

Winsford Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

All representations are available to view in full on the Councils Consultation Portal at:

http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/np/winsford_np

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Jon Caulfield		WNP1	<p>As a long standing resident of Winsford, I have major concerns with the current plan. I feel that this council has not actively engaged with the community of Winsford regarding major development work that will have an adverse affect on the look of the town forever.</p> <p>Winsford does not have many things going for it as a town, the town centre is a magnet pound shops and nothing else, Winsford does however have several green areas such Whitegate way, Ways Green- the flashes and Rilshaw meadows etc. I am very upset that this council is thinking for one second about ruining these beautiful natural areas for the sake of development to please a national government who have decided from London that this town needs over 3000 more homes. Local ism was supposed to give more power to local communities and not allow Westminster to dictate how this town will look. Councillors from Tattenhal and Chester should also not be allowed to dictate on our towns future.</p> <p>I have lived on Ways Green for many years and the area looks like one big building site, dust and rubbish from the current site destroying out green fields is blowing across the roads and covering cars and my children's toys on a daily basis. This area in particular has seen so much development over recent years that it hardly resembles the neighbourhood that we moved into years ago.</p> <p>I am honestly so disappointing and upset that this town and unitary council is once again looking to develop and not protect this beautiful space.</p>
Mr Terence Baxter		WNP3	<p>The first thing I want to say is that I'm not against change / progress / planning (at whatever level) and agree that there is a real need to develop Winsford on a structural (infrastructure / Town Centre in particular) basis and to develop certain area's of the Town in a sensitive / sympathetic (to it's history and taking full account of what already makes it special) and sustainable basis.</p> <p>My thoughts on Winsford's Neighbourhood Plan, as currently drafted, and the whole NP process, as followed by Winsford Town Council and CW&C Council to date, are as follows:</p> <p>(1) The consultation process has been fundamentally flawed, and considerably (some would say irretrievably) damaged, by Winsford Town Council's abject failure to deliver copies of the "Winsford Voice" Neighbourhood Plan "Special Edition" updates covering the proposed Neighbourhood Plan to residents in many area's of Winsford which has undoubtedly affected the amount of feedback received throughout the process - particularly in those area's that are potentially most affected like Rilshaw Lane (development area's S1 / S2 / S3) and Ways Green / Gladstone St / Townfields Road (development area's STC2 / STC4). My property overlooks development area's STC2 and STC4 and neither of these publications have been delivered to my address. I am aware of the proposals and accept, to a limited degree, that the issue has been highlighted in the local press (not read by everyone), at the local Libraries (not attended by everyone) , at "drop in sessions" at various places (not attended by everyone depending on location / timings) etc but still feel that these publications were a vitally, and possibly the most, important part of the consultation process. I feel that the failure to deliver these publications, whether by negligence or design, is inexcusable, has led to many people still not being fully aware of the real extent of the development proposals in the (2) That the inclusion of certain development area's in the Neighbourhood Plan and has prejudiced</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>the whole consultation process - making a mockery of any pretence that any "feedback" received would be considered and acted upon (the inclusion / extension of development area's STC2 / STC4 during the process being based on landowner willingness to sell / developer willingness to build rather than feedback from Winsford residents also illustrates this). The way that earlier stages of the NP process have been handled does not bode well for future stages of the process when the people of Winsford need to become far more knowledgeable about the proposals that they are being asked to vote on in the referendum - failure to engage voters will clearly impact on turnout.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan is contrary to both the current Vale Royal Borough Council (now CW&C) Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework . For example the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that the vast majority of development area STC4 is in a long established Conservation Area, whose ongoing maintenance by the Local Planning Authority remains covered by Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Area) Act 1990, and that development area STC2 is in a visually sensitive area but still proceeds to propose a considerable amount of residential development in both area's on a scale that will undoubtedly change the whole character of both in the process - reducing their existing appeal and making the whole area less attractive to visitors in the future. Neither of these area's have been included in earlier Local Plan's and I believe that development in these area's is contrary to sections BE1 / BE10 / BE11 (and other policies) of the Local Plan, whose September 2013 version continues to incorporate these sections of the earlier VRBC Local Plan, and paragraphs 131 / 133 / 134 / 137 (and others) of the National Planning Policy Framework. I believe that the issue of compliance with these, and all other, policies should have been fully established / confirmed before final development area decisions were made rather than during the subsequent planning process (see conservation area issues that are arising in relation to planning application 13/02760/OUT which has been submitted in advance of the NP referendum by a developer heavily involved in this process) and that the willingness of landowners to sell their land / developers to come forward with development plans has been a far bigger driver in the whole process than local residents wishes - which is contrary to the whole spirit of Localism.</p> <p>(3) That Winsford Town Council have used / considered inappropriate documentation in the process adversely affecting their decision on development area's. Development area STC4 is mostly within the existing boundary of St. Chad's Conservation Area, designated in 1979 and extended / re-designated in 1990, and the area has had no subsequent Appraisal since those dates. Winsford Town Council were fully involved in these Appraisals / supportive of these two designations, and consequently fully aware of this, but have proceeded on the basis that the area has never been fully Appraised and have instead considered a wholly partial / developer funded Conservation Area "Appraisal" , rather than the original designation papers which were presumed to be lost and have only recently been located. This wholly partial document was even accessible via Winsford Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan website without any reference to the fact that it was not an impartial LPA Conservation Area Appraisal, as required by the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Area) Act 1990, and have incorrectly / inappropriately considered this in deciding to include development area STC4 in the latest draft of the NP. Winsford Town / CW&C Council's have indicated that developers often provide supporting / background documents to Council's but that's not quite the same as the weighty Conservation Area "Appraisal" that has been published by developer Richborough Estates in this case. I believe that a full and impartial LPA Conservation Area Appraisal should have been held as part of this process and that that document alone should have been considered in deciding on development area's - or if not that only the original Appraisal and designation papers should have been considered if the cost of a new LPA Appraisal was considered to be prohibitive. I believe that the publication / consideration of this developer "Appraisal", rather than holding a new LPA Appraisal or locating and using archive documents that both councils knew full well existed, calls into question the impartiality and legality of the entire process and has potentially prejudiced the decision to include development area STC4 in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Rosemarie Lee		WNP2	<p>The Neighborhood plan focuses heavily on the Flashes as an untapped amenity and it plays an integral part in the housing plans vision. I can concur it's beauty and idyllic contribution to the landscape that borders Winsford is indisputable. The reason for this is that it is untouched, it lies in the main undisturbed by any human footfall or mechanical disturbance.</p> <p>If the plan should go forward subject to vote, then it will have a huge impact on this present situation in many ways. The changes will undoubtedly affect the environment, wildlife and biodiversity of all the boarding lands with the new access to cycle ways and pedestrian footpaths. It will require much conversation and consideration to comply with the EU environmental strategies that are in place to protect the existing conservation areas and habitats. It will change everything about the Flashes visual borders and once changed there will be no return.</p> <p>The plan is a positive vision for Winsford it is therefore vital that every effort should if it go forward be made to ensure that the environmental impact be thoroughly investigated using EU policies and local user groups. I would encourage the independent review board to come and visit the sites of the footpaths and cycle ways and the provisional site of the footbridge, before making their final decision.</p>
Mr John Doherty		WNP4	<p>It is with great concern that the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan is progressing to referendum stage via Cheshire West & Chester Council even though the complete process of collating information through to creating & up to the final publicising & examination of the WNP has from the very start & throughout been endemically flawed.</p> <p>(1) The initial selection of the Winsford Town Council steering group (a collection of individuals without the expertise of large scale development, this was confirmed by a fellow councillor at the Town Council meeting held on the 28th May) elected to manage & create a major town planning development. The chair of this group was actively involved in this major project with complete disregard to the townspeople who voted him as their ward councillor. This surely is a huge conflict of interest as the proposed WNP is directly against the wishes of this very same electorate.</p> <p>(2) The initial consultation/information gathering phase was carried out incompetently:</p> <p>(a) a drop in centre in a dilapidated shopping precinct which is seldom used by the majority of the towns people, was never going to receive much footfall & in fact did not.</p> <p>(b) the few consultation workshops held were of low attendance & several attendees involved where present at two if not all workshops. Also note should be taken that several councillors attended these. Not really a good cross section of the general public.</p> <p>(c) face to face with public at the two supermarkets in the town during off peak times cannot be credited as successful.</p> <p>In all three cases A,B,C, this discounted people out at work and housing was not specifically addressed.</p> <p>How can the views of 1 in 114 people be a true representation of the population of Winsford? This is the actual statistic which is less than 1% of the 34,000 residents.</p> <p>(d) post cards from school children "sent from a future Winsford" defies words. To even consider this as a plausible view to ascertain</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>the needs of the town's adult population is an insult.</p> <p>(e) From conception, a large number of consultees were made up of interested parties i.e.. Bellway Homes, Morris Homes, Wimpy Homes and many other developers, who of course would have information prior to the town's public. How can this be in keeping with the ethos of the Localism Act? This has highlighted areas of the town for which developers are now endeavouring to obtain planning permission. One such example is that of a conservation area by St. Chad's Church bordering Townsfield Road. Richborough Homes in their planning application provided "their own" conservation report, which would blatantly be biased to their own benefit.</p> <p>(f) The Winsford Voice, a vehicle used by Winsford Town Council to communicate with the townspeople, was delivered to many residents after the cut off date for response. Also, areas which would be directly affected by the mass development planned were "missed out" by the company hired to deliver this document. Delivery maps can be provided to substantiate this issue.</p> <p>We were unaware of the Neighbourhood Plan until early 2013, details of which were provided by a neighbour in a leaflet drop.</p> <p>Five days prior to the Neighbourhood Plan being forwarded to CWACC for ratification, we attended a local residents meeting along with Councillor Brian Clarke. It was at this point that we realised it was too late for us to influence the proposed development within the Neighbourhood Plan. At this meeting, Councillor's Clarke & Booher advised us that without the Neighbourhood Plan Winsford would be open to mass development, thus trying to coerce us into acceptance of THEIR proposed plan. At no time during the meeting did Councillor Clarke make us aware of his lead role within the Neighbourhood Plan steering group.</p> <p>Overall, the plan has many flaws:</p> <p>Poor consultation/information gathering</p> <p>Ownership of the land highlighted is incorrect in many areas</p> <p>Description of current land use is incorrect i.e. Station Road Quarter is agricultural land and not open countryside.</p> <p>One particular proposed development shown contains ancient woodland which is grade A SBI. This cannot have the cycle track that the plan proposes so therefore scoping has not been carried out thoroughly by the consultants, which is surely one disadvantage of using a firm from London who do not even know the area or its history. This again is misleading to the general public.</p> <p>Deliberate disinformation e.g. Falsifying information on the Council website. Evidence is available. Providing incorrect information with regards to council meetings and where they were being held. Again, evidence is available.</p> <p>Ensuring that meetings were held at times and in areas that would be difficult for working people to attend. Why was the Welsh Lane proposed development meeting held at Ellesmere Port?