

Nether Alderley Looking Forward Alderley Park Development Survey

A range of views has already been expressed by residents about the Alderley Park development proposals and we would like to know the extent to which they reflect local opinion.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. Enter ONE only

- 1.** The development of the Alderley Park site into a life science park focusing on human health science research and development, technologies and processes as a means of retaining skilled employment in the North West should be supported.

95.6% *Agree*
3.5% *Disagree*
0.9% *Don't know*
- 2.** As Alderley Park is entirely within Green Belt which has been additionally designated as being of Special County Value because of the attractive character of its historic parkland, future building should be tightly restricted to the sites of existing buildings.

86.0% *Agree*
8.8% *Disagree*
5.3% *Don't know*
- 3.** The potential opportunity to open public access to the beautiful woodlands, parkland, lakes and historic garden within Alderley Park, linking footpaths from the Conservation Area through to National Trust property on The Edge, is an excellent idea.

87.0% *Agree*
8.7% *Disagree*
4.3% *Don't know*
- 4.** It is a concern that by making a decision now to allow residential and other non Life Science development uses on the site before the science park has had an opportunity to become established and develop its full potential will inevitably restrict its long-term growth unless expansion is eventually allowed into the parkland or woodlands, which are on Green Belt land.

69.9% *Agree*
22.1% *Disagree*
8.0% *Don't know*
- 5.** Nether Alderley is a low density sprawling rural parish. The building of 200+ homes (near doubling the size of the parish) within a relatively small area is incompatible with the character of the parish and being physically apart from the existing settlement of Nether Alderley risks creating a separate community.

76.5% *Agree*
16.5% *Disagree*
7.0% *Don't know*
- 6.** The prospect of a significant increase in skilled employment in the North West (growth projected from the current 3,500 within Alderley Park up to 7,000) is to be welcomed as a boost to the local economy.

74.6% *Agree*
14.9% *Disagree*
10.5% *Don't know*

- 7.** It is a concern that additional housing coupled with a large increase in the Alderley Park workforce will lead to a significant increase in traffic through the village and congestion at the northern entrance of Alderley Park.
81.7% *Agree*
13.0% *Disagree*
5.2% *Don't know*
- 8.** The fact that developers will be expected to make appropriate contributions to offset impacts on the physical, social community and environmental infrastructure, via the Section 106 Agreement, should be welcomed as a valuable contribution towards much needed local facilities.
77.0% *Agree*
15.0% *Disagree*
8.0% *Don't know*
- 9.** The business case for including residential and other potential development said to be needed to finance the business park should be justified and published as it is fundamental to the planning assumptions.
89.4% *Agree*
6.2% *Disagree*
4.4% *Don't know*
- 10.** The Framework includes sports pitches and the historic garden within the definition of 'previously developed land'. If deemed unsuitable for development, it allows any PDL to be swapped with any other land on the site. There is a concern this will lead to 'development creep' within the Green Belt
84.8% *Agree*
8.0% *Disagree*
7.1% *Don't know*
- 11.** It is a concern that whilst a planning application for the Dobbies farm shop and garden centre within Nether Alderley has been recently rejected by Cheshire East Council, there is now a suggestion that there should be a farm shop within Alderley Park.
53.5% *Agree*
36.0% *Disagree*
10.5% *Don't know*
- 12.** The potential impact upon local services such as schools, doctors, as well as potential local traffic congestion and additional parking needs within neighbouring Alderley Edge, should be evaluated and published by Cheshire East Council.
94.8% *Agree*
4.3% *Disagree*
0.9% *Don't know*
- 13.** It is a concern that Cheshire East Council has purchased Green Belt agricultural land opposite Alderley Park which might be used for development since it has been described by them as being a 'strategic' location.
82.5% *Agree*
9.6% *Disagree*
7.9% *Don't know*
- 14.** It is a concern that there is a potential conflict of interest in Cheshire East Council being both a shareholder in, and the planning authority for, the site.
84.2% *Agree*
7.9% *Disagree*
7.9% *Don't know*

15. In this section please feel free to make any other comment on the proposal for Alderley Park.

We feel that this survey adequately raises the concerns and thoughts regarding the potential impacts on local services in Nether Alderley and Alderley Edge. We hope that the views expressed will be taken into consideration and enable the Alderley Park site to continue to make positive contributions to the local area.

