Cheshire East Council (Strategic Planning Team),
Delamere House,
Delamere Street,
Crewe CW1 2LL.

26th August 2026

Dear Planning Team,

Local Plan Consultation Scoping Response

Please find attached the Stop Adlington New Town residents group response to the Local Plan Scoping consultation.

We welcome the opportunity to contribute to the preparation of the new Local Plan and are keen to engage constructively with the Council as the process progresses.

Our overall position is that the Local Plan should provide a robust policy framework for strategic development that is genuinely sustainable, infrastructure-led and environmentally responsible.

Housing growth should prioritise brownfield regeneration, protect Green Belt and valued countryside wherever possible, safeguard rural communities, and ensure that transport, health, utilities, care and education infrastructure are planned and delivered alongside development.

The current proposals for large-scale development at Adlington, as evidenced through the Call for Sites process, demonstrate why these principles are important. They should be considered not simply as an issue affecting one location, but as an opportunity to ensure that the overall strategy for Cheshire East reflects housing need, employment growth, infrastructure capacity and environmental constraints. We believe this supports a more dispersed approach to housing growth, rather than concentrating very large-scale development in individual locations.

Development should also remain genuinely plan-led while the new Local Plan is being prepared. Strategic decisions about the future of Cheshire East's Green Belt should be based on a complete and publicly available evidence base, including the borough-wide Green Belt Assessment, rather than being influenced by the timing of individual planning applications.

We therefore ask the Council to **publish the Green Belt Assessment as soon as practicable** and, importantly, to **publish an Interim Housing Policy Statement without delay** given the likely lead time before the new Local Plan is adopted.

An Interim Housing Policy Statement would provide much-needed clarity for communities, developers and decision-makers during this transition. Without clear interim guidance, there is a risk that speculative planning applications — particularly large-scale proposals — could begin to influence the pattern and scale of housing growth before the Council has completed the strategic work needed to determine the most appropriate long-term approach.

We look forward to continuing to engage constructively with the Council and contributing to a Local Plan that delivers the right homes in the right places, supported by the infrastructure and services needed to make those communities sustainable.

Thank you for considering our response.

Yours faithfully

Alison Small, Peter Emery, Brian Whitefoot, Gavin Clifford

on behalf of Stop Adlington New Town

CC: Councillor Nick Mannion (Leader of CEC); Councillor Michael Gorman (Deputy Leader of CEC); Tim Roca MP; Haf Barlow (Clerk of Poynton Town Council), Simon Gleave (Chair of Adlington Parish Council)

Response to the Cheshire East Local Plan Scoping Consultation from Stop Adlington New Town residents' group

We support the need for Cheshire East to plan positively for future housing growth. However, the Local Plan should establish clear principles for assessing developments to ensure they are sustainable, infrastructure-led, clearly meet identified needs and are supported by local communities. There are a number of important planning considerations that should be reflected within the Local Plan, and we have attempted to tie these into the relevant sections within the consultation document.

Section 1: Local Plan Scoping Consultation - How to respond (1.10)
Representation summary: Timescale given for the consultation.
We have concerns as to the timescale allowed for initial input given the Parish Councils often do not meet over the summer period. and many residents being on holiday during the summer school holiday. We ask the Council to reach out to all Town and Parish Councils to ensure they have had chance to review and input given the importance of this process. We would ask that the next programmed consultation period take into account school holiday periods.

Section 2: New Local Plan (2.1)
Representation summary: Planned Development should be through the Local Plan Process. Any large strategic housing and commercial developments should only be brought forward through the Local Plan process following meaningful engagement with local communities, elected members, town and parish councils and key stakeholders. Communities should have confidence that strategic growth has been assessed transparently against reasonable alternatives and that local knowledge has informed decision-making from the outset.

Section 3: Context for the new local plan

Sub heading 3.1 – 3.2 Introduction
Representation summary: Strategic planning policies should be based on adopted national policy rather than any draft consultation documents, which may change significantly before they are finalised. The Local Plan may need to be revised during its production to reflect legislative changes, and if these are material the changes must be subject to consultation.

Sub heading 3.3 – 3.7 Increase in housing requirements
Representation summary: Development should be in the long-term public interest and not respond to short term private interests or a theoretical shortage of land supply.