</p> <p>No communication with the local Wildlife Trust has been made</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Geological fault line not taken into account</p> <p>In addition, we would like to raise the following points:</p> <p>Station Quarter proposed development is vastly disproportionate to the rest of the plan</p> <p>The increase in traffic could not be supported by current highways infrastructure and as yet no travel plan or infrastructure plan has been provided.</p> <p>Could create serious drainage and flooding issues. Farmland in Station Road quarter is subject to flooding during heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Subsidence is very evident in some properties within the area. Many of which have tie bars running through them</p> <p>Many protected species including barn owls and bats would be affected by loss of habitat</p> <p>It would remove the last vestige of green space which is at a premium within Winsford and greatly valued by townspeople for recreational and aesthetic reasons</p> <p>It would change the character of Rilshaw Lane which effectively is a small hamlet on the edge of the town and would have significant adverse impact on the quality of life and well being for the existing residents.</p> <p>It would extend an existing area of urban sprawl</p> <p>It is totally unnecessary in this current economic climate and will not enable any new business to start or create permanent jobs across any business sector.</p> <p>It will not regenerate Winsford Cross shopping centre as this is privately owned</p> <p>Building on farmland is against National Policy Planning Framework</p> <p>Losing good agricultural land is not sustainable</p> <p>Throughout Winsford Town Council and Cheshire West & Chester Council have not been open or transparent with regards to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We as residents of Winsford are not opposed to a Neighbourhood Plan and would welcome as stated to the council previously a new plan using Parish areas to provide work groups from each, working alongside the council. The cost of devising and seeing this plan through to the referendum is not cost effective. The money would be better spent on a robust plan that includes as it should have done originally, the genuine views of the townspeople.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Quote from the localism act</p> <p>1.1 Under the act, new rights will allow local communities to shape new development by coming together to prepare Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>1.2 A Neighbourhood Plan will allow local people to say where they think new houses, businesses and shops should go and what they should look like, what open space should be protected, the design and quality of new development and much more.....</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>John & Denise Doherty</p>
Mr Simon Artiss	<p>Planning Manager North West</p> <p>Bellway Homes Limited (North West)</p>	WNP10	<p>We fully support the submission made by The Planning Studio regarding the draft plan and concerning site allocations STC2 and STC3. We seek to deliver quality new homes to WInsford and see these sites as providing a sustainable development opportunity. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore maximise the residential element to be delivered from these sites, which is likely to include on site POS and affordable housing.</p>
Mr Alan Warburton	Clerk Winsford Town Council	WNP11	<p>At a meeting of Winsford Town Council held on 29th April 2013 it was agreed that the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan be approved and submitted to Cheshire West and Chester Council to take forward to the statutory publicity period, and that the Town Council then consider all responses prior to a decision being made about progression of the Neighbourhood Plan to examination.</p> <p>Following that meeting a number of letters of representation were presented to Members. Although these representations were received after the closing date for comments, Councillors agreed that they be passed to Cheshire West and Chester Council with a request that they be forwarded to the Independent Examiner.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would arrange this.</p>
Mr Tom Ferguson	<p>planning policy manager</p> <p>The Mersey Forest</p>	WNP8	<p>The Mersey Forest welcomes and supports the commitment in the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan to the creation of a new “heart” for Winsford set around the flashes and river (Theme 2)</p> <p>The Mersey Forest is a growing network of woodlands and green spaces spread across 465 square miles of Cheshire and Merseyside.</p> <p>The Mersey Forest Plan sets out a 30-year vision to transform the landscape of the area, through the creation of new community woodlands in and around our towns and cities, to provide economic and social benefits from environmental regeneration - delivering 'more from trees'.</p> <p>The creation of the Forest is driven by a partnership between seven local authorities in Merseyside and North Cheshire including Cheshire West and Cheshire and the national bodies Natural England and Forestry Commission. A wide range of public, private and</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>voluntary organisations and individuals are involved as partners in delivering The Mersey Forest. The Partnership has put in place a dedicated Forest Team whose role is to support and drive forward the delivery of The Mersey Forest Plan. The Plan has recently been reviewed and updated and will be formally endorsed by the partner authorities during September and October 2013. This will ensure that the Plan can be used as a material consideration in preparing development plans and in deciding planning applications in accordance with Para 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>http://www.merseyforest.org.uk/files/TMF_Plan_double_page_sept13.pdf</p> <p>The Plan includes for each of our partner areas recommendations for increasing woodland cover including C7 and C16 which relate specifically to Winsford and the Weaver Valley:</p> <p>C7. Around Winsford: Create woodland as an attractive setting for new development, employment sites, and transport corridors; screening the visually intrusive urban area from the surrounding landscapes.</p> <p>C16. Weaver Valley: Extend the wooded nature by planting on the valley shoulders, sides and, where appropriate, floor, buffering and connecting ancient semi-natural woodland. Ensure planting does not block the line of the valley floor. Manage existing woodlands with special regard to ancient semi-natural woodlands.</p> <p>The Mersey Forest is also instrumental in supporting our partner authorities in developing their policies for green infrastructure as required by para 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This has included working with the Weaver Valley Partnership in developing a green infrastructure approach to assisting in transforming the Weaver valley and economic performance of the area</p> <p>The Mersey Forest would be very keen to assist Winsford Town Council and its partners in delivering the neighbourhood plan in relation to the ambitious proposal for the Weaver Valley. If there is one suggestion we would make that is to give greater emphasis in the plan to the important role that trees and woodlands could have in meeting your vision for the area. This would include ensuring that developers are made aware of their responsibility for tree planting on those sites wherever it is appropriate</p>
Turley Associates Planning Team	Turley Associates	WNP7	<p>On behalf of our client, Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, we have reviewed the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan publication draft consultation paper and would like to take this opportunity to comment on it.</p> <p>Vision: The Council's vision sees Winsford as a 'vibrant and attractive town centre' which will benefit from 'a larger and better range of shops, including a mix of independent and national retailers' by 2027.</p> <p>Sainsbury's broadly support the Town Council's vision and wish to highlight the important economic contributions that retail developments can make towards achieving this vision, as they provide significant employment opportunities that are both attainable and achievable to local people.</p> <p>Development Sites Policies: Sainsbury's support the Council's acknowledgement that greenfield sites may need to be developed to achieve the development requirements for Winsford over the plan period. 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.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Town Centre: As advocated by Paragraph 23 of the NPPF, local planning authorities are required to undertake an assessment to determine whether a sufficient supply of land is available for future retail development. The Cheshire Retail Study Update (2011) identifies the need for new supermarket development to be centrally located within Winsford town centre, therefore, Sainsbury's broadly support the objective of Neighbourhood Plan Policy TTC2 which seeks to ensure that new convenience retail development is delivered in the town over the plan period. This approach is considered to be consistent with the conclusions of the Council's Retail Study and national policy contained in the NPPF.</p>
Mr Stephen Hignett		WNP5	<p>My, what a weighty document the Neighbourhood plan and all its attachments are. I wonder how much of Council Tax payers money has been wasted on this. Perhaps the reason it is so large and wordy is so that no-one will read it and therefore question it, or perhaps I am just very cynical of our Councillors and Council Officials in their ivory towers with there Not In My Back Yard attitudes. I hope you will therefore forgive my objections to your Neighbourhood Plan, and will give my objections, which are equally long and wordy, the time and consideration that I have given your document.</p> <p>The foreword to the Neighbourhood Plan, by Cllr Clarke states that the National Planning Policy Framework states that the growth of a town should be sustainable in "ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations". If this is the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan then it has failed in the opinion of true Winsfordians, as the plan will not only make living in Winsford intolerable for the next 16 years as we will be living on a permanent building site, but will also ensure that Winsford becomes nothing more than a housing estate with no amenities and facilities for future generations.</p> <p>For ease of reference I have split my arguments against your plan into 3 areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General points of policy and accuracy which are questionable - Reasons against development for each of the specific sites outlined - Missed opportunities and areas that the Neighbourhood Plan should address <p>General points of policy and accuracy which are questionable</p> <p>Your documentation states that there is a need for 21,000 homes across Chester West & Cheshire over the next 16 years. 3150 (Neighbourhood Plan P4) of these, 15% are to be built in Winsford. Why has Winsford been identified for such a high percentage when your document only indicates that the population of Winsford is going to grow by 3% (approx. 1800 people) over the next 16 years (Evidence based summary P4 para 2). How many new houses are to be built in some of the more "sexier" areas of Cheshire, Frodsham, Helsby, Tattenhal, Tarporley, Hoole, and Vicar's Cross for example. Surely these areas must have a need for housing so why is such a high percentage being forced on to Winsford. Perhaps because it was envisaged that the people of Winsford would object least or because the Councillors at Cheshire West did not want developments in their own back yards?</p> <p>Your "Evidence Based Summary" Document states that it is expected that the population in Winsford is going to rise by 3% between 2013 and 2030, yet the intention is to increase the number of homes by 15%. That seems extremely disproportionate to me. I know Winsford Town Council will argue that people will be moving into the area, but that will surely be balanced by those that are moving out of the area.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>The document shows a disproportionate growth in housing compared to populace, which will no doubt be argued is to cover new people moving into the area, but surely we have to attract those people to the area first. How are we going to achieve this when your own documents clearly show a need for investment in better retail facilities, increased employment opportunities and improved leisure facilities? Surely it makes sense to improve the area to generate demand for housing, before building those houses, rather than building houses for which there is no demand which then becomes vandalised and decayed, thus further deterring people from wanting to move to the area.</p> <p>Your Evidence Base Summary indicates a need for 35ha of employment land (P8 Para 7) and yet you want to build houses on some areas of existing industrial land (Nat Lane). How does that work? I will discuss the Nat Lane Development further as part of my second section.</p> <p>Your Evidence based Survey indicates that the number of GPs per head is lower than the average for the rest of CWAC and the national average, however you are proposing to increase the number of houses by 3,150, thus making it even more difficult to see a GP. (Evidence Based Summary P12)</p> <p>There are a number of inaccurate photographs and annotations contained in the Evidence Based Summary. This must surely question the competence of the writer when they cannot even get basic information correct.</p> <p>Page 27 – The plan indicates that there is an area of Town Centre in the middle of Wharton. I have only lived in Wharton 40 years and must have missed this part of our Town Centre.</p> <p>Page 29 – Photograph of Wharton Road, is actually School Road</p> <p>Page 29 – Photograph of Lodge Road, is actually Lodge Drive</p> <p>Page 33 – Photograph of Winsford Hall, presumably the Civic Hall, which has now been demolished for the Councils new carbuncle (Road System). Should the writer not be aware of this?</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan Fig 2.4 – Conservation Area – The area highlighted orange for the St Chads Conservation area does not take into account the extension that took place in 1990. The Council have tried to argue the status of the Conservation Area in recent months however it was taken to Vale Royal District Council Planning Committee on the 4th Sept 1979, when the Planning and Development Committee designated the area Winsford (St Chads) Conservation Area and was further taken to Vale Royal Borough Council Planning Committee on the 19th June 1990 when the Conservation Area was extended to include the land which Richborough Estates now want to cover in concrete.</p> <p>Reasons against development for each of the specific sites outlined</p> <p>NTC 1 I actually agree that this is the right position for a housing development and will be well served by the new road linking Roehurst Lane &</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Bradford Road.