with the Draft Policy AE9 statement that: 'development proposals should not contribute towards the erosion of the green gap between the built up areas of Alderley Edge and the neighbouring town of Wilmslow'	Noted.  This part of the Policy was prepared in response to responses to public consultations that showed that local residents wanted to maintain this area of separation.  A new Map has been included in the Submission Plan identifying the Green Belt.	No change.
AE9	We must keep the village as a village	Noted.	No change.
AE9	As above, the key threat to the character is the speed of the traffic along the entry routes to the village	Noted.	No change.
AE9	The policy as worded is overly onerous. Some limited intervention in the green gap between Alderley and Wilmslow could still be possible with some minor "erosion" but with the important green gap function being retained.	Not accepted. A new Map has been included in the Submission Plan identifying the Green Belt.	No change.
AE9	Support extension to the car park at Ryleys lane	Noted.  Please refer to AE16.	No change.
AE9	Support the new train station development	Noted.  Please refer to AE18.	No change.
AE9	"Cycle linkages" not just where feasible, but also where they will not adversely affect the safety and enjoyment of pedestrians	Noted.  Shared routes for pedestrians and	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
		cyclists should be designed to accommodate all users safely. Refer to Policy AE14 which requires designs to maximise safe accessibility for all non vehicle users.	
AE9	OK as far as you have gone but we also need to watch for growth round Brook Lane as well. In fact ribbon development could occur along any of our outlet routes and could become a problem as current growth areas are restricted.	Noted.  The area around the settlement boundary is in the Green Belt where development is strictly controlled.	No change.
AE9	Greenfield and open countryside should be protected as much as possible	Noted.	No change.
AE9	Only where necessary and where it benefits the village. I see keeping roads in good repair, grass verges cut and residential streets and roads free from weeds. Footpaths levelled to prevent tripping hazards would also fall under my definition. Trees trimmed but not felled. We are supposed to be living in a village, not a suburb of a major town. Keep it a village. That entails limiting the number of people living here.	Noted.  These are not matters of planning policy but refer to highways (managed by CEC), public footpaths and possibly trees on private land (some of which are protected by TPOs).	No change.
Q10 Draft Policy AE10: Local Green Spaces	RESPONSES Support 95.59% Object 1.47%	High level of support noted	
AE10	Generate more green spaces	Noted.  Please refer to Table 2 Sport England's comments. It is proposed to amend AE19 to refer to developer contributions	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
		towards sports and recreation facilities.	
AE10	But need to develop it for better use.	Noted.	No change.
AE10	We should be stronger and deny use of green space. Once it is lost it will be lost for good. Do we really need to blight the lives of our decedents even more than we have done. Preserve the green space around Alderley.	Noted.	No change.
AE10	Can we create new 'green spaces' ? End of Marlborough Ave.	Green space at Moss Lane/Marlborough Avenue was evaluated but unlike other LGS sites was not considered to be demonstrably special because it is located within a residential development and not at a key village gateway or alongside a listed building or site	No change
AE10	10.6 triangle Moss Lane and Marlborough Avenue.	See point immediately above	No change
AE10	I see that oddly the cemetery is not in Alderley Edge Parish . Do we have any influence re the sorry state of the interesting entrance building?	Noted.  This is outside the role of the NDP. The building is presumably in the ownership of CEC.	No change.
AE10	Retain and take good care of existing green spaces. No reduction in green spaces. Local facilities primarily for residents of the village.	Noted.	No change.
AE10	Unless would improve road safety and traffic flow	Noted.	No change.
Q11 Draft Policy AE11: Protecting and enhancing the Conservation Area and adjacent areas	RESPONSES Support 97.06% Object 1.47%	High level of support noted	
AE11	Developers should not be permitted to squeeze	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	additional properties into small gardens	Refer to AE4.	
AE11	More and better walking areas	Noted.  Please refer to Access and Infrastructure section.	No change.
AE11	ASAP	Noted.	No change.
AE11	The descriptions seem too restrictive for developments in the conservation area. Chimneys for instance should not be required, as they may encourage burning of fossil fuels. Driveways should be similar to those near by, not necessarily tarmacadam.	Noted.  The criteria are drawn from the Conservation Area Appraisal. They are necessarily prescriptive to protect the special character of the conservation area.	No change.