Given the shortfall in housing land supply, we are concerned that, prior to the Local Plan being published, CEC is under pressure to release land for development even where the locations may not be sustainable or deliverable in meeting dispersed local housing and employment needs.

In light of the above we request that CEC issues an Interim Housing Policy Statement (IHPS) to guide developers and provide clarity for the public during this period. This is an established route for Councils to demonstrate how they are complying with housing policy and outline their strategic approach (for example bringing forward safeguarded land, entering into planning performance contracts with developers and promoting town centre regeneration). There is a strategic policy void at present which is unacceptable to all parties and without an IHPS this will continue until the Local Plan is published.

We also recommend that planning applicants are asked to provide realistic and supported credible timescales for delivery demonstrating that a proposed development will deliver at least a partial solution to the shortfall.

CEC has already considered that safeguarded land can help meet longer-term needs. Because of changes in the standard method for calculating the housing requirement, the "longer-term" has now arrived and CEC should make it known that it will consider favourably the principle of releasing such sites. This will help address the housing shortfall as one element in an IHPS until such time the new local plan is adopted. It will also direct the development industry to those sites CEC has considered suitable for release rather than having to allow less than appropriate sites to be released for development on application or appeal.

Peter Emery (ex.MRTPI) carried out an assessment of potential sites across the Borough to inform SANT's Challenge to the Shortlisting of Adlington as a New Town using the current development plan documents, including safeguarded land, the 2024 Call for Sites and the Brownfield Register. From this we consider that there are more than sufficient potential sites and in appropriate dispersed locations to meet the Council's updated housing requirement through the plan period and beyond without material loss of Green Belt land. The recent 2026 Call for Sites will have added more sites to consider which may be appropriate to allocate. A summary of the work we carried out is shown below.

This is based on information published in 2025, we present the information to you as follows:

NORTH SECTOR TOWNS	Total Allocated & Committed	Brownfield	Safeguard Land	Probable Call for Sites	Total Supply
MACCLESFIELD	2,515	183	2,030	997	5,725
HANDFORTH	1,636	0	303	259	2,198
KNUTSFORD	720	10	980	974	2,684
POYNTON	275	1	472	609	1,357
WILMSLOW	286	12	864	1,026	2,188
TOTAL 1	5,432	206	4,649	3,865	14,152
LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES					
ALDERLEY EDGE	243	33	70	1,095	1,441
BOLLINGTON	109	7	60	95	271
CHELFORD	0	0	158	40	198
DISLEY	5	0	85	148	238
MOBBERLEY	2	0	0	0	2
PRESTBURY	18	0	93	109	220
TOTAL 2	377	40	466	1,487	2,370
INFILL VILLAGES : ASHLEY; GAWSWORTH; HENBURY; HIGH LEGH; PLUMLEY; STYAL.					
TOTAL 3	0	0	0	246	246
OPEN COUNTRYSIDE		10			10
NORTH SECTOR TOTAL	5,809	256	5,115	5,598	16,778

Overall District Summary	Total Committed	Brownfield	Safeguard Land	Probable Call for Sites	Total Supply
SOUTH SECTOR TOTAL	7,830	467	0	17,347	25,644
NORTH SECTOR TOTAL	5,809	256	5,115	5,598	16,778
RURAL COMMITMENTS	991				991
SMALL SITES ALLOWANCE					1,500
OVERALL TOTAL	14,630	723	5,115	22,945	44,913

Sub heading 3.11 to 3.14: Changes to Green Belt Policy

Representation summary: We need to protect Green Belt, Agricultural Land and Ecological Assets.

Where large-scale development is proposed on greenfield land, the environmental impacts must be fully assessed and demonstrably outweighed by wider public benefit.
The Local Plan should reinforce a clear commitment to protecting the Green Belt, recognising that its essential characteristics are **openness** and **permanence**, as set out in the adopted National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Green Belt performs several important strategic purposes:

- check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
- safeguard the countryside from encroachment;
- preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- support urban regeneration by encouraging the effective use of previously developed land.

These purposes remain fundamental within Cheshire East and should form the basis of any assessment of proposed Green Belt release.