</p> <p>NTC 2 I actually agree that this is the right position for a housing development and will be well served by the new road linking Roehurst Lane & Bradford Road.</p> <p>NTC 3 Planning permission has already been granted so not sure why this needs to be part of the plan for future development.</p> <p>NTC 4 I would have thought that this could be linked to NTC 1 & 2. Also why has the land between NTC 4 and NTC 1 & 2 not been considered for future development?</p> <p>NTC 5 Whilst I am in agreement that this area does need development, I am not sure that the best use of the land is housing. I would have expected this to form part of the riverside development and would incorporate bars, restaurants, shops (so as to encourage boats to stop for supplies), leisure facilities. Putting housing on this area seems to be a lost opportunity.</p> <p>NTC 6 Whilst I am in agreement that this area does need development, I am not sure that the best use of the land is housing. I would have expected this to form part of the riverside development and would incorporate bars, restaurants, shops (so as to encourage boats to stop for supplies), leisure facilities. Putting housing on this area seems to be a lost opportunity.</p> <p>NTC 7 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>TC0 Pressure needs to be brought on MAR to develop the shopping centre or to sell it on to someone that will develop it. This is the biggest problem faced by Winsford, how to improve and change the perception of this carbuncle. If I could wipe the slate clean and start again with one area of Winsford, this would be it. I and many others shop out of town, so that we do not have to visit the Town Centre. This MUST be the first area for development, as this is the biggest reason why people will not come to Winsford. We are the laughing stock of Cheshire because of our Town Centre.</p> <p>TC 1 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>TC 2 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>TC 3</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>TC 4 & 5 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>TC 6 I agree with Plans proposal that this area is need of development, though this should be for commercial/retail use. This would then help link the Town Centre and the retail units on the High Street and Collingham Way, which are currently separate of each other. This is not the site for residential properties.</p> <p>TC 7 Planning permission has already been granted so not sure why this needs to be part of the plan for future development.</p> <p>TC 8 I agree with Plans proposal that this area is need of development, though this should be for commercial/retail use. This would then help link the Town Centre and retail/leisure facilities fronting onto the river. This is not a site for residential properties, unless they can be incorporated above the retail units.</p> <p>TC 9 I was very surprised to see that this area was listed for residential use, as the “underutilised car park” is actually the overspill car park for the recently built college and one of the factors taken into consideration when it was built was that there was an overspill car park, so as to avoid on street parking along Weaver Street. The Council appear to be backtracking on an earlier decision, by now allowing this area for development. They are now proposing that on street parking is acceptable I assume.</p> <p>TC 10 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>STC 1 This area is currently being built on, therefore I fail to see why this is detailed in the Plan for the “future” of Winsford.</p> <p>STC 2 This area is located in a very visually sensitive area and overlooks the flashes. Development here should not go ahead. One of the recurring themes of the Plan is the improved access to and useage of the flashes and its visual importance. That importance will be negated if the flashes are surrounded and overlooked by housing estates.</p> <p>This site also requires access off Ways Green, this is probably one of the worst roads in Winsford for on street parking and congestion. The road cannot be widened or improved due to the existing buildings, therefore the Council in their infinite wisdom are planning to move a further 200-300 cars through this “bottleneck” at least twice a day. No thought has been given to the practicalities of actually living in this area.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>This area should be designated a county park and no residential development allowed, although use should be made for leisure purposes. Café/Bars, bike hire facilities, ecology centre etc.</p> <p>STC 3 I agree with the plans proposals and this would link nicely with my proposals for STC 2.</p> <p>STC 4 Not only is the proposed entrance to this development on one of the most congested, narrow and busy routes in and out of Winsford, but it intends to cover Winsford's only Conservation area with Concrete.</p> <p>In numerous places in "your" documents you make reference to the St Chads Conservation Area and how this should be maintained. (Neighbourhood Plan P10, para 2.1.21, Evidence Based Summary P23 & P36) Perhaps you will bring this to the attention of the planners at Winsford Council who want to develop this land and turn it into a housing estate. That feels like contradiction to me, on page 10 you state that this area should be maintained and yet on page 64 you want to destroy it and turn it into a housing estate.</p> <p>S 1 Whilst in principle I agree with this proposal, I have two major concerns.</p> <p>The first is the access to the site. The proposed development numbers 665 houses, that is approx. 1,300 cars and there are only two road/access points onto the estate. That either means the creation of a busy bottleneck for traffic or the construction of a major road link to me, and this is a rural area very close to the Flashes where we are trying to retain the beauty of the existing landscape.</p> <p>Which brings me onto my second concern, how close will the development actually be to Bottom Flash. It is a necessity that the development is not visible from the flashes in order to retain the visually sensitive area that is the flashes and to not discourage the wild birds and wildlife that use the flashes.</p> <p>S 2 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>S 3 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>S 4 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>S 5 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>W1 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>W 2 Planning permission has already been granted for this land, but due to the contamination I find it hard to believe that it will actually ever be financially viable to build these properties.</p> <p>W 3 This is currently industrial land, and as the Plan requires the creation of new industrial and employment land I cannot understand why it is proposed to turn this land into residential land. The area is in need of development, but due to the contamination and gasses issues I would have thought it better suited to commercial/industrial usage.</p> <p>W 4 This is currently industrial land, and as the Plan requires the creation of new industrial and employment land I cannot understand why it is proposed to turn this land into residential land. The area is in need of development, but due to the contamination and gasses issues I would have thought it better suited to commercial/industrial usage.</p> <p>W 5 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>W 6 I agree with the Plans proposals; however this site is on one of the main gateways into the town and should therefore be a “prestige” development, and not just another steel shed.</p> <p>W 7 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>O 1 This area already has planning permission for residential use, therefore I fail to see why it is in a document detailing the “future” of Winsford.</p> <p>O 2 This area already has planning permission for residential use, therefore I fail to see why it is in a document detailing the “future” of Winsford</p> <p>O 3 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p> <p>O 4 I agree with the Plans proposals.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>O 5 I agree with the Plans proposals. Missed opportunities and areas that the Neighbourhood Plan should address</p> <p>Brownfield Sites. Winsford has a number of disused, brownfield sites, which are both an eyesore, as the land falls into dis-repair and a waste of land which could be further developed. Whilst some of these areas have been addressed a number appear to have been overlooked, these include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Raven Public House, Swanlow Lane o Playing Fields to the rear of the Old Verdin Grammar School and Verdin Exchange. o The former accountant’s offices and builders yard on Grange Lane, opposite the Guildhall. o Vacant land adjacent to the Grange Sports Complex going towards Chester Road. o The derelict buildings at the lights on the junction of Middlewich Road, Road 1 and Clive Lane o Land adjacent to NTC 2 & 4 <p>Surely we should we should be looking to develop these brownfield sites before we start ripping up green fields. This would not only save the countryside for future generations to enjoy but remove a number of eyesores around the town.</p> <p>Failing Shopping Facilities.</p> <p>Winsford Shopping Centre and its “retail outlets” can best be described as either a dieticians worst nightmare or as nothing more than a joke.</p> <p>Your document “” indicates that 40% of the retail opportunities in Winsford are fast food or convenience outlets. These do not encourage healthy eating or living. Maybe if it was not so easy to obtain fast food, less people would eat it, so improving their diet, so making them healthier. Just an idea !</p> <p>Likewise the Shopping Centre consists of nothing more than empty units, charity shops, take-always and discount shops. Make the shopping centre attractive to retailers, thus bringing in more quality and varied shops, thus making Winsford a more enjoyable shopping environment, where you can actually buy what you want and maybe both more local people and people from out of town will come and shop in Winsford, which will in turn attract yet more retailers. It is very simple and has worked in thousands of other places, look at the Trafford Centre, this was once a disused piece of waste land (very similar to Winsford Shopping Centre) and with a little investment it is now one of the most prestigious shopping venues in the North West. I am not saying that Winsford can be the next Trafford Centre, but it should be able to compete with Frodham, Tarporley, Crewe and Chester.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>The new road linking “Roehurst Lane” to Bradford Road.</p> <p>There has been extensive rumours that as part of the development of the “Academy” and its associated carbuncle (High Street Road Improvements) there have been rumours that our beloved councillors have sold off more of Winsford Green Fields to allow a new road to link Wharton and the Academy. Unfortunately no-one seems able, or willing to deny or admit that such a scheme has been give the go ahead.</p> <p>If such a scheme has been given the go-ahead, why not build your 3150 houses along and off this road, or are they planning to build even more homes on this land, but don’t want to declare that until the Neighbourhood Plan has been “pushed through the back door”.</p> <p>Failure to Consult.</p> <p>Apart from the obvious lack of vision in selecting the areas for development and a clear understanding of the construction needs and complications of building on some of the proposed sites the one thing that concerns me most about this plan is the lack of opportunity for Winsfordians to input into it. The Council have had an open day on the town centre, put details on “Facebook & twitter” and held public consultation events in local superstores, but what about those of us that work. I am unable to attend public consultation events during the day as I work Mon – Sat, I am not on “Facebook and Twitter” as I prefer to talk to my friends face to face and in fact only found out about the Plan through overhearing two Council employees talking about it in my local dentist’s. I, and a lot of other people in Winsford feel that we have been excluded. Surely everyone in Winsford should have been given the opportunity to input into this document. The counter argument will no doubt be that this is my opportunity, but it is to late know the document exists, I would have liked to have been involved from the start. I cannot help but feel that our Councillors are being forced into pushing this document through the back door by the bullies at CWAC and that the true opinions of Winsfordians are not important.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>CLlr Clarke states in his closing paragraph of his foreword to the Neighbourhood Plan that it is “important we get it right now”, well as I hope you now realise Winsford Town Council have definitely got it wrong.</p> <p>Finally let me plead with the Councilors of this town, just for once listen to the people of Winsford and give us what we want, green fields, countryside and a big fat NO to the developers shovel. Let’s keep Winsford as the Heart of Cheshire and not the concrete dumping ground for the rest of Cheshire that it is rapidly becoming.</p> <p>Yes we want a town we can be proud of with high quality shopping facilities, plentiful leisure and recreation facilities, we want to see the river and flashes enjoyed as a beautiful, natural resource utilised by locals and visitors, and yes we want modern housing, but we do not want to see this at the expense of building for buildings sake, or because CWAC tell us to.</p> <p>Winsford could be the only town we will ever need, but not if we adopt the neighbourhood plan and definitely not if we don’t involve the people that matter, WINSFORDIANS.</p>