AE11	Any development should require contractors' vehicles to be parked within the curtilage of the development if possible	Noted.  This is a matter for development management but it would be difficult to enforce in practice.	No change.
AE11	If it really does bite hard and protect our green space.	Noted.	No change.
AE11	New development - no felling of mature trees unless health and safety issues and such must be proved by professionals . Not just a case of that branch looks dodgy so we must take the whole tree down and then an extra house can be included in the plans!!! Gardens a priority.	Noted.  Mature trees in the Conservation Areas will be protected by TPOs.	No change.
AE11	11.2.B is not consistent with affordable.  I am unhappy with the way that RENDER is used as a cheap way to cover up poor brickwork. AE is beginning	Noted.  Render is considered to be a suitable material in the Conservation Area	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	to look like Greece. (Just look towards Squirrel's Jump). Brick should be used where brick buildings predominate. Render is a last resort so put brick first on the list. Not many can afford sandstone however nice it looks.	Appraisal and the list of materials is not in any particular order of priority.	
AE11	Keep all conservation areas. Stop encroaching on greenbelt land.	Noted.	No change.
Q12 Draft Policy AE12: Local & Historic Character	RESPONSES Support 97.01% Object 0%	High level of support noted	
AE12	support a template for the high street	Noted.  Please refer to AE8.	No change.
AE12	Any development should require contractors' vehicles to be parked within the curtilage of the development if possible	Noted.  This is a matter for development management but it would be difficult to enforce in practice.	No change.
AE12	Has anyone thought of creating a village trail to include special places of interest and to culminate in a visit to the Edge itself ? Are you aware that the Scout and Guide Hut is the oldest in the world ?	Noted.  Refer to Parish Council or local historical society for consideration.	No change.
AE12	Yes. We live in an English monoculture and that should be maintained.	Noted.	No change.
Q13 Draft Policy AE13: Key views and townscape	RESPONSES Support 97.06% Object 1.47%	High level of support noted	



Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
AE13	These are what make the village especially the initial impressions.	Noted.	No change.
AE13	Support castle rock view	Noted.	No change.
AE13	Must retain the surrounding historic rural landscape as well as that of the Edge itself.	Noted.	No change.
AE13	Good point but not sure you should limit it to just these views.	Noted.  The views were considered and identified through the Design Codes process as the most important.	No change.
AE13	Are views a big thing for the locals?	Noted. The Policy has been supported by residents responding to several public consultations.	No change.
Q14 Draft Policy AE14: Sustainable transport routes	RESPONSES Support 95.45% Object 4.55%	High level of support noted	
AE14	More use of bus and train travel should be encouraged. I try to take the bus to Wilmslow whenever possible	Noted.	No change.
AE14	Cycle routes would be good	Noted.	No change.
AE14	Need better cycle hub at the train station, and an electric charging point	Noted.  Please refer to AE18.  Consider adding a cycle charger to the station AE18 3.	No change to AE14.  Amend AE18:  Add <b><u>and an electric cycle charging point</u></b> to AE18 3 after "facilities"

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
AE14	It must be recognised that many footpaths are not suitable for cycle, wheelchairs etc and routes should be clearly identified accordingly.	Noted.  Public footpaths should not be used by cyclists but bridleways can be. The Policy aims to improve accessibility for all.	No change.
AE14	Joint action with adjacent neighbourhoods should be a primary action.	Noted.  The NDP can only be used to guide development in the designated area (see Map 1) but there may be opportunities to link routes with neighbouring parishes.	No change.
AE14	I do not think the wording is strong enough for developers to include 'proper' cycling provision into their plans. One developer can at present allow for cycling route on their development which doesn't link up at all with the next development next door. More joined-up thinking and work required to make this a workable plan giving a cycling route that is feasible around our area.	Noted.  Hopefully CEC take a strategic view across the area.	No change.
AE14	It is essential new developments encourage the use of walking and cycling routes	Noted.	No change.
AE14	Cycle path to Wilmslow please (not on the main road) and support for a reliable 130 bus route. Pleased to see that timetables have been delivered for the 130 bus this week.	Noted.	No change.