The increase in employment is to be welcomed but how does that equate with building 200 houses and hotel etc on the site? The site should be reserved for future scientific expansion. Section 106 = bribery and corruption.

Having today returned from a meeting to view the Framework (11/02/2015), I thought the Council presented a very good case for the houses proposed. The majority would be on Alderley park, by the Sports Centre and not on Astra Zeneca itself. A few shops would possibly be built to offset traffic congestion in Alderley Edge.

Re Section 106: Upkeep of Parish Hall

With an ever growing elderly population, it is important that this group in society are provided for. Re SECTION 106: Could contribution to community include Hopper Bus and some sort of community support meeting place for the elderly on the AZ site? I have big concerns regarding great increase in traffic.

There should be a footpath entrance into Alderley Park near the Mill and Church to link both to avoid having to walk along the main road.

We should wholeheartedly embrace new developments within Nether Alderley, particularly if that also brings with it social improvements and additional amenities.

We think that if any homes are built, they should be small affordable flats/houses and allocated to people who are working in the science park. This would reduce traffic congestion at rush hour and would be ideal for young graduates starting on their careers.

Re Q4 (selling off development land for other uses): The history of AstraZeneca expansion bears this out.

Re Q5 (Building houses within Alderley Park): Creating separate enclaves is against national planning policy.

Re Q7 (Expanding workforce): Development at the north end will cause more traffic movements into Alderley Edge (when a £60m bypass has been built).

Re SECTION 106: Could be interpreted as developers bribing the local authorities. Re Q9: Cheshire East own 10% of the consortium. This changes the balance where total transparency is essential.

Re Q10 (Allowing PDL swaps): is a conduit for expansion of development into Green Belt parkland. This appears already to have happened in this planning framework. When was 'Very special circumstances' approved and what was the process?

Re Q12 (Pressure on local services): Every single development within Cheshire East Local Plan had a full justification analysis with the exception of Alderley Park. These included number of houses and the effect on local services. This analysis should have been included within this development framework. After all, CEC has had over 12 months to prepare it.

Re Q13 (CEC acquisition of land opposite Alderley Park): It was described as strategic to the Life Science Park. Therefore, it is ear-marked for future development.

Re Q14 (conflict of interest): The Cheshire East Council owning a share in the consortium makes it impossible to be both 'poacher and gamekeeper'. Decisions will be biased. Who is safeguarding the interest of local residents?

The developer selection process was tainted from 'Day One'. All competitors knew the name of the winning developer after two months.....

Whatever is agreed, money from wherever will be the deciding factor.

It was deemed necessary to build a bypass to alleviate traffic congestion in and around Alderley Edge, but now with the number of visitors to the area the problem has not really been solved. To build a few hundred houses on the AstraZeneca site would be madness as the infrastructure could not cope with same.

Re SECTION 106: Parish hall renovation, footpaths, open access to parkland, play area. Also if there has to be affordable housing it should be allocated to Nether Alderley people - our children will never be able to afford property in Nether Alderley yet they have lived here all their lives and went to school here.

Cheshire East Council should be divorced from obtaining financial benefit from potential housing development.

The projected growth from the current 3500 to 7000 (Q6) is in my opinion too high and achievement is questionable. The impact of increasing this may have a disastrous effect on local amenities and resources. To even propose such a move without very detailed reviews on the local community and resources would be grossly irresponsible of Cheshire East Council.

Housing development within the site would help to bring the actual village of Nether Alderley closer to Monks Heath which is also part of Nether Alderley.

A self-contained mini city offering nil to existing village. 200 houses=400 cars. Whose doctors? Village school? Any amenity will have no connection to existing problems i.e. place for children to play - all too far away. Nether Alderley needs a new village hall with better parking and wish disabled access and a village green to join into this village. Visit Over Alderley and Mottram.