Mr Gordon Jones		WNP6	<p>I cannot express the disappointment and disgust I feel towards the local councilor’s who are allowing Winsford Town Council (WTC) to be bullied by CWAC into forcing such a concrete development onto the people of Winsford. The Neighbourhood Plan is not only destroying our countryside, heritage and conservation area, but does not even consider the views of the people who actually live here and what they want.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>I can't believe some of the locations that have been chosen for development and that they are even being considered as sites for house building.</p> <p>Not only do they want to destroy the fields and green field areas around the perimeter of Winsford but they want to build on a conservation area, Winsfords ONLY conservation area. The St Chads conservation area is a beautiful green site, and is one of many green areas that the residents of Winsford are proud of. I find it despicable that WTC want to spoil local green areas, when there are so many brown field areas in Winsford that are an eye sore and desperately need attention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Land adjacent to New Road, from the roundabout towards the industrial units, fronting onto the river. (Site of the old post Office and Gym that burnt down years ago) o The Vale Public House on New Road. (recently burnt down) o Playing Fields to the rear of the Old Verdin Grammar School and Verdin Exchange. o Land located between NTC 2 & 4 in the NP. <p>Brown field sites should be a priority for development and NO green field sites should be considered until all the brown field sites have been developed and the "blot" removed from our landscape. This will then make Winsford a better town and more attractive to make people/shops/business' want to come here.</p> <p>I would also object to the proposals in the Neighbourhood plan because Winsford does not have the road structure to deal with all these new developments and the additional cars that they will inevitably bring. The proposed development numbers over 3000 properties to be built in Winsford which means there will be at least 7500 additional cars introduced into an already congested road system. We already have a motorway through the center of town, which can't cope with the number of vehicles using the A54, so where are another 7,500 cars going to go. The town will be gridlocked and who wants to live in that.</p> <p>Where are the safety considerations, of exposing an already congested road system to this number of cars, site traffic, delivery wagons etc. Have these proposed development sites even been considered in terms of access and traffic flow, or have Winsford Town Council just picked the "easy" options.</p> <p>Winsford also does not have the infrastructure, doctors, schools, shopping, and leisure facilities for all these additional people. Let's make the town an attractive place to live first and when people actually want to come here, then look to build more houses. Let's not build the houses first and then when they are stood empty wonder why people do not want to live here. It's called common sense something severely lacking at Winsford Town Council.</p> <p>If an additional 3000+ houses are to be built in Winsford, where is everyone going to work and shop? Your own document "Evidence Based Summary" indicates that there is a need for industrial space, office accommodation, and new retail facilities and yet the Neighbourhood plan addresses none of these issues, or more importantly explains where the money is going to come from. In fact the</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Neighbourhood Plan intends to change the use of one current Industrial Area into a housing area (W2, 3, & 4). How is that going to help increase the number of job opportunities. If people have not got jobs, how can they afford to buy new homes?.</p> <p>Your “Evidence Based Summary” Document states that it is expected that the population in Winsford is going to rise by 3% between 2013 and 2030, yet the intention is to increase the number of homes by 15%. That seems extremely disproportionate to me. I know Winsford Town Council will argue that people will be moving into the area, but that will surely be balanced by the number that are moving out of the area due to the Town becoming the new Cheshire Housing Estate.</p> <p>Winsford has a number of large scale developments currently ongoing and does not need or want another building site in Winsford. Let us keep some green spaces and open land for us to enjoy in our later years, but also for our Children to enjoy for many years to come. Winsford is not a sprawling CITY, we are a small rural town, please let us stay that way.</p> <p>Please say NO to the document that has been written, it will destroy Winsford and everything we love about it.</p>
Mrs Emma Hughes		WNP9	<p>I have been a resident of Winsford for almost 40 years and am appalled at the intentions of Winsford Town Council.</p> <p>In the 1950's and 1960's the then Winsford Council voted to change the town from a small rural town into its current format. This involved the demolition of the heart of the town to allow the construction of a motorway through the centre of the town, and the construction of hundreds of Council owned houses, which were to house the overspill from Manchester and Liverpool. They turned a quiet, rural Cheshire town into one large Council Estate. The current councillors seem intent on doing the same thing, but rather than Council owned housing they want to let developers run riot in our town. They have already widened the motorway through the heart of the town, they have built a monstrosity of a “Lifestyle Centre” and now want to give carte blanche to developers to build over 3,000 houses in Winsford. They have not consulted with WINSFORDIANS about what they want but have ensured that they look after their own interests.</p> <p>Some of the potential development sites take little account of the actual practicalities of developing that site or the concerns of the existing residents. Whilst I appreciate that there MAY be a need for additional housing in the future, surely it is important that these new developments do not alienate the current residents and so drive them out of Winsford. The banner headline on your document states “Winsford. The only town you will ever need”, and yet I have spoken to a number of people who have all said that they will consider moving out of Winsford if this “Neighbourhood” Plan is agreed, as they do not want to live in Cheshire's new housing estate.</p> <p>Your documentation states that there is a need for 21,000 homes across Chester West & Cheshire over the next 16 years. 3150 (Neighbourhood Plan P4) of these, 15% are to be built in Winsford. Why has Winsford been identified for such a high percentage when your document only indicates that the population of Winsford is going to grow by 3% (approx. 1,800 people) over the next 16 years (Evidence based summary P4 para 2). How many new houses are to be built in some of the more “sexier” areas of Cheshire, Frodsham, Helsby, Tattenhal, Tarporley, Hoole, and Vicar's Cross for example. Surely these areas must have a need for housing so why is such a high percentage being forced on to Winsford.</p> <p>Also why are we considering building new properties when there are already large numbers of properties standing empty? For example, the recent Anwyll development at Mere Court. This was completed over 2 years ago and yet 1 of the properties has never been sold and 1 was only sold within the last two months. Does this not show that there is very little demand for new housing in Winsford.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Your "Evidence Based Summary" Document states that it is expected that the population in Winsford is going to rise by 3% between 2013 and 2030, yet the intention is to increase the number of homes by 15%. That seems extremely disproportionate to me. I know Winsford Town Council will argue that people will be moving into the area, but that will surely be balanced by the number that are moving out of the area</p> <p>The document shows a disproportionate growth in housing compared to populace, this will no doubt be argued is to cover new people moving into the area, but surely we have to attract those people to the area first. How are we going to achieve this when your own documents clearly show a need for investment in better retail facilities, increased employment opportunities and improved leisure facilities? Surely it makes sense to improve the retail/leisure/employment opportunities in the area in order to generate a demand for housing, and once there is a demand then build the houses, rather than building houses for which there is no demand which then becomes vandalised and decayed, thus further deterring people from wanting to move to the area.</p> <p>Some of the proposed areas for development whilst being located in beautiful spots have terrible access constraints and some of the roads concerned are already gridlocked, therefore I fail to see how additional housing is going to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion. Whilst we would all like to live in the Councillors "perfect" world, where we can all walk or cycle to work, the reality of the situation is very different. Most homes will have 2-3 cars, and any proposed housing development will bring even more cars and congestion to the area.</p> <p>Please note that there are issues with a large number of the development sites, access, existing residents, green belt land, areas of natural beauty however I have concentrated on the enclosed as they have specific site issues that I am more aware of;</p> <p>Site STC2 This site require access off Ways Green, this is probably one of the worst roads in Winsford for on street parking and congestion. The road cannot be widened or improved due to the existing buildings, therefore the Council in their infinite wisdom are planning to move a further 200-300 cars through this "bottleneck" at least twice a day. No thought has been given to the practicalities of actually living in this area.</p> <p>There also seems to be some question over the owner's willingness to sell the land. The Neighbourhood plan intimates that all the proposed development sites have been discussed with the landowners and they have reacted positively to the prospect of selling for development. This is not necessarily the case with regard STC2. It appears that the land is jointly owned and one party would consider selling and one is against it. This has to bring into question the validity of the Councils comment that the landowners have "reacted positively to the prospect of selling" on all the other sites.</p> <p>Site STC 4 Not only is the proposed entrance to this development on one of the most congested, narrow and busy routes in and out of Winsford, but it intends to cover Winsford's only Conservation area with Concrete.</p> <p>In numerous places in your documents you make reference to the St Chads Conservation Area and how this should be maintained. (Neighbourhood Plan P10, para 2.1.21, Evidence Based Summary P23 & P36) Perhaps you will bring this to the attention of the planners</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>at the Council who have designated this as one of the areas for development in the Neighbourhood Plan. That feels like contradiction to me, on page 10 you state that this area should be maintained and yet on page 64 you want to destroy it and turn it into a housing estate.</p> <p>The Council have tried to argue the status of the Conservation Area in recent months however it was taken to Vale Royal District Council Planning Committee on the 4th Sept 1979, when the Planning and Development Committee designated the area Winsford (St Chads) Conservation Area and was further taken to Vale Royal Borough Council Planning Committee on the 19th June 1990 when the Conservation Area was extended to include the land which Richborough Estates now want to cover in concrete.</p> <p>Site S1 This land is accessed off a narrow country lane, will the developers therefore be destroying hedgerows and trees that have been in situ for hundreds of years in order to widen roads and to bring through tons of concrete and tarmac. What a lovely place Winsford will be, miles and miles of houses, with the occasional tree, on the very distant horizon.</p> <p>Missed opportunities and areas that the Neighbourhood Plan should address.</p> <p>The Councillors, who have dreamt up the Winsford Neighbourhood plan, seem to believe that the best solution to their housing problem is to destroy our current green field sites, cover them with tarmac and concrete and that magically the decaying eyesores of currently disused buildings will disappear. They do not seem to want to address or resolve the current problem of what we do with our current brown field sites.</p> <p>Winsford has a number of disused, brownfield sites, which are both an eyesore, as the land falls into dis-repair and a waste of land which could be further developed. These include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Raven Public House, Swanlow Lane o Land adjacent to New Road, from the roundabout towards the industrial units, fronting onto the river. (Site of the old post Office and Gym that burnt down years ago) o The Vale Public House on New Road. (recently burnt down) o Land at the Junction Of High Street and Dene Drive (currently motorway contractors site compound) o Playing Fields to the rear of the Old Verdin Grammar School and Verdin Exchange. <p>Surely we should be looking to develop these brownfield sites before we start ripping up green fields. This would not only save the countryside for future generations to enjoy but remove a high number of eyesores around the town, thus making the town an attractive place to live.</p> <p>As a Winsfordian it grates me to say this, but Northwich Town Council have the right idea. They have turned the river side area in the</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>town centre from a disused, festering wasteland, into an attractive place to both live and spend leisure time adjacent to the river. Why can we not have something like this in Winsford, rather than mile after mile of housing estates?</p> <p>I am extremely worried that this neighbourhood plan will be given the green light and that rather than improving the town it will finish the job that our Councillors started 50 years ago in turning our town into the dumping ground for the rest of the North West. The people who really matter in Winsford, the people who already live here, have not been given a fair chance to develop a Winsford that they would like to live in and raise families in.</p> <p>I therefore say NO to the Neighbourhood Plan, let's go back to the drawing board and create something that we want, something that benefits the people of Winsford, something that we can be proud of, not something that Councillors in Chester tell us we have to have.</p>
Mr Nick Whittaker		WNP13	<p>The destruction of historic farm land and wildlife habitats is out of line with national policies.</p> <p>These proposals are not sustainable with the road network, employment opportunities, schools, doctors as they currently stand. No plans to change any of the above seem to be forthcoming. An unbalance burden is being placed on Winsford when compared with other areas in the county. This consultation process has been flawed. The destruction of my environmnet without a proper consultation process infringes my human rights.</p>