The Local Plan should require that any proposal affecting Green Belt demonstrates:

- clearly evidenced and substantiated exceptional circumstances;
- that brownfield land, urban regeneration opportunities and other reasonable alternatives have been comprehensively assessed first;
- the impact on each of the five Green Belt purposes;
- the cumulative effect of Green Belt release on openness, landscape character and settlement pattern;
- the effect on the identity and separation of neighbouring towns and villages; and
- the long-term permanence and effectiveness of the Green Belt.

Development should also avoid the unnecessary loss of productive agricultural land, ancient woodland and established habitats supporting biodiversity and areas vulnerable to flooding. These environmental assets contribute significantly to climate resilience, food security, landscape quality and the character of Cheshire East's rural communities.

We are concerned about the statement in 3.7 "development might be approved in locations where it would not normally be allowed, such as the countryside and Green Belt, unless very strong reasons exist to refuse it" - this seems to assume a presumption to build on Green Belt.

Instead, we argue that weight should be given to rejecting proposals and land submitted in the Call for Sites that would erode the physical separation between settlements or create continuous urban development. Once openness and settlement identity are lost, they cannot realistically be restored.

Weight should also be given to input from Cheshire Wildlife Trust and how land has been identified in the Cheshire and Warrington Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

This aligns with the Labour Party manifesto that committed to:

- *Preserving the Green Belt which has served England's towns and cities well over many decades.*
- *A **brownfield-first** approach, prioritising previously developed land.*
- *Recognition that **brownfield alone would not meet housing need**.*
- *Retaining the **overall purpose and general extent** of the Green Belt.*
- *Prioritising the release of **lower-quality 'grey belt' land** rather than high-quality Green Belt land.*
- *Applying **"golden rules"** so that any development benefits both communities and nature.*

These environmental assets are irreplaceable and given, from SANT's assessment, there is a sufficient potential housing land supply from safeguarded land, previously developed and underused land (brownfield) and greenfield land located in appropriate and sustainable locations, there is no justification to release land that strongly contributes to the original purposes of Green Belt. We ask that the Council state their position on how they will assess grey belt and how it is proposed to enforce the delivery and timing of the Golden Rules of affordable housing, infrastructure and green spaces.

Sub heading 3.15: Brownfield First
Representation summary: We support the Local Plan reinforcing a clear brownfield-first approach and would like to recommend actions to support this.

Previously developed land and the regeneration of existing urban areas should be prioritised before the release of Green Belt and productive agricultural land. Regeneration of towns such as Crewe, Macclesfield and Cheshire East's market towns would make better use of existing infrastructure, increase town centre footfall, support local businesses, meet local housing needs and reduce pressure on the countryside.

Government and local authorities should continue to support the redevelopment of brownfield sites by addressing viability constraints through targeted funding and infrastructure investment.

We would ask the following actions to be considered:

- Update the Brownfield Register
- Put a targeted call out to landowners for brownfield sites
- Assess the blockers of brownfield development and consider a fund for remediation. Whilst contamination and site constraints are recognised we are at risk of large swathes of our market towns being underused and vacant if this is not addressed.
- Regeneration is not an option; it has to be done, and we would hope the Local Plan recognises and addresses this.
- Request the Government to set up funding for treating contaminated land e.g., derelict land grant.
- Give consideration to packaging the redevelopment of several towns into one financeable programme to give it scale and make it more attractive to investors and government. There is an opportunity to link this to an expansion of social housing directly focused on areas of need.

Section 4: Baseline information and spatial portrait

Sub heading 4.11 – 4.16: Heritage, culture and natural environment
Representation summary: The Cheshire and Warrington Local Nature Recovery Strategy should be cross referenced and included within the preparation of the Local Plan.

Sub heading 4.17 – 4.19: Settlements and rural-urban composition
Representation summary: The Local Plan should continue to recognise the importance of Cheshire East's rural communities.

Strategic development should strengthen rather than undermine the character, identity and sustainability of villages and rural settlements. Development that fundamentally changes the nature of rural communities should only be considered where there is compelling evidence that all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted, and there is a genuine local area need.

Sub heading 4.20 Demographic mix
Representation summary: The Local Plan should recognise the need to allocate sites for housing to facilitate 'downsizing' for older residents, helping to free up activity in the housing market and thus making better use of existing housing stock.

Section 5: Scope of the new local plan

Sub heading 5.1 Local Plan Period
Representation summary: The plan period needs to run from 2025 (to overlap with existing Strategy) as CEC originally proposed and run to 2045, 15 years after likely adoption date.