AE14	The bus and rail facilities are appalling. And now that Arriva have handed the bus routes over to D&G, the	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	number of buses has reduced to one per hour. That's a good way to keep people off public transport. Is that the intention? We're not all wealthy enough to afford taxis to take us everywhere.	The NDP cannot control bus service provision.	
Q15 Draft Policy AE15: Promoting accessibility to public transport	RESPONSES Support 96.97% Object 1.52%	High level of support noted	
AE15	Definitely to stop all the bad parking	Noted.  Management of car parking cannot be addressed through the NDP.	No change.
AE15	The hilly nature of AE makes walking a difficult task for a village with an aged profile It must be recognised that a very large proportion of train users and shoppers in AE live outside the village.	Noted.	No change.
AE15	Doesn't help when the local bus service stops at Handforth and no longer goes into Manchester. I realise that there is not a lot you can do about this.	Noted.	No change,
AE15	When are we getting bus stop arrival displays?	Noted.  This is not a matter for the NDP. Please refer to bus company and/or CEC.	No change.
AE15	Yes.	Noted.	No change.
Q16 Draft Policy AE16: Supporting the provision of additional parking spaces at Ryleys Lane car park which	RESPONSES Support 92.54% Object 5.97%	High level of support noted	

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
is adjacent to the Park to improve car parking facilities in Alderley Edge			
AE16	I support this, but there needs to be a system to avoid the car park being full of commuter cars from early morning until evening.	Noted.  Car park management is not a planning policy matter.	No change.
AE16	With some reservation. The car park should be time limited donut can't be used by train commuters and airport users.	Noted.  Car park management is not a planning policy matter.	No change.
AE16	How about adding a deck to the current footprint. This would achieve the aim of increased parking slots, without losing too much of the Park. Fund raising should be considered along side the traditional routes of government /section 103 pots.	Noted.  The design and scale of the car park would be considered as part of the development process.	No change.
AE16	I object to the loss of amenity and green space that increasing the size of Ryleys Lane Car Park would entail. Increasing the car parking provision in this location will contribute to increased traffic congestion and air pollution close to the villages 3 main schools.	Noted.  The policy has been prepared in response to significant local concerns about car parking and the need to find solutions to address existing problems more effectively. The policy would require re-provision and relocation of the area of open space which would be used.	No change.
AE16	Good screening is essential	Noted.	No change.
AE16	But any work done on parking has to include a plan for monitoring bad parking which at present is totally	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	ignored by the authorities, so offenders get away with it.	Car park management is not a planning policy matter.	
AE16	Unless something sensible like underground parking (like the French do) then I strongly object to increasing the area for parking. The winging "oh, its too expensive" is a pathetic reply. Let me compare the quotes, which must include a long term view.	Noted.  The design and scale of the car park would be considered as part of the development process.	No change.
AE16	This exploits a relatively unused part of the park and is preferable to loosing allotments anywhere in the village.	Noted.	No change.
AE16	Shame to lose parkland space but I suppose this is inevitable. Could a corresponding green space be identified elsewhere ?	Noted.  The policy would require re-provision and relocation of the area of open space which would be used. The location for this has not yet been identified.	No change.
AE16	Could some of housing development site ALD2 or 3 be used as a car park?	Noted.  This would be a matter for the site allocation / SADPD process.	No change.
AE16	The park should be protected.	Noted.  The policy would require re-provision and relocation of the area of open space which would be used.	No change.
AE16	There are too many cars parking in Alderley. Measures should be taken to ban and discourage people coming to Alderley Edge to park up for the day and presumably take the train into work. This whole policy/ philosophy is wrong and the evidence is there for all to see.	Noted.  The NDP includes a wide range of other policies and proposed measures to encourage more walking and cycling	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
		and reduced reliance on cars.	
AE16	Very strongly support	Noted.	No change.
Q17 Draft Policy AE17: Car Parking	RESPONSES Support 93.94% Object 3.03%	High level of support noted	
AE17	<p>Despite what appears to have been an orchestrated negative response to the proposal to change part of the Heyes Lane allotment site into a car park, I would still like the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council to consider this option.</p> <p>As far as I understand, the covenant on the land was for it to be available to the people of Alderley Edge for community use. The Festival Hall is our last remaining community building, and additional parking would help its commercial viability. At present 'Allotment Holders Only' excludes most people, and I strongly support the idea of a public garden on the remainder of the site as, I regret to admit, the Heyes Lane allotments are looking more of an eyesore than ever before. Please don't let this one slip into obscurity.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The PC and Steering group made the decision not to pursue this matter through the NDP - see Community Facilities section.</p> <p>However it is likely that the proposals may have to be revisited at some point in the future to support the viability of the Festival Hall.</p>	No change.