Ms Kate Wheeler	Lead Adviser Natural England	WNP18	<p>Publication of the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on the above which was received by Natural England on 17 July 2013.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Overall we do not have any specific comments to make on the publication of the Winsford Neighbourhood Development plan. However we would like this opportunity to remind you that you need to be confident that any proposals in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan will not result in a likely significant effect on a European site.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening</p> <p>Where a Neighbourhood Plan could lead to significant environmental effects it will be necessary to screen the Plan in relation to the Habitats & Species Regulations (as amended) 2010 (the 'Habitats Regulations') and the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. One of the basic conditions that will be tested at Examination is whether the making of the plan is compatible with European obligations and this includes requirements relating to the Habitats Directive and SEA Directive.</p> <p>In relation to the Habitats Regulations, a Neighbourhood Plan cannot progress if it would result in a likely significant effect on any European Site (see Schedule 2, The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012). Therefore reduction and/or avoidance measures may need to be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure compliance with the Regulations. A screening exercise should be undertaken if there is any doubt about the effects of the Plan on European protected sites. This will be particularly important if a Neighbourhood Plan is to progress before a Local Plan has been adopted and/or the Neighbourhood Plan proposes development</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>which has not be assessed and/or included in the HRA for the Local Plan.</p> <p>In addition to the HRA process, if environmental effects are predicted a SEA screening exercise should also be undertaken. A SEA may be required where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development - a neighbourhood plan contain sensitive natural assets that may be affected by the plan - a neighbourhood plan may have significant effects that have not already been considered and dealt with in the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan. <p>If I can provide any further advice relating to this consultation, please do not hesitate to contact me. For all other correspondence, please contact the address above.</p>
Mr David Sherratt	Local Development Framework Assessor United Utilities Water PLC	WNP14	<p>Thank you for your consultation and seeking the views of United Utilities Water PLC in this process.</p> <p>We support growth and sustainable development within the North West.</p> <p>Our aim is to proactively share our information; assist in the development of sound planning strategies, to identify future development needs and to secure the necessary long-term infrastructure investment.</p> <p>We wish to build a strong partnership with all Local Planning Authorities [LPAs] to aid sustainable development and growth within the North West. We aim to proactively identify future development needs and share our information. This helps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♣ ensure a strong connection between development and infrastructure planning; ♣ deliver sound planning strategies; and ♣ inform our future infrastructure investment submissions for determination by our regulator. <p>Water and wastewater services are vital for the future well-being of your community and the protection of the environment. When developing your Local Development Framework [LDF] and future policies you should consider the impacts on its community and environment and ensure infrastructure capacity is available.</p> <p>We have no additional comments to make at this stage, but wish to be included in further consultations and where necessary, the development of Cheshire West &</p> <p>Page 2</p> <p>Chester Council and Winsford Town Council's [Council] future sustained economic growth plans and polices, to ensure that all new</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>growth can be delivered sustainably and with the necessary infrastructure available in line with the Council's delivery targets.</p> <p>Our historical responses to the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan and the Council's Local Development Framework consultations; planning applications; pre developer enquiries and planning policy liaison meeting comments are still valid and should be taken into consideration when developing the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan and supporting policies.</p> <p>We would like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept our comments and the future progress of the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss this in further detail please do not hesitate in contacting me or Jenny Hope.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Dave Sherratt Local Development Framework Assessor Developer Services & Planning United Utilities Water PLC</p> <p>Also letter attached</p>
Mr Mike Pender	Anwyl Homes	WNP15	Just a quick small point - Fig 4.3.2 Option B should read 2030 in SE corner - not 20230
Mr J P A Williams	Clerk Middlewich Town Council	WNP23	Thank you for consulting with Middlewich on the Plan. We are involved in discussions with Winsford Town Council on a number of levels, and given the geographical position of Middlewich, we as a Town need to have maximum possible interface with the West and Winsford in particular.
Diane Clarke	Town Planning Technician LNW Network Rail	WNP24	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Network Rail is the "not for dividend" owner and operator of Britain's railway infrastructure, which includes the tracks, signals, tunnels, bridges, viaducts, level crossings and stations – the largest of which we also manage. All profits made by the company, including from commercial development, are reinvested directly back into the network.</p> <p>Network Rail has the following comments to make as the proposal boundary is both adjacent to the operational railway as well as including Network Rail land within its area.</p> <p>Network Rail has the following comments to make as the proposal boundary is both adjacent to the operational railway as well as including Network Rail land within its area.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>We are concerned that the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan which include the railway within its boundary (our ref CGJ1 167.1138 to 162.1351) may result in proposals being undertaken near to or next to the operational railway / Network Rail land which may impact upon its safety, performance and operation as we will not have had the opportunity (as via the current planning application notification process) to review and pass comments on vital asset protection measures to the council and developer / applicant.</p> <p>In light of the above we would request that the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan authority / group should contact Network Rail for any proposals within the area to ensure that:</p> <p>1. Access points are not impacted. All roads, paths or ways providing access to any part of the railway undertaker's land both temporary and permanent, shall be kept open at all times (24/7, 365 – around the clock) during and after the development. Any development proposal must not encroach onto any Network Rail access road, paths or ways of access to any part of Network Rail land. This also includes emergency vehicles ability to access and exit Network Rail land. Developers are reminded that each Network Rail access point has a specific right of way and as such any developer is requested to contact the Network Rail Operational Property Services Team to discuss the impact of the proposal upon our access. I attach a list of the access points within the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>ELR</p> <p>Mileage From</p> <p>Mileage To</p> <p>Hazard Description</p> <p>Easting</p> <p>Northing</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>162.1577</p> <p>162.1577</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Vehicle</p> <p>368607</p> <p>362165</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>164.1369</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>164.1369</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Pedestrian</p> <p>367599 365007</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>165.0484 165.0484</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Pedestrian</p> <p>367233 365724</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>165.0870 165.0870</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Pedestrian</p> <p>367100 365981</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>165.0942 165.0942</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Pedestrian</p> <p>367040 366096</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>165.0964</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>165.0964</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Pedestrian</p> <p>367030 366114</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>166.0880 166.0880</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Vehicle 366307 367504</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>166.1415 166.1415</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Pedestrian 366061 367885</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>166.1540 166.1540</p> <p>Authorised Walking Route 365991 367992</p> <p>CGJ1</p> <p>167.0955 167.0955</p> <p>Authorised Access Point - Vehicle</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>365427 368855</p> <p>That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Drainage works / water features · Encroachment of land or air-space · Excavation and earthworks, bunds and embankments · Wind turbines / solar farms · Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues · Lighting impacting upon train drivers ability to perceive signals · Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments · Any piling works · Any scaffolding works · Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949) · Any use of crane or plant · Any fencing works / acoustic fencing works and boundary treatments (we would request that any development adjacent to the railway erects a minimum 1.8m high steel palisade trespass proof fence to prevent unauthorised access onto the railway. · Any demolition works · Any hard standing areas · Works adjoining / adjacent or near to railway stations <p>We would very strongly recommend that the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan authority / group are made aware that any proposal within 10m of the operational railway boundary will also require review and approval by the Network Rail Asset Protection Team, and such schemes should be accompanied by a risk assessment and a method statement. No works should commence on site without the approval of the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Network Rail is required to recover any expenses incurred in facilitating third party proposals, a BAPA may be required for the works on site.</p> <p>We would request that the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan authority / group authority / group when submitting proposals for a development contact Network Rail's Town Planning Team and include a location plan and a description of the works taking place for review and comment.</p> <p>All initial proposals and plans should be flagged up to the Network Rail Town Planning Team London North Western Route at the following address:</p> <p>Town Planning Team LNW Network Rail</p>
Mrs	Area Planner	WNP28	The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is the landowner of Site NTC7, which lies between New Road and the River Weaver. The south-west

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Alison Truman	Canal & River Trust		<p>corner of the site is identified as a suitable location for residential development of around 20 dwellings, with leisure development proposed on the remainder of the site.</p> <p>The Trust submitted representations to the Town Council at the draft consultation stage in respect of this site (NTC8 in the draft plan). These comments do not appear to have been given due consideration and are not addressed in the Consultation Statement. The Trust's comments are therefore reiterated below and we would be grateful if they could be fully considered prior to examination of the plan.</p> <p>The Canal & River Trust is keen to ensure that all options have been fully considered in respect of Site NTC7. The Neighbourhood Plan states that the majority of the site is currently identified as being in an area of flood risk. However, as recommended in the West Cheshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the Winsford Area Flood Risk Assessment was commissioned in order to provide a more detailed assessment of flood risk. It is the understanding of the Trust that the AFRA has not yet been finalised. However, the 2010 draft document concludes that only the banks of the River Weaver should lie within Flood Zone 3a.</p> <p>The AFRA states that:</p> <p>“Based on available LiDAR and ISIS hydraulic model data the 1 in 200 year peak water level is likely to be contained by the west bank of the River Weaver north of Winsford Bridge. It can therefore be determined that the 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change peak water levels will remain in-bank. This statement ...is contrary to the current flood extents as displayed on the current Environment Agency flood zone maps. It is understood that the EA are currently undertaking further modelling for the Weaver Navigation.”</p> <p>On this basis, the Trust would suggest that until the AFRA is approved by the Environment Agency and the amended Flood Maps are available, there can be no certainty over the status of Site NTC7 in respect of flood risk. The residential development of the whole site or a larger part of the site would allow for a planned comprehensive development, possibly in conjunction with the adjacent Cheshire Warehousing site. Such a development would make a significant contribution towards the Neighbourhood Plan's vision of encouraging pedestrian and cycle leisure access along the riverside, with development fronting onto and overlooking this route and the river. The provision of water-based leisure facilities including mooring points and pontoons could be incorporated on the riverside, in order to further encourage activity and interaction with the waterspace.</p> <p>The Canal & River Trust would be glad to provide further information in respect of Site NTC7 and to enter into the appropriate discussions with the local planning authority, Town Council and Environment Agency in order to agree the most beneficial way forward in respect of this site.</p>