Sub heading 5.8 – 5.14 Identifying and assessing sites
Representation summary: the scoring and criteria referred to within 5.11 should be published and before the initial site assessment is published to ensure transparency regarding the decision-making process.

Representation summary: Cheshire East should demonstrate that its housing requirements cannot be met through suitable brownfield, previously developed and appropriately located green field sites before seeking releases of land which strongly or moderately contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt. Where Green Belt land is considered, the Council should assess its contribution to Green Belt purposes, its environmental and landscape value, infrastructure capacity and the sustainability of the location and proximity to existing and proposed places of employment. Housing allocations should also reflect the actual geographical distribution of housing need, particularly the need for Social Rent and affordable housing.

See the point made above about the IHPS which is also relevant here.

The Call for Sites has notably highlighted significant land in the Green Belt, and specifically in Adlington Parish where land for 10,000 houses (based on Cheshire East dph of 30) has been proposed. Whilst we understand the proposed sites are currently being reviewed against local need and national policies, we ask for clarity to be given on the land which is being considered for release as soon as possible. As discussed in our previous reports in connection with the Adlington New Town original proposal, there is no strong strategic, financial or

locational case for this scale of strategic development in this location. Please see the appropriate sections of our Interim and Update Reports accessed here
Adlington New Town Proposal Challenge to Shortlisting Interim Report: https://www.poyntontowncouncil.gov.uk/_UserFiles/Files/Adlington%20New%20Town%20Challenge%20Report%20%20V14.21.pdf
Adlington New Town Proposal Supplement and Update to Interim Challenge Report: https://www.poyntontowncouncil.gov.uk/_UserFiles/Files/ANTUpdate%20v2.4.3%20Post%20announcement%20Supplement%20and%20Update%20Report.pdf
Planning Statement in response to the Proposal for Adlington New Town, P Emery, 30 January 2026:
https://www.poyntontowncouncil.gov.uk/_UserFiles/Files/Planning%20Statement%20ANT%20P%20Emery%2012.02.26.pdf

Subheading 5.15 – 5.18 Green Belt
Representation summary: The Council's commitment to preparing a comprehensive borough-wide Green Belt Assessment is welcomed.

This work will provide an essential evidence base for understanding the strategic function of the Green Belt across Cheshire East and for informing decisions on whether any land should be released through the Local Plan.

Given its importance, the Green Belt Assessment should be completed and published at the earliest opportunity. This is particularly important because we understand that planning applications for large-scale developments affecting Green Belt land are already being promoted. Without an adopted and publicly available Green Belt Assessment, there is a risk that decisions will be made in the absence of a consistent strategic framework, leading to piecemeal erosion of the Green Belt before the Local Plan has established the most appropriate strategy for growth.

The Assessment should provide a transparent and objective evaluation of Green Belt land across the borough, including:

- the contribution each area makes to the five purposes of the Green Belt;
- the degree of openness and permanence that would be affected by development;
- the role of land in preventing the coalescence of towns and villages;
- the contribution made to landscape character, biodiversity, agriculture and the wider natural environment;
- cumulative impacts where multiple sites are promoted; and
- the long-term strategic consequences of releasing individual parcels of Green Belt.

The findings of this Assessment should be published before strategic Green Belt allocations are progressed through the Local Plan and should also be afforded significant weight in the determination of planning applications that could prejudice the Local Plan process.

Strategic Green Belt decisions should be informed by a borough-wide assessment rather than by site-specific evidence submitted in support of individual planning applications. This will ensure that decisions are made consistently, transparently and in the wider public interest.

The Council should also resist the incremental erosion of the Green Belt through speculative planning applications that could undermine the comprehensive plan-led approach. Given the

inability to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply the Council should prepare an Interim Housing Policy Statement setting out the policy and the criteria for allowing developments. Once Green Belt land has been developed and openness lost, those strategic functions cannot realistically be restored.

Consideration should also be given to the effect of areas immediately outside but neighbouring Cheshire East. This is of particular significance in the northeast of the borough, where proposals have been allocated and planning permissions granted within Stockport MBC area which already have the effect of allowing urban sprawl. If the CEC Local Plan is considered in isolation CEC risks adding to a growing urbanisation by default which would also place pressure on the surrounding infrastructure including the highway network.