From what I have read in the media and from the Council website, there appears to be a lack of transparency.

Re Q8 (Section 106): Repair village hall.

Parking in the village is already chaotic. Residential development and increased workforce will be unsustainable for a village of this size. It would also destroy its unique village life.

Re Q6 (Expanding employment): Road infrastructure couldn't cope with 7,000 effectively and negative impacts associated. Can't access website listed (Sunday 15th). Don't believe footprint of existing site should be expanded although if existing buildings needed replacing to benefit the appearance of the site I wouldn't object. Road infrastructure a concern as need to keep traffic out of village i.e. bypass exit improved and feed all traffic directly into southern entrance and close northern entrance. I missed event on 11th and would welcome a further event.

Section 106 Agreement: Monies should be spent on traffic calming measures through the village to ensure safety of all residents, especially with additional vehicles / traffic. School, social facilities, playing fields.

Residential development should be kept to absolute minimum and Green Belt should be respected totally. Traffic concerns must be noted - as must impact of hundreds of people on local area - on services etc. This is an inappropriate area for this kind of development.

Developing Alderley Park as a Life Science Park is a very good idea. Any other development (e.g. housing) is of great concern.

1. No Green Belt development.
2. Adversely affect all aspects of Nether Alderley.
3. No infrastructure (schools, doctors etc) to support any residential development.

4. Cheshire East Council has a severe conflict of interest.

The Alderley Park Masterplan is very well presented but what will the realities be and how do we as residents consider the consequences of this development, reading between the business speak and eloquent proposals could the planners be masking a more ruthless end.

Developing further the North end of the site (Mereside west) will impact on the traffic into Alderley Edge which will migrate to the old A34 and encourage a rat run, destroying the benefits of the bypass.

A speed limit of 30mph on the old A34 should be considered or speed restrictions on the bends by the mill and the school at the very least. If the car park at Mereside west is to be redeveloped were will people park in the future?

Changes to the site roads should encourage traffic to use the south entrance, or consider a new entrance at the bypass roundabout a far better location for all.

Has the effect on the heronry been considered?

A proposed hotel would seriously affect the Mill Guest House which is located close by the north entrance, 90% of its business is with Alderley Park. Would a proposed farm shop be on Green Belt and develop into a Dobbies style business and once you start nibbling at the Green belt there is no end. We would like to see a thriving Alderley park but not at the expense of a beautiful Park and our local environment being compromised.

It is essential the existing community should be considered as fundamental in the consideration of this development e.g. by a section 106 and the rural / agricultural nature of the area should be protected at all costs.

Q5 (creating separate community within Alderley Park): Does it matter?

SECTION 106: Community centre / sports hall in Rectory field. Q11: Seems to be just a comment.

SECTION 106: Putting back into the community for the benefit of all, helping with the Animal Sanctuary, pot holes, roundabout gardens etc.

Section 106: Making Nether Alderley a better place to live in. Let's put back something in the community planters, nice welcoming signage, planting etc.

We do not need any further residential development at Alderley Park. There is good housing stock locally in a broad range of prices from Macclesfield and Congleton to Alderley / Wilmslow / Prestbury. This would purely be a money-making venture to maximise land values. Do not allow residential under any circumstances.

We need to develop a 'centre' for the village. The Alderley Park development should help.

It is a worry if houses are built within the Park. Once this happens, developers will start building outside of that area. We chose to live in Nether Alderley because of its beauty / landscape. We do not want it to become built on like A34 in Wilmslow / Handforth.

Life Sciences hub to be supported.

Correct to be suspicious of residential development necessary to fund the primary aim. Potential for Cheshire East conflict of interest very real.

Planning applications should be judged against the normal Green Belt protocol.

SECTION 106: This is bribery.

Q9 (justify with business case): Publish business case before any decision is taken.

Q14 (CEC acquisition of land opposite Alderley Park): CEC should disclose its intended use.