Mr Simon Clarke	Highways Agency	WNP22	<p>Thank you for consulting with the Highways Agency (H.A.) about the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that the plan aims to give local people a greater say about what happens in their area and provides a vision for the future of the town. It sets out a number of key objectives for the area and planning policies which it wishes to be used to help determine planning applications in the Winsford area</p> <p>The provisions of this Plan have been reviewed and the primary message we have is that the Highways Agency has adopted a general stance to welcoming growth amounting to additional development which would not have severe impact upon the strategic road network.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Arising from the proposed land uses on the various sites contained within this plan, we would ask Cheshire West and Chester Council to be mindful that the H.A. would continue to rely in future on being formally consulted on development proposals which would be likely to have a material impact upon the strategic road network. This applies to both planning applications and pre-application proposals from would be developers. In practice also, this could include more than one site where proposals come forward at a similar time and which would be liable to have greater effects in highway terms also</p> <p>Of more significance in respect of such impact would be the larger sites to the eastern periphery of Winsford. For example, employment sites W8 and W7 would be seen as having potential implications for future traffic generated at junction 19 of the M6, as well as junction 18</p> <p>On Policy T4: 'CWACC will work with neighbouring authorities to seek improved access to the M6, especially to link the business area to the motorway' ; this aspiration is noted.</p> <p>In addition, there are clear sustainability arguments in favour of extending housing areas in the town closer to the railway station. Where such initiatives may be complemented by an effective approach to encouraging greater use of transport modes other than the private motor vehicle, these will be more likely to achieve some success in reducing road congestion. The application of an appropriate and targeted approach in the necessary travel plans would be likely to realise welcome community benefits also.</p> <p>I trust that this response is of some assistance. Should you need us to clarify or amplify any aspect related to strategic highways and motorways could you please contact the writer</p>
Mr Edward Hughes		WNP16	<p>I recently came back to Winsford after living away for a few years due to University. I found out about the plan to build more housing on Rilshaw soon after returning, as it is a spot that me and my friends frequently visit. While I do agree Winsford is in dire need of a renovation, I don't believe that more residential areas (especially those build on green spaces when there are so many brown field sites) will help. There are talks that it would bring in more jobs for the community, but from what I can tell this will not be the case. I have seen what more housing does to Winsford from the housing that has been built in the past few years and all it seems to do is bring in more people and nothing new in terms of Jobs, commercial or recreation. The town council say that with the new people they can attract more businesses and commerce, but if they can't do that with 40,000 people, then a few thousand more won't make this town any more appealing. The proposed plan will also destroy lots of native habitats of local wildlife some of which are protected. It has also been suggested that it could create serious damage in regards to flooding. Finally the road and highway infrastructure would not support the drastic increase from the influx of people. Thank you for your time and I hope that you seriously reconsider or at the very least alter the plans that are currently in place.</p>
Ms Jennifer Clare		WNP17	<p>I wish to object to the Current Neighbourhood Plan proposal. There are areas on this Plan that are totally unsuitable for Development, because of the road network in those specific areas that cannot cope with further traffic.</p> <p>It is quite apparent after attending all Public Council Meetings on this proposal, that residents in Winsford are opposed to this Plan. Many Developers are currently putting Planning Applications in to pre-empt the N.P., surely CWAC should wait for this to be ratified first!</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>If as we are led to believe that this is to be “what the residents of Winsford want”, then please listen WE DO NOT WANT THIS!!!</p> <p>We were also promised to have copies of the Winsford Voice delivered to all addresses, yet again we haven’t had one. The information given out to residents has failed miserably.</p> <p>Start looking at all Brownfield sites first, build on them first, before we start taking away our beautiful green spaces. Isn’t this current Government Policy?</p> <p>It is ludicrous to build around the Flashes,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This is the area used in all Winsford Town Council Publicity shots. · It is used as recreational area for many Winsford Residents · It is home to many species of wildlife · The whole view from the lake will be hundreds of houses · The roads will not accommodate any more traffic in that area, they are overcrowded with many current problems now, without many extra cars. <p>I suggest this Council goes back to think again what the residents want, as I see it, it’s not the current N.P. in this form</p> <p>Jennifer Clare</p>
Alaine Britton		WNP19	<p>Reference NP002 – Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>We belong to a local community action group (Over Residents Action Committee – ORAC), set up to oppose planning applications to build on green field sites in our area.</p> <p>We (ORAC) wish to put the following comments on record:-</p> <p>We are generally in agreement with the key objectives of the Plan, particularly the promotion of the River Weaver, Flashes and Salt Mine with a view to their development as visitor (and community) attractions, improvement and/or redevelopment of the shopping centre and also the development of the station quarter, with improved links between the station and the town centre.</p> <p>However, we have major reservations with regard to the numbers of new homes required, as stated in the Plan, particularly the development of greenfield sites in order to meet this requirement. We believe that the requirement of 3,150 houses was reduced to 2,715 in CWAC’s Housing Requirement Background paper, published August 2012.</p> <p>Although Outline Planning permission has been granted for land east of Chester Road, we would strenuously request that building on this greenfield site is held in reserve until:-</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>- All brownfield sites have been utilized (including, for example, the site of the former Woodford Lodge High School, off Oakmere Road, which would support the development of around 440 houses).</p> <p>- After the completion of the station quarter.</p> <p>- A 'real' requirement for this housing has been identified.</p> <p>Please be advised that we wish to be notified regarding future progress of the Plan.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mr Jack Ellis		WNP20	<p>I frequent Rilshaw Lane and surrounding areas with my friends on a regular basis and we are concerned for its future. The Neighbourhood Plan could create dangerous flooding and drainage issues, something which we already see during heavy rainfall in Winsford. On top of this the plan affects wildlife adversely, barn owls, bats and various other birds will lose their homes. I'm often surprised at the variety of birds found this side of town and these would be lost.</p> <p>The Rilshaw lane part of The Neighbourhood Plan is unfairly disproportionate compared to the rest of the plan and can not be supported by the roads currently in place. Ideally the plan should be looked over from a new perspective.</p> <p>It is more than agreeable that Winsford needs renovation and expansion, however using good quality agricultural land and green space, so valued by the people of Winsford, is not the way to go. Perhaps it would be beneficial to focus on revamping the town centre and bettering the roads before taking such radical options as suggested so far.</p> <p>After explaining the pros and cons of the Neighbourhood Plan to family and friends not one of them have considered it a well planned idea.</p> <p>I sincerely hope whoever reads this considers my words and the words of the many people who are no doubt writing in to oppose the plan.</p> <p>Thank you for reading,</p>
A Walker		WNP21	<p>Objections to Winsford Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Responses to basic conditions of Neighbourhood Plan relating to Rilshaw lane</p> <p>" has appropriate regard to national policy"</p> <p>The plan is simply taking good farmland out of commission with total disregard to abundance of wild life on the lane.</p> <p>" contributes to the achievement of sustainable development"</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>The plan is advocating 1000 high density affordable houses in an area which will not sustain the large amount of traffic this will generate To compound this congestion the new plan advocates that there will be no access to</p> <p>Rilshaw Lane from the proposed development. Assuming that each house has a minimum of one car with a track rating of 0.85 plus parking areas this will generate approximately 8 kilometres of extra cars.to the area. The plan is aspirational and unsustainable with no regard or evidence to the infrastructure. There has been no congestion survey in the plan.</p> <p>The flood survey in the report does not take into an account the report or recommendations of " the Geological Society of the area round Winsford. "</p> <p>Now that the extraction of natural wild brine has ceased in the Winsford area the rate of subsidence has virtually disappeared but it has not stopped altogether and it has been recognised that fresh subsidence scars were still</p> <p>forming as late as the late 1990`s. in the fields bordering and in the proximity and the depression caused by the Bottom Flash.Therfore evidence of land instability.</p> <p>There is evidence of linear subsidence running on a line parallel to `The Churchill Fault ` which cuts into the development at plots two and three.The Churchill Fault runs in a SW to N E direction along the edge of Rilshaw</p> <p>Lane up to Station Road. The potential instability of the land is noted in the presence of tie bars in some of the property on Rilshaw Lane.(Airedale, Rose Villa, Rilshaw Farm.)</p> <p>The potential INSTABILITY of the area parallel with Rilshaw Lane is noted on page 45 of the report. Mapping of Saliferous Beds.</p> <p>" the solubility of the top salt layers combined with the surface effect of solution and unpredictable surface drainage (no mention of this in the flood report of the Neighbourhood Plan) into the Weaver makes mapping</p> <p>un predictable and difficult. in an area of instability .It notes that a definite line would not be accurate in the proximity of the survey and the area would be of no practical value for economic or planning purposes."</p> <p>Therefore building on unstable land is unsustaiable and economic suicide,</p> <p>Added to this is the changing state of the Bottom Flash which in the last ten years is silting up and reverting back to a river .A large spit has grown parallel to the east bank extending 40 metres from Rilshaw Meadows.</p> <p>The silting up and scouring of rhe Weaver (its not called the Weaver for nothing) as it changes course with subsequent accompaniment of land slip and soil creep is scouring a stream back towards Rilshaw Lane. The</p> <p>Weaver is returning back to its denuded original form .The land is potentially unstable. The cost of supporting the bank and building a</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>walk or cycle path plus a bridge is total pie in the sky and financially prohibative in this day and age .This is a piece of spin impractical since it was first suggested in the 1960`s</p> <p>There is no comprehensive drainage survey in the plan .</p> <p>The plan recognises that there is a need for low cost housing in the town. linked to jobs. The only prospect of sustainable jobs in the town is in the distribution area; there are no manufacturing traditions ,few offices. Ten miles from the motorway near to Mid point large distribution companies select more attractive sites closer to the motorway with less transport costs (Morrisons Tesco.) The large distribution companies have come to the town and left when incentives were removed. If the town has not been able to attract companies on a permanent basis within the last 50 years the hope for new jobs linked to new housing is unsustainable.</p> <p>A Walker B.Sc geology M.Sc Cranfield.</p>
Ms Julie Harris		WNP25	<p>Building on farmland is against the national planning policy framework.</p> <p>The Rilshaw Lane site vastly disproportionate to the rest of the plan. An increase in traffic could not be supported by current highways infrastructure.</p> <p>It could create serious drainage and flooding issues. At present the lane and surrounding farmland are already subject to flooding during heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Ecology issues. Many protected species including barn owls and bats would be greatly affected and sustain a loss of habitat.</p> <p>It would remove this last vestige of green space, which is at a premium within this area and greatly valued by the Winsford townspeople for recreational activities and it`s aesthetics.</p> <p>It would change the character of Rilshaw Lane immeasurably by extending an existing area of urban sprawl.</p> <p>It would seriously damage the environment and have significant adverse impact on the quality of life for the existing residents.</p> <p>Unlikely to enable any new business to start or create permanent jobs across any business sector.</p> <p>It will not regenerate Winsford Cross Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Losing good quality agricultural land is not sustainable (see National planning policy framework).</p> <p>The SHLAA information is incorrect as it describes the farmland around Rilshaw lane as open countryside whereas this is in fact</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>agricultural farmland.</p> <p>Ownership of land highlighted for development is incorrect as the council have already been informed.</p>
Melanie Starkey		WNP26	I write this e-mail to log my vote against the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan. In particular, I object/disagree to any housing development on the existing rural land within the vicinity of Rilshaw Lane and the Winsford Flash area.
Mr Bob Nicholson	Pochin Developments Limited	WNP27	Detailed letter and plan attached
Angela Ellis		WNP29	<p>I am writing today to express my concern with the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Winsford needs new jobs for its current residents, I believe adding more residents will not help this at all. Other housing estates built in Winsford have not brought in new jobs and I'm sure this new one at Rilshaw will be exactly the same. It's residents will be people moving in from outside Winsford, most likely people who are already working from another area in Cheshire. Apart from the obvious tax benefits the council will receive, it seems there are very few pros for those people already living here.</p> <p>Not only will it negatively affect those living close to Rilshaw Lane but it will affect everyone in Winsford as the current roads and junctions will not hold up with thousands more people moving in. To prove my point one may only look at the High Street as it currently is. With road works, the streets of Winsford are already congested to an agonizing extent.</p> <p>Far more important matters need to be implemented before the Plan can take place.</p>
Mr Robin Buckley	Redrow Homes (North) Ltd	WNP57	Please see attached letter.
Miss Emily Hrycan	Historic Environment Planning Adviser (North West) English Heritage	WNP32	See attached letters dated 22 July and 20 August.