AE17	Obvious options are multi decks on the car park behind Royles Square and Highams. Funding will be the issue, but go after standard funding routes and ask local wealthier residents to contribute. Chess might be persuaded to build a deck on their car park to increase their own capacity.	Noted.	No change.
AE17	need more, but not in the centre of the village	Noted.	No change.
AE17	What happened to the proposal for buses from	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	Alderley Park to transport pupils to the village school on route to the station?	This is not an NDP matter.	
AE17	I support with the caveat that the statement implying there is no consensus on using the Heyes Lane allotments for some car parking is wrong. There is a 75% consensus in favour of doing something and a small minority against. The plan should reflect that the vast majority of the respondents want this land used for car parking to some extent	Noted.  The PC and Steering group made the decision not to pursue this matter through the NDP - see Community Facilities section.  However it is likely that the proposals may have to be revisited at some point in the future to support the viability of the Festival Hall.	No change.
AE17	More car parking is vital	Noted.	No change.
AE17	In addition to Ryleys Lane. Heyes Lane provision of parking for the Festival Hall and Medical Centre. The option considered of 25% of allotment space for parking, 75% for park/green open space seemed ideal giving Festival Hall more prominence and crucially more parking!	Noted.  The PC and Steering group made the decision not to pursue this matter through the NDP - see Community Facilities section.  However it is likely that the proposals may have to be revisited at some point in the future to support the viability of the Festival Hall.	No change.
AE17	Very disappointing. As already noted, car parking problems was/is one of the major concerns of local residents. This report seems to offer few answers to that problem. Doubling the number of spaces on the	Noted.  The NDP includes a range of policies and proposals to help tackle this issue	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	Riley's Lane car park will have little effect and a few more spaces for rail users at the station gateway, while a welcome idea, is again a drop in the ocean. After that the Plan offers no solutions other than street parking, so, as you are, to the continued annoyance of local residents. The greater use of public transport is obviously an important way of reducing reliance on cars but the village is hardly big enough to support an expanded bus or rail service	including reducing local reliance on private cars.	
AE17	But any work done on parking has to include a plan for monitoring bad parking which at present is totally ignored by the authorities, so offenders get away with it.	Noted.  Parking management is not an NDP matter.	No change.
AE17	I'm a strong supporter of parking provision using part of the Heyes Lane allotments, Option 3 or possibly Option 2. The Festival Hall and the village as a whole need this provision and it should not be blocked by a vociferous minority	Noted.  The PC and Steering group made the decision not to pursue this matter through the NDP - see Community Facilities section.  However it is likely that the proposals may have to be revisited at some point in the future to support the viability of the Festival Hall.	No change.
AE17	There is an inadequate bus service between Alderley Edge and Wilmslow. Many people walk across the fields to the roundabout at Melrose Way, but thereafter have to walk adjacent to the very busy road. I would urge co-operation between the Parish Council and Wilmslow Town Council to have a	Noted.  This will be referred to the PC for consideration.	No change.



Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	footpath/cycleway through the Royal London site when it is developed.		
AE17	Unless we do something radical, such as underground parking, then no-one will be happy. Do not use green space to park cars.	Noted.  Refer to AE16 - any loss of open space would be subject to re-provision elsewhere.	No change.
AE17	The plan should encourage village residents to walk and cycle when traveling within the village. People who commute to the village for work should be encouraged to use public transport. New businesses that would generate more car travel (and therefore parking) within the village should be discouraged.	Noted.  The NDP includes a range of policies and proposals to help encourage walking and cycling and to reduce local reliance on private cars.	No change.
AE17	No new development - housing or business - without parking areas included as part of the plans.	Noted.  Please refer to CEC parking standards as advised in AE3 4.	No change.
AE17	AE17.2 needs rewording.  AE17.B remove "whereever possible" They will try to wriggle out of it whatever you write.	Not accepted.  There may be cases where this is not viable / possible.	No change.