Within **3.14** of the consultation document reference is made to "Green Belt development around well-connected railway stations". The NPPF definition should be made explicit within the Local Plan Scoping document to avoid misunderstanding and speculative development around inappropriate stations. Not all stations meet the NPPF definition of a well-connected station.

National Planning Policy Framework Annex B Glossary.
"Well-connected station": Railway stations and underground, tram and light rail stops located within a top 80 Travel to Work Area located partially or fully within England by Gross Value Added (GVA)72 and which, in the normal weekday timetable, are served (or have a reasonable prospect of being served due to planned upgrades or through agreement with the rail operator) throughout the daytime by at least four trains or trams per hour overall, or at least two trains or trams per hour in any one direction.

Sub heading 5.24 – 5.26 Spatial distribution
Representation summary: We agree that development should be dispersed.
Cheshire East should not rely on a few large new settlements to meet its housing requirement. Housing growth should be distributed across the borough in locations that reflect identified housing and employment needs, make effective use of brownfield and previously developed land, utilise existing infrastructure, and support the regeneration of established communities.

A **dispersed approach to development** can help deliver housing more quickly while supporting existing communities and leveraging existing infrastructure. Such development is likely to be more cost effective and socially beneficial than single point large developments in poorly connected greenfield locations.

It can:

1. **Accelerate housing delivery** by using sites where infrastructure and services are already available.
2. **Place social and affordable housing closer to identified need and employment**, reducing commuting pressures and costs for residents.
3. Minimise the need for relocation of population to new locations with resultant social dislocation.
4. **Support regeneration of existing towns**, including Macclesfield and Crewe, rather than directing investment away from established communities. Avoid 'shiny new developments and under invested old towns' in coming years, and the significant societal problems this would create. Regeneration is not a choice; it is an immediate need.

5. **Make better use of existing infrastructure**, while allowing investment to be targeted at areas where additional capacity is required.
6. **Support earlier economic and community regeneration**, with investment in existing areas helping to attract further private investment and ultimately generating additional local tax revenue from revitalised towns.
7. **Spread development risk, reducing the overall cost and deliverability risk to the borough wide plan.**

Overall, the Local Plan should prioritise **housing where it is needed, where infrastructure can support it, and where social and affordable homes can be delivered quickly and the demand is present**, with development distributed across Cheshire East to support sustainable growth and regeneration.

Sub heading 5.29 Development in countryside and sub heading 5.30 – 5.32 Housing
Cheshire East should take a balanced, county-wide approach to housing delivery, ensuring development reflects where housing need, employment and infrastructure are located rather than concentrating growth disproportionately in particular areas.

- Cheshire East's housing requirement should be assessed against existing commitments, brownfield opportunities and sites identified through the call for sites. The evidence cited suggests there is significant potential to meet the requirement through a range of sites across the borough.
- Housing growth should broadly reflect the geography of housing need and employment, helping to reduce commuting and pressure on already constrained transport networks.
- Development should be directed towards locations where transport, schools, healthcare, utilities and community facilities already exist or can be expanded alongside growth. This is likely to be more sustainable and deliverable than relying on locations requiring major new infrastructure.

Sub heading 5.33 – 5.35: Affordable housing
Representation summary: Social and affordable housing should be delivered where the need is greatest and as quickly as possible.

- Approximately 60% of Cheshire East's social housing need is in the south, particularly around Crewe, with around 40% in the north. Housing allocations should therefore reflect this distribution of need.
- The Council should prioritise sites capable of delivering social housing in the short term, rather than relying on schemes where delivery may be delayed by the need for major supporting infrastructure.
- Dispersing social and affordable housing across existing communities can provide **better access to employment, services and transport**, while making better use of existing infrastructure.

Sub heading 5.49 Housing diversification and providing for small and medium sized sites
Representation summary: We agree the importance of providing a portion of smaller sites, which will be attractive to local SME building companies, and help support the local economy (such sites need to meet all the criteria for releasing land, as set out in our response to paras. 5.27 -5.29, particularly in the Green Belt)

Sub heading 5.84 – 5.90 Waste
Representation summary: A plan should be set out to ensure that there are sufficient accessible Refuse Sites for any new development. Locally, the closure of three around the Poynton/Bollington Towns means that these basic public services are not provided in these locations. Travelling to the south side of Macclesfield is not sustainable, and contrary to the current government focus on eliminating illegal dumping of waste.