Ms Vicky Stirling	The Director National Grid Company	WNP48	<p>(see also attached letter)</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>The land to the south of School Green is identified in figure 4.1.1 'Development Potential of Land within the Neighbourhood Plan Area'</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>as an area of potentially unconstrained land. Whilst this area is not allocated for any development within the Neighbourhood Plan at present, National Grid considers that it is necessary to</p> <p>drawn your attention to the high pressure gas pipeline which borders this area and may represent a significant constraint.</p> <p>Our underground pipelines are protected by permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway under our licence. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our gas transmission network. Hence we require that no permanent structures are built over or under pipelines or within the zone specified in the agreements, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the pipeline route and that unrestricted and safe access to any of our pipeline(s) must be maintained at all times.</p> <p>Local authorities have a statutory duty to consider applications for development in the vicinity of high pressure (above 7 bar) pipelines and to advise the developer on whether the development should be allowed on safety grounds on rules provided by HSE. This advice is provided by the HSE Planning Advice for Development near to Hazardous Installations (PADHI) process. The relevant HSE guidance can be accessed via the following link: http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.pdf</p> <p>In order to ensure that National Grid's pipelines are protected from uncontrolled development in the vicinity of the pipeline please also read the following guidance prepared by National Grid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties <p>http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/50ACAC0A-ED26-41A7-91FA-83163A98270F/23790/TSPSSW22_J537_Rev0807.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gas Transmission Underground Pipelines – Guidance <p>http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/446009BF-ABB5-42E1-B9FE-44E90D577DD5/18653/APTGasGuidance_2_.pdf</p> <p>Should these sites be taken forward as development sites in the future, the developers should be made aware of the above issues.</p>
Mr Richard Chamberlain	Senior Land Manager Wainhomes (Developments) Ltd	WNP51	Please see attached letter and documentation.

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Peter Wilkinson		WNP34	<p>as a representative of the residents in the station quarter of the N.P. I must strongly reject the proposed plan. The proposed housing development on green fields along Rilshaw lane would be building on land where there are two Geological Fault lines. Houses on this lane already have "tie-bars" fitted to help stop the cracking due to land slippage. Why build on green fields when brown land is available?. Traffic at peak periods in Winsford is already grid-locked and an additional 3,300 houses would generate an additional 7000 cars simply making traffic problems even worse - this would not improve our community. Rilshaw Lane is a quiet winding land so how will the development "protect the Historic character of Rilshaw Lane". The infrastructure cannot cope with an additional 7000 + residents to an already struggling system where we already have to wait 3 weeks for doctors appointments and even longer for dentist and hospital appointments. This development would increase the population of Winsford by 20% and we don't have the services or employment to back this up. Where are the industries ? The industries that were enticed to come to Winsford in the 1960's have long gone leaving the industrial estates half empty.</p>
Mr Trevor Sayle	Director Goldfinch Promotions Limited & Goldfinch (Estates) Ltd	WNP46	<p>Subject: Land at Swanlow Lane/Welsh Lane, Winsford, CW7 1SA</p> <p>We write to formally object to the above Neighbourhood Plan with regards to the omission of the above site as an allocation for future housing land.</p> <p>This site has been carried forward by Cheshire West and Chester Council in their Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, July 2013: under their reference WSD/0005/S and a copy of their site details is attached herewith. It should be noted that the number of homes that could be delivered would be in the 1-5 year period, rather than the 6-10 year period.</p> <p>There is a current planning application, reference 13/03459/OUT, for 116 dwellings pending consideration and extensive details may be viewed with this application. On the 20th June 2013 members of the Strategic Planning Committee were minded to approve application 12/04901/OUT for residential development of up to 80 dwellings, subject to a Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>There is also clearly conflict between Cheshire West & Chester Council's allocation of 3,500 new homes to be built in Winsford in their Draft Local Plan and only 3,150 new homes in the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan. We must respectfully request that this parcel of land be included in both allocations.</p>
Mr Trevor Sayle	Director Goldfinch Promotions Limited & Goldfinch (Estates) Ltd	WNP47	<p>Subject: Land at Shepherds Fold Drive, Willow Close & Wades Lane, Winsford, CW7 2UJ</p> <p>We write to formally object to the above Neighbourhood Plan with regards to the omission of the above site as an allocation for future housing land.</p> <p>This site has been carried forward by Cheshire West and Chester Council in their Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, July 2013: under their reference WOV/0010/S and a copy of their site details is attached herewith. It should be noted that the number of homes that could be delivered would be in the 1-5 year period, rather than the 6-10 year period. Furthermore, the use is stated as "agricultural", however, this is incorrect, as we, our Planning Consultants and our Architects have previously advised the land has not been used for agriculture for approximately twelve years due to damage to mowing machinery caused by fly-tipping (domestic items) dumped on the site and also due to extensive trespass. This land is now a totally wasted asset/resource.</p> <p>Previously this site had been identified for residential development by Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design and Winsford Town Council in</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>their draft Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan, but, without explanation, it has been omitted from the current Plan.</p> <p>There is a current planning application, reference 12/04858/OUT, for 73 dwellings pending consideration, and extensive details may be viewed with this application. Since we submitted this application evidence of some landfill affecting the south area of the land has come to light, however, we would stress that none of the proposed homes are near to this area. In fact, it is a proposed new woodland area, to serve as a wildlife corridor and newt habitat. Rather than have this issue covered by Condition our Environmental Consultants are fully addressing the issue.</p> <p>When the previous Local Plan was being reviewed the Government appointed Inspector, Mr David Felton, concluding on this parcel of land in his Report on the Local Plan (Vale Royal Borough Council) stated:</p> <p>“This land is on the edge of the built-up area of the town, in an area that has seen progressive eastward movement of new development towards the Weaver. From the site substantial industrial/commercial development can be seen clearly to the east. This land does not have the feel of open countryside to it. It is on the urban fringes; its development would seem to me to be a natural progression of development. Its allocation would not physically extend the settlement boundary out into the rural hinterland. Since the land is on the fringes of one of the two main towns and is reasonably close to the town centre, it must be a prime candidate for inclusion as a site to help make up the shortfall in housing land that I have identified. I shall not formally recommend the allocation of this site, since it is for the Council to review all potential sites in order to ascertain those most suited to make up the shortfall, but shall recommend that its potential be further considered.”</p> <p>There is also clearly conflict between Cheshire West & Chester Council’s allocation of 3,500 new homes to be built in Winsford in their Draft Local Plan and only 3,150 new homes in the Winsford Neighbourhood Development Plan. We must respectfully request that this parcel of land be included in both allocations.</p>
Mr Daniel Chant	Graduate Planner Gladman Developments Ltd	WNP55	Please see attached document.
Mr Paul Campbell	Director Richborough Estates	WNP56	Please see attached document.
Mr Terry Nutting		WNP31	<p>As a Winsfordian of some 65 years I've seen the mess that's been made of this once lovely little town. No need for specifics the proof is out there. Now The Planners want to stick the boot in re Rilshaw Lane. I sincerely hope that if built and subsequently sold, the occupants can find a job and frequent our biggest attraction being the never ending Balti and Kebab shops.</p> <p>Why not have the guts to offer the townsfolk a referendum to decide yes/no to this farce? Imposition is hardly democratic.</p> <p>For G_D's sake leave us alone.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs K Egerton		WNP30	<p>I do not agree with the neighbourhood plan. It does not answer why Winsford has to have (on greenbelt land) over 3000 houses, that is 3/5 of the total for Cheshire West. Winsford does not have enough schools, decent roads, enough jobs and the shopping centre is a joke.</p> <p>Who is going to buy all these houses, people from out of town, they will have to travel to work, causing more pollution. This government wants less pollution not more. They will buy them because they are cheaper than the rest of Cheshire. We will have no green spaces left only a "concrete jungle".</p> <p>In the Winsford Voice it says the council will do lots of things - eg for tourism, jobs etc. The council does not say how it will do these things or where the money is coming from.</p> <p>As a Winsfordian born and bred here, I say NO to this plan.</p>
Mr & Mrs JF & GM Higgs		WNP33	<p>We have seen a draft plan for west Winsford and town centre. We feel parts of this plan are unacceptable for the following planning reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One potential site is at present a recreational park on High Street. As Winsford has relatively few facilities of this sort for size of population this seems wrong. 2. There are large areas of Greenfield site development proposed eg fields south of Moors Lane. One of these fields has unimproved grassland with ponds with great biodiversity eg snipe. We do not think that destroying Greenfield sites with housing is right way forward, so there should be justification showing that all brownfield sites have been used eg the Woodford Lodge school site, the semi derelict town centre, and infill sites not already on the plan eg along Swanlow Lane. 3. The surrounding areas such as south of Moors Lane are rural and the proposed housing allocations are far too dense to fit in for the surroundings. 4. In the past, poor decisions about planning have been made to the detriment of Winsford town. For example the Winsford flashes which could be a valuable amenity have been subject to unsightly housing estates. The spatial plan provides an opportunity to enhance the area by ensuring more green spaces than are in the present plan which seems solely to consist of housing estates.