AE17	More carparking will attract more cars. That's not what is needed for the village.	Noted.  The NDP includes a range of policies and proposals to help encourage walking and cycling and to reduce local reliance on private cars.	No change.
AE17	Definitely an area of concern especially as people use the village to park and get the train into Manchester.	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	Clearly this is an ongoing issue for may areas.		
Q18 Draft Policy AE18: The Station Gateway	RESPONSES Support 92.42% Object 3.03%	High level of support noted	
AE18	Please note this area floods	Noted.  Improvements at the station may offer an opportunity to address drainage / surface water flooding issues.	No change.
AE18	Station approach should be listed	Noted.  This could be referred to CEC for consideration for local listing.	No change.
AE18	The current state of the station is still an embarrassment (although has recently been improved a lot)	Noted.	No change.
AE18	The station itself looks dreadful	Noted.	No change.
AE18	Like the idea of the shop	Noted.	No change.
AE18	Looks good and really needed	Noted.	No change.
AE18	1. Signage - yes 5. Extension to car park - yes if feasible 6. Protection - yes 2,3,4. either very difficult or not worthwhile		
AE18	If this side of the Station is the 'gateway', the ticket office should be relocated to the 'gateway' side, then consideration given how best to exploit the other 'Manchester bound' side, Vehicle access on to London Rd from that ticket office cul de sac is precarious.	Noted.	No change.
AE18	Big need for improvement here - the station is one of the most important access points to the village.	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
AE18	No more shops and rubbish	Noted.  An enhanced scheme could include a small retail unit.	No change.
AE18	Needs very careful thought or at certain times of day this area could become a highly dangerous bottleneck, particularly if there are children alighting from school buses and from trains from Wilmslow.	Noted.	No change.
AE18	Go to Wilmslow when the evening London train arrives to see how NOT to do it.	Noted.	No change.
Q19 Draft Policy AE19: Protecting and enhancing local community facilities	RESPONSES Support 96.88% Object 1.56%	High level of support noted	
AE19	Sorry, but totally disagree with the decision to not increase the Festive Hall parking at the expense of some of the allotments. What was the point in developing the fantastic Hall if visitors have no parking? Upset the minority for the benefit of the majority. The waiting list for plots is low, especially if you ban out of village users!	Noted.  Regrettably the 'majority' referred to by this respondent did not turn out to make their voices heard at the last consultation and for that reason the PC and Steering group made the decision not to pursue this matter through the NDP - see Community Facilities section.  If the community does in the future support such an initiative then the proposals may be revisited outside the NDP with a view to supporting the viability of the Festival Hall.	No change.
AE19	But still needs to allow economic growth	Noted.	No change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
AE19	Agreed for all except allotments. Historically a high proportion have been allocated to non village residents. May appear to be unused. No need for more allotments	Noted.	No change.
AE19	More care needs to be taken not to imply that all facilities are open to all members of the community.  They are not, some have membership selection criteria and significant fees beyond the means of some. The Plan should have the encouragement of inclusivity for all members of the community as an objective.	Noted. The NDP cannot influence private club memberships.	No change.
AE19	Who is going to pay for this? I want a lowering of Council Tax and this sounds like another cost that we'll have to bear whether we use the facilities or not. Lower the Council Tax and make us all happy.	Noted.  The NDP supports improvements but is not linked to funding proposals.  The Policy will be amended to refer to developer contributions - see Table 2 - Sport England comments.	No change.
AE19	We have briefly reviewed the most recent Alderley Edge Neighbourhood Plan (AENP) proposal. The wider and key intent of the NP appears to be generally to protect existing facilities (green space, playing field, park, facilities (hall etc.) etc.) that we would support.  We do also consider it is widely accepted (and as village grows – i.e. more potential residential development etc.) that such facilities (green space, playing field, park, facilities) will always be required (currently at a minimum level) and even if they were not in use would	Noted.  Refer to Table 2 - the Policy will be amended in line with Sport England's comments to provide a more robust framework to protect existing sports and recreation facilities.	No further change.