We are very supportive of the basic aim to create a world-class bio science facility to replace AZ. The Alderley Park site provides a first class site for such an idea, existing facilities and a wonderful campus in which to work and ample space for long-term development. It is the latter point which gives most cause for concern. ICI set up in Alderley Park when their new pharmaceutical division was no more than a 'seed business', but they had the vision to acquire a site for a business could grow with the business. The Bio Science Park is intended to become home for dozens of seed businesses similar to ICI pharmaceuticals back in the early '50s. One of the site's assets is the space for these seed businesses to grow. If 40% of the PDL is hived off and converted into residential, retail and other uses, this will deny long-term growth potential for the new industries establishing themselves in the science park. The only option will be to encroach on the historic parkland and surrounding woodland. We believe that it is very short-sighted and detrimental to the long-term vision to seek short-term gain by selling of land for residential development. In effect, it is planning for failure by denying potential for any of the new business start-ups from becoming as successful as AZ has been and planning their long-term future within Alderley Park.

Additionally, we are concerned about the proposal to double (or more) the size of Nether Alderley and transform this rural hamlet into suburbia (including housing estates, potential hotel and retail outlets) without any of the usual planning criteria being justified or local impact assessment undertaken. The sole planning rationale given for this development is to create funds 'to enable' (or finance) the science park. No other business would have such a rationale accepted by a planning authority. Development funds should be sought from elsewhere. We understand that no attempt has been made to secure international funding.

By combining the role of Alderley Park shareholder with that of planning authority, CEC is perceived to be compromising its independent oversight and risks losing the trust of local residents. This concern is encouraged, for example, by generously defining Previously Developed Land (PDL) to include all the sports fields as well as the beautiful historic sunken garden and the temporary Mereside car park. The significance of this is that the right to swap land within the PDL which can't be developed with any other land on the site outside the PDL 'if demonstrated to be necessary' is being allowed and the Framework already includes plans to build houses on the Mereside car park overlooking the heronry and to swap some sport facilities to the northern part of the park to enable development on the present facilities at the southern end of the site without any justification.

To add to local concern no indication of the number of homes planned for the site has been made public. It should not be forgotten that the entire site, without any exception, is defined as Green Belt. Macclesfield Borough Council further defined Alderley Park as being an area of 'Special County Value' due to its beauty.

Section 106 should not justify inappropriate development, but if funds are made available, then the following projects should be considered:

- 1) Introduction of 20mph in the short section of Congleton Road between the school, NT Mill and Church Lane with cobbled rumble strips as this now becomes the 'centre of the village'
- 2) Purchase of strip of land on eastern side of Congleton Road just south of the Mill to enable a new footpath to link from the church and the NT Mill into the Alderley park footpath network to provide a route through to The Edge
- 3) Make the Mereside car park a permanent facility to provide public parking and enable use of the trails from the NT Mill through to the NT land on The Edge.

SECTION 106: Creation of a historic centre by linking up the Mill and Alderley Park with footpaths and calming on Congleton Road. Refurbishment of Parish Hall.

On the one hand we should welcome high value new jobs in the North-west. On the other hand a large number of new homes in Alderley Park would have no connection to Alderley Edge or nether Alderley and would inevitable attract 400+ cars unless the people work on site and walk their children to Nether Alderley school (not likely!). What element of proposed housing would be social housing I wonder?

Limited housing would be fine to avoid Alderley House becoming derelict!

Q3 (public access): Infringement of property rights.

Q4 (selling off development land for other uses): Wrong to stop development on pre-developed land because of an unknown future possibility.

Q5 (creating separate community within Alderley Park): Houses have to be built somewhere.

Q7 (Expanding workforce): More highly paid jobs (prosperity) means more traffic.

Q10 (Allowing PDL swaps): Only pre-developed land should be built on.

Q11 (Retail): There never will be a farm shop in Alderley Park. Other uses will pay more rent, plus no demand.

Q13 (CEC land acquisition opposite Alderley Park): This was an obvious move by the Council.

Don't like Radnor end building plot.