Mr Graham Ashley		WNP35	<p>My comments on the neighbourhood Plan, & why I object to it are that for the majority of Winsford residents. There are few positives just negatives. The beautiful views of the flashes & the green field sites surrounding them will be ruined for ever. St Chands viewed from Rilshaw Lane meadows look picturesque but not within an estate. We also lose the pretty walk along Rilshaw Lane. The national policy of building on agricultural land when the world population is increasing & the future need to feed ourselves is so short sighted. The long term development in this fashion will produce just a mass sprawl in West Cheshire. With our EU obligation of mass immigration into this country there will be no end to the loss of farm land.</p> <p>Winsford seems to be getting a disproportionately large proportion of the developments, 4,000. This puts our services under more pressure:- Doctors surgeries, Dentists hospitals, Schools when they are already at full stretch. Our human rights to these facilities will be much reduced. It will mean 1,200 extra houses around Rilshaw Lane, Feeding onto the A54 a single lane. Rilshaw Lane, The number of</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>cars from this development alone 1,800 will casue congestion pollution.</p> <p>Middlewich Rd for many hours of the day will be more like a car park.</p> <p>No lack of new firms wanting to come to Winsford. I see nothing for Winsford, people in this development especially as there are already many houses for sale a preview for the future is what is happening just putting an extra lane off to the shopping centre.</p>
Mr J A Brittleton		WNP36	<p>The Winsford Neighbourhood Plan for the Station Quarter would not enhance the town plan but create a satelite village on its outskirts. It would also have a devastating effect on the environment and wildlife in the area. The plan is to build 1000 houses and community buildings on land that tends to flood in bad weather. All surface water from roofs, roads and pathways will be channeled into drains and directed into the Weaver which has its own problem with flooding thus creating ongoing problems.</p> <p>The sewage system from this area has to be pumped under the River Weaver to the filter beds so will put extra pressure on the existing pumping equipment.</p> <p>The access roads to this development will have to join either the A54 a main road with no speed limit or Rilshaw Lane which is an access road to existing property and little more than single track wide. The impact of some 1000 extra vehicles joining these and the existing road system would cause major holdups especially to Clive Lane which is the main route from Winsford to Leighton hospital.</p> <p>If the Neighbourhood Plan goes ahead the impact on local doctors, dentists, opticians and associate services including Leighton Hospital would have a serious effect on an already overloaded facility.</p>
Mr Mark Hayes		WNP37	<p>I would like to raise my objection to the planned development work planned for Rilshaw Lane. The reason for my objection is that the area and all along the river Weaver in Winsford is becoming a haven for wildlife, it was one of the major attractions of the town when we moved here.</p> <p>Your plans for new estates on Rilshaw may attract more people and more commerce for Winsford and for this reason I have been undecided for quite a while, but I am beginning to see how Winsford is becoming a stepping stone for young families, not a place to stay. It is cheap, house prices are more affordable, but the area is not attractive enough for people to stay in, there is crime, the town centre is poorly looked after, the schools are atrocious.... The only people who do stay are the people who have no choice. You are creating a sink estate town. Please leave our wildlife and countryside alone and create a long term plan to make Winsford into a place people what to settle down in and stay. House prices will go up, you can charge more for services, the town will be a nice place to live.</p>
Mr & Mrs Ian & Alison Brandon		WNP38	<p>I wish to place an objection to the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The reasons being are that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Winsford cannot sustain the extra traffic problem this would cause as there is no infrastructure in place to accommodate all the extra traffic (potential 7,000+ extra cars on the road). The M6 corridor through Middlewich is already over capacity. 2. Winsford has been given an unfair proportion of housing compared with others in the Chester West and Chester area (especially

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Chester itself).</p> <p>3. The extra housing will NEVER bring businesses to the town as this is going on all around the country, so you have a status quo situation.</p> <p>4. Facilities such as Schools, Leisure and retail provision in the town cannot sustain the current population let alone another 7,000 + residents which new housing would bring if anyone actually bought them.</p> <p>5. There are numerous houses in Winsford now that are unoccupied so how do you expect further houses to be sold.</p> <p>With regards to the Rilshaw Lane development.</p> <p>1. This is scheduled to be developed on a fault line and the houses around there are seeing minor problems with this.</p> <p>2. Building houses towards the flashes WILL cause flooding and the land between the dual carriage way and Rilshaw Lane is always flooded during the winter.</p> <p>3. The houses to be built between the dual carriage way and Rilshaw Lane will infringe human rights of the residents creating further noise, pollution disruption, light deprivation and infringement on views.</p> <p>4. Councillor Clarke said 25 years ago that houses would never be built between the dual carriageway and Rilshaw because they would NEVER be granted permission from the council to access the area from off the dual carriage way and NEVER be granted access off Rilshaw Lane because the lane is not wide enough.</p> <p>5. Building houses would cause major disruption to the wildlife in the area.</p>
Mr & Mrs R & A Underhill		WNP39	<p>People enjoy the natural countryside of Rilshaw Lane.</p> <p>Why destroy what little remains of Winsfords green belt land, putting wild life at risk and taking our heritage away from future generations.</p> <p>The land quality with its known subsidence and flooding is surely a recipe for building disaster.</p> <p>There is a job shortage in winsford so if people work! they will have to travel. The increased traffic alone will destroy Winsford (noise, congestion, pollution) the roads will not cope.</p> <p>Policeing and all public services will be put under impossible pressure.</p> <p>There will be no money to provide the promised cycle paths and leisure activities for such an increase in population. we can see no good in the so called Neighbourhood plan.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr & Ms Simon & Kate Chilcott & Selby		WNP40	<p>I wish to oppose the neighbourhood plan for the proposed development of building a large amount of houses in the place that I live.</p> <p>My partner and myself are against this, for starters, the unemployment level in Winsford is at a high and there is little chance of this changing. Various close friends including myself have faced redundancy over the last few years and people have found it just as hard to enter back into employment in the area as there are hundreds going for the same jobs everytime.</p> <p>There is also an all time low of things for children to do in the area compared to when I was little. The Civic Hall was demolished, youth centres closed and the facilities at Knights Grange have become few and far from any access too.</p> <p>The town centre has also perished over the last few years. Once again it doesn't even offer the public a day out they can now enjoy and take part in as the level of shops and stalls has perished.</p> <p>The amount of public houses in the area has fell to an all time low and would offer nothing for new residents of the town to have any part in enjoyment of the area and communicating with the public.</p> <p>The level of the noise would be far too much for people who are starting a family and the state of the countryside and places we can simply enjoy walking with our dogs would be destroyed with building material, waste and vehicle passage.</p>
Mr Danny Bennion		WNP41	<p>I've lived in Winsford for my entire life, being raised and schooled here, and will be one of many people negatively impacted by the changes this decision will cause.</p> <p>On top of this decision potentially ruining one of the few remaining green areas in the town, I cannot trust the claims that this will open up some much needed jobs. Various other housing estates added to Winsford didn't offer the jobs they promised in the past so there is no reason to believe it would be handled differently this time.</p> <p>Along with the increase of people within the town, it should also be factored in that there is currently no way the roads can comfortably support the increased amount of traffic, leading to significant delays and traffic congestion.</p> <p>In terms of the actual land involved, the proposed changes would permanently destroy the habitat for a variety of species, some of which are protected like barn owls and bats.</p> <p>Another issue is that there could be problems with flooding, which the area has already proven to have some difficulty with when the weather is particularly harsh.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, and I hope you keep messages like this under consideration.</p>
The Ashley Family		WNP42	<p>The neighbourhood plan in it's current format will have a negative impact on the people of Winsford in particular the residents of Rilshaw Lane. The over concentration of houses around this area on the Station Quarter sites is greatly disproportionate to the rest of the plan. This would create a major increase in traffic that the current highways system can not cope with. The land proposed for the</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Station Quarter sites has always been used as agricultural farmland which the use of this land for building purposes is against the national planning policy framework. Not only will it be a loss of good agricultural land but also the loss of green space for the residents to walk and the natural habitat for many protected species of wildlife. The total number of houses proposed will have a detrimental affect on the existing residents and the local services, as the increase in population will put a further strain on the already struggling Health Service. Please reconsider this plan.</p>
S Hefferan		WNP43	<p>I am writing to inform you of my strenuous objections to the current form of the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst recognising that new housing is a government requirement and each council has its quota to fill, this can still be met in a sustainable way that does not focus negative impact of house building on one town. My objections are listed below:</p> <p>1 The allocation of house building across the borough is disproportionately high in Winsford. Winsford does certainly have scope for development but can not sustain the significant numbers planned. When viewed across the borough as a whole, the appearance is very much that of Winsford being a 'sink' for the majority of housing.</p> <p>2 The location of the allocations within Winsford eats up the majority of the few greenspaces within town. Studies for local planning recognise the importance of maintaining/creation of greenspaces for the psychological benefits of its residents. Town park and Weaver Parkway are not sufficient for the populous once expanded.</p> <p>3 The density in which the housing is proposed is unsustainable - have we learnt nothing from high density estates which are often pockets of social deprivation and crime hot spots. People need space and can not live in cramped conditions.</p> <p>4 Infrastructure can be built/altered and whatever expense is found to pay for it, however if you do not have a pleasant place to live/work/study/leisure, they will be wasted as no-one will want to live/work/study/leisure in a place with a densely built and populated area, with no views and no quality of life.</p> <p>This plan in its current form will be to the major detriment to the future of Winsford. The town will never rise out of its historic image of social deprivation if such a short sighted, uninspired and unsustainable plan goes ahead. Winsford will never have the character of Cheshire's more picturesque historic towns but can, with innovation and considered planning develop a modern attractive environment to attract a socially upward mobile populous that can progress and has the potential to be a strong economic centre in the future. The plan sadly reeks of borough planners identifying 'sink' areas and even more sadly of town councillors taking the 'easy way' out and accepting the first offer on the table. I strongly support the concept of a neighbourhood plan, one that has fully consulted and developed concepts based on the current populations aspirations. No one is foolish enough to recognise that development is inevitable, however it should lead to progression of an area and not regression. A new plan is needed, developed with representatives of the local business and residential community - this is the true meaning of the localities agenda!</p>
Mr J McIntosh		WNP45	<p>May I in the strongest possible terms formally place on record my objections to the above proposed development plans by Cheshire West Council. My reasons for objection are numerous highlighted by the key issue of the council</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			officers being accountable to the electorate and the electorate not dictated to by the elected officers. Such officers are appointed to office to serve the people. The residents of Winsford do not exist to serve the council.
Mrs Denise Doherty	Save Rilshaw Action Group	WNP49	Please see attached document.
Mr Jon Suckley	Darnhall Estate How Planning e	WNP50	Please refer to covering letter and attachments.
Mr Edward Reilly		WNP52	Please see attached document.
Mrs Hazel Reilly		WNP53	Please see attached document.
	MAR Group of Companies and Winsford Cross Development Ltd	WNP54	Please see attached letter.
Mr Jeremy Owens	Strategic Manager - Spatial Planning Cheshire West & Chester Council	WNP58	Please see attached letter and appendices A and B.
Mr Paul Starkey		WNP60	I wish to object to the Winsford Neighbourhood plan. 1st. Ruining of Rilshaw Lane with development that will take away one of the most attractive areas of Winsford that is used by many residents of Winsford for relaxation and exercise, robbing local people of the opportunity of quick and easy access to a country environment.

Full Name	Organisation Details	ID	Comments - Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>2nd. Increased traffic and noise to the area.</p> <p>3rd. Lack of consultation and information of the plan.</p> <p>4th. Misleading information presented of the plan.</p> <p>5th. Putting the countryside out of reach people such as myself .</p> <p>6th. Loss of wildlife habitat.</p>
Cllr Mike Jones	Leader of the Council Leader, Cheshire West & Chester Council	WNP44	<p>(PDF copy of letter is attached).</p> <p>I am writing to support the above neighbourhood plan and congratulate Winsford in achieving the excellent progress in developing a plan for the Town.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.1.7 describes the critical two issues Winsford has to address if it is going to attract inward investment and create jobs. Investment is needed to help tackle the list of objectives it has identified, such as the regeneration of the town centre, developing an evening economy and transforming Winsford into a vibrant and great place to live. Utilising the range of green space such as the flashes, waterways, quality business parks and Winsford’s location in Mid Cheshire, the Plan sets out how advantage can be taken to achieve this once in a lifetime opportunity for Winsford.</p> <p>Cheshire West and Chester see the development of a Neighbourhood Plan and its own Local Plan as an opportunity to transform Winsford and enable Winsford to become a centre of growth for the Borough. The detail contained within the Winsford Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) covering housing allocation, business development, use of green space and creating environmentally rich habitats fully accords with paragraphs 7 and 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and I fully support the approach.</p> <p>The WNP sets out the issues and through a detailed consultation and community engagement (I personally attended a couple of the public events) as described in section 2.2. I fully support the themes as detailed in section 3.2, however, understandably the need for a northerly bypass has not been included due to the potential size of such a project and with it being outside the control of the Town Council. However, I do believe it should be mentioned as an aspiration in paragraph 4.1.1 due to its importance to support business growth in and around Winsford.</p> <p>Section 5 contains a range of policies that are intended to shape the place for people to live and feel proud of the developing town. This is very important as they have been developed by residents and will give a sense of ownership of the town to its residents, developing a strong sense of civic pride. Combined with the work to develop an evening economy, jobs in the leisure industry, hospitality, commercial and industrial sectors will offer a range of employment opportunities enabling local people to be educated locally and then employed locally. It is clear much thought has been given to the allocation of sites for housing, leisure and business to maximise local employment, an objective I fully support.</p>