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	<p>be converted to an alternative public space i.e. as one example if a hall fell into disrepair / under-utilisation (we would hope not – example only) then this would be converted to a grassed park for public use (or other alternative public use etc.). Therefore it is on this basis that we consider the potential scope for / reference for “Developers to seek change of use” to public spaces is too open and “inviting’ to seek such a change and also for them to demonstrate (as currently worded at Draft Policy AE19 and copied below for ease of reference).</p> <p>When reading it may be perceived to essentially “open the door” for a developer (many such with their significant resource (both people, in house planning teams and financial powers)) to argue their position and support a case even though it may not be in the villages wider interest and or desire. We do not consider that the AENP needs to open such a door.</p> <p>Taking a number of examples: AE19 states</p> <p>The change of use of existing facilities to other uses will be resisted unless the following can be demonstrated:</p> <p>“A: The proposal includes alternative provision, on a site within the locality, of equivalent or enhanced facilities. Such sites should be accessible by various means of transport including walking and cycling and have adequate car parking”</p>		

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	<p>What does “on a site within the locality” actually mean. Could this mean relocation of a space / facility to the outer extremities of the village in lieu of its current perhaps central location. This would be a significant negative for many residents and the village as a whole. Such facilities must remain the centre to be accessible to all. This is too open? Gives potential Developers too much option and freedom to target such important areas and to provide for very unsatisfactory (not comparable) alternatives.</p> <p>“B: There is no longer a need for the facility, and this can be robustly demonstrated by the developer through public consultation.”</p> <p>As intimated above developers are experienced and have pools of resource (and funds) to apply to demonstrating a case. This is where the general public can find it difficult to compete (against such experience and cash positive companies). Further it might be that the facility may no longer be needed as its current intended purpose however it is without doubt if not needed to provide one public service could be utilised to provide for another public service i.e. a hall would actively be utilised as a park (as previous paragraph). We would suggest the wording should be less “open” to developers and provide more for our public spaces to be retained as public spaces. Such wording should be for our own (the village) influence in its change of use for public spaces (not a developer or</p>		

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
	<p>other independent whom is solely looking at a space for their own financial gain). Such areas of public space (centrally located) within Alderley Edge are so very limited that we should be ensuring their upmost protection as public space indefinitely – not opening doors to their removal by developers (or others).</p> <p>The above wording (and as below extract) could have far reaching planning and legal implications and as such we consider should be re-worded (and also checked by independent specialist planning advisors) to ensure that there is no “opening up” (and importantly legally binding) opportunities for developers. This should be to ensure no conflict or legal interpretation that could be used and or go against the intended interpretation of this clause. The “devil is in the detail” and as such ensuring the correct wording to protect such key assets and the desires of the village is fundamental. Ultimately (and in summary) we do not consider such potential “doors” need to be opened (easily opened) as in draft policy ae19 for developers within the AENP and we should instead within the AENP (and draft policy a19) be seeking to retain public and open public spaces for such permanent public use only (and for providing greater protection of the same) and therefore the wording should be amended accordingly.</p>		
Q20 Draft Policy AE20: Chorley Hall Lane Playing Fields	<b>RESPONSES</b> Support 96.92% Object 1.54%	High level of support noted	

Question/ Vision/ Objective/ Draft Policy	Responses and comments	Steering Group and Sub-group consideration	Agreed changes to the NDP
AE20	We should absolutely see regular football here	Noted.	No change.
AE20	Great idea	Noted.	No change.
AE20	Important local facility	Noted.	No change.
AE20	A very worth while project, we must have up to date facilities within Alderley so that the youngsters are not forced to travel to home games.	Noted.	No change.
AE20	Most of the Chorley Hall Playing fields site is unusable because it is too low and too wet.	Noted.	No change.
AE20	I have not read this. I support keeping them and I support moving them to release the land but only if we all gain, including the children	Noted.	No change.
AE20	How often are these playing fields used?	Noted.  Please refer to club. The facilities are not currently usable due to their poor condition and the club has to use facilities elsewhere – as noted in the NDP. They require investment in order to allow regular use	No change.
AE20	Are they (will they be) that well used?	Noted.  The club currently has to use facilities outside the parish and fully intends to use them when they are improved.	No change.
AE20	Yes the building needs a renovation.	Noted.	No change.
AE20	Keep this playing field for use by the village.	Noted.	No change.