If CEC allow housing at AZ, they should allow for affordable housing for Nether Alderley residents who still live 'at home' and are unable to get on the housing ladder.

Q3 (public access): Has positive and negative points.

As the farm shop in Horseshoe Lane has gone there should be no objection to one at Alderley Park subject to such building being sited on the site of existing buildings.

Why spend all that money on the bypass to divert traffic away from Alderley and Nether Alderley then reverse the process with these plans for the science park. It's not just about what Alderley Park can take, it's also about the surrounding area and quality of life for the residents.

1. Traffic on the old A34 road to Alderley Edge could once again, after spending £50m plus on the bypass become a problem.

2. The Alderley Edge infrastructure is not capable of coping with a significant increase in families in the area.

3. We have only 3 old peoples' bungalows in Nether Alderley with an aging population. Any attempt to improve this situation would be appreciated by the community.

Section 106: New Cheshire railings down Church lane to church and Parish Hall. New Cheshire railings at school in Bradford Lane. Parish Hall re-furbishment. Demolish large post which obstructs from track egress from church. Resurface drive from the church: we're forced to use that exit as it is too dangerous to exit on the blind bend.

Re the suggested Radnor Mere development: It was a surprise to see the housing and leisure facility here because

i) I cannot see the car park being PDL. It was only a temporary measure while the multi-story was erected and due to be returned to Green Belt.

ii) Any addition to traffic from the North gate will decant onto the old A34 causing problems of egress at

1) the Church Track and Church Lane (blind bend) and The Mill

2) Sand Lane, The Old Hall & Apple House

3) All the cottages along the western side

4) The school at Bradford Lane

5) Welsh Row

6) Artists Lane

7) Whitebarn and the already gridlocked Alderley Edge village (now with parking banned on residential roads making it impossible to go to the bank of the doctors)

The superstructure is already failing in Alderley Edge. Surely you cannot fail to address these existing problems? We have had about 4 years somewhat less of a traffic impact as a result of a very expensive bypass; now it looks as though that has all been a waste of time for us.

As for the addition of two leisure facilities at Radnor Mere may I remind you of the biological importance and the environmental asset there is there? From a conservation point of view, houses needing car parking, lights and 24 hour traffic movements, added to a requirement for changing facilities and parking with lighting requirement, all of which would have a serious adverse impact on the mere and its important heronry. The whole scheme here is contraindicated. Surely there are facilities enough for both housing and leisure at the southern end which hopefully would use the bypass.

Direct adverse comment made (in the consultation process).

The impact on traffic on Congleton Road and pressure on doctors' facilities is a major concern if there are 200ish new homes on the site. Also on Alderley Edge parking space.

Basically we are not opposed to housing but 200 is far too many. It would destroy the character of Nether Alderley.

Previous Section 106 for houses in Bollington have been ignored. A science park within the existing area of buildings should be supported. No other housing or additional buildings are required.

No development beyond life science park should be allowed.

Local facilities should be offered such as a swimming pool and family friendly leisure facilities (e.g. park and gym) for use of local children. Cycle route would also be of benefit to local children.

Growth, apart from the growth of the science park for life science purposes, is to be avoided. Traffic pressure on services and potential for erosion of the Green Belt are the major concerns.

I agree the majority of the statements / points raised. I do not know whether a controlled building of homes i.e. limited to 200 should be allowed - possibly a farm shop if it was privately owned.

I believe there is a need for further housing development and Alderley park is ideal for such development. No further impact on highways as would be with skilled employment on Alderley Park.

At the presentation on 11th Feb I spoke with two persons from the site owners to express concern that other than PDL could be developed. On asking about the take up of space for life science purposes I was informed that there is a positive response and take up was currently ahead of expectations. I was also informed that if necessary PDL would be used for premium office space. I specifically asked about industrial development and was told that this would not be allowed.

Section 106: Funds should be allocated to support local bus service between Nether Alderley and Macclesfield. Park facilities for younger children would be appreciated: the lack of pavements makes cycling dangerous for younger children.

Section 106: Restore Park Hall