Sub heading 5.91 - 5.95: Transport and infrastructure
Representation summary: Infrastructure must come first. The Local Plan should require infrastructure-led development rather than development-led infrastructure and needs to consider the existing shortfalls in support services.

Transport
Roads, rail capacity, public transport, utilities and active travel infrastructure should be fully funded and delivered in advance of significant housing occupation.

Without this approach, there is a substantial risk that large developments become heavily car dependent and place unacceptable pressure on existing infrastructure as well as being skewed towards those that can afford to drive and own a car. This principle is particularly relevant where current road and rail networks already experience congestion and capacity constraints such as rural stations with infrequent services.

A transport report was prepared whilst assessing the Adlington New Town proposal. Given the size of the land put forward around Adlington in the Call for Sites, we ask this report to be considered in the Call for Sites review process. The report outlined the severe issues with roads and rail capacity and raises many points that are relevant across a wider area than Adlington and should be taken into account in the Local Plan making process. Link: https://www.poyntontowncouncil.gov.uk/_UserFiles/Files/2511075%20FS01.pdf

Healthcare Provision
The Local Plan should require clear evidence that healthcare infrastructure can accommodate proposed growth. Where developments are of sufficient scale to require new GP surgeries, community health facilities or hospital capacity, these should form part of the development strategy from the outset rather than being considered after housing has been occupied.

Based on past work from SANT, health infrastructure around Poynton/Bollington and Adlington is at capacity now, as is hospital provision in Macclesfield, so this is an area where up-front investment in additional capacity is required now, and certainly before any material new housing developments, and cannot be deferred.

Education Infrastructure
Similarly, primary and secondary school provision should be planned alongside housing delivery.

Our previous work concluded that secondary school provision in the Macclesfield area was at or close to capacity, again investment in this area to expand secondary school places would be needed before any material development in this area could take place. Additional primary school provision should be addressed through s106 agreements. Educational infrastructure should be available as new communities develop, ensuring that existing schools are not placed under unsustainable pressure while new facilities are delivered.

Subheading 5.96 – 5.103 Natural environment
Representation summary: resisting Green Belt land release in the open countryside will help protect valuable habitats and ensure nature corridors remain open. Biodiversity reports should be commissioned for any land considered and the findings assessed before land is considered for release.

Subheading 5.113 Climate Change
Representation summary: Cheshire East's agricultural land contributes to domestic food production and long-term national food security. Its favourable agricultural conditions, including relatively high rainfall, make protecting productive farmland an important planning consideration. Agricultural land should therefore be protected from unnecessary development to safeguard food production and this strategic resource for future generations.

Subheading 5.142 Local plan evidence base
Representation summary: The scoping document states that "The government requires us to make use of any standardised tools, methods and templates that it publishes to assist in evidence preparation. However, only a very basic template for site assessment and selection has been published to date." A methodology for this needs to be set out and should be in line with guidance provided by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Local Government Association's Planning Advisory Service.

Section 6: Proposed Local Plan Engagement Strategy

Subheading 6.1 – 6.2
Representation summary: We are concerned that the Local Plan process may not involve sufficiently meaningful and widespread community engagement. As noted, the timing for this initial scoping consultation was unfortunate, as was the lack of any prior engagement with local councils.

Successful strategic planning depends upon early, meaningful and ongoing engagement with local communities.

The Local Plan should emphasise that proposals for major developments should involve elected representatives, town and parish councils, residents and community organisations from the earliest stages of plan preparation. We would hope that engagement will improve as the plan progresses.

Recent proposals for a large-scale New Town at Adlington illustrate many of these wider planning challenges, and the pitfalls. Large-scale developments, such as development proposed in Adlington, would have implications beyond the immediate site, affecting wider transport corridors including the roads, rail services, and utilities, healthcare and education infrastructure. Strategic developments can have borough-wide impacts that extend well beyond their boundaries.

The widespread concerns expressed by Cheshire East Council, neighbouring town and parish councils, environmental organisations, local MPs and community groups further demonstrate the importance of ensuring that major strategic proposals command public confidence at an early stage.

End *27th August 2026*