

## Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions and Written Correspondence

| Area One<br>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| Respondent   | Comments   | Response  |
| Cheshire CPRE                                      | <b>Area 1</b> – Removal of this area from Green Belt would result in the settlement of Roughill merging with development of the Lache Eyes.  | Separation between settlements is one of the purposes of the Green Belt, and an assessment of the distance between the built edge of the city and the nearest settlement (Dodleston) has been made.   |
| Mr and Mrs Mistry                                  | <p>For Chester to retain its international tourist appeal as a historic city of importance it should maintain its current countryside setting to preserve its character, more housing would not improve its appeal; Chester's Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and ensures Chester retains its setting as a compact and historic city;</p> <p>There are a number of Brownfield and urban areas that would greatly benefit from redevelopment;</p> <p>Grosvenor Bridge is an idyllic route into and out of Chester and any modern development would reduce such a scenic route in to the city thus destroying its unique appeal;</p> <p>The infrastructure around Chester will not be able to sustain higher volumes of traffic;</p> <p>Planned growth for new housing will not be sustainable and will have a detrimental effect on the existing residential areas and Chester housing market; Impact on flora and fauna;</p> <p>Support growth in Chester but not to detriment of its idyllic settings, increase traffic and most importantly to ensure Chester city is not surrounded by housing and modern developments;</p> <p>(sent to Stephen Mosley MP)</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Urban sprawl is assessed by looking at natural and physical boundaries and at how well an area of land is contained by the urban/built form.</p> <p>Grosvenor Bridge is identified in the 1997 Environmental Capacity study as a historic building / monument.</p> <p>Issues such as infrastructure, land use and traffic will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |

| <b>Area One</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| Think this area is more red with railway and business park so close   | The footprint of the Business Park falls within <u>Area 2</u> so is not included in the calculation of developed land within this area  |
| I think there is probably room for some development in this area<br><br>This should not be touched<br><br>Affordable housing need is considerable in Lache Ward and sustainable building on adjacent land would be desirable<br><br>Another plot which sees comparatively little in the way of opposition from residents compared to other areas of Chester. Noise from A55 though and would need landscaping as the area is fairly urbanely dense within Lache | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.  |
| Flood storage area<br><br>This area historically was up to high water mark before the Dee was canalised. It shouldn't be built on because of flooding risk.   | The character of the area is defined by a network of ditches and brooks that are identified in the general description of the area.<br><br>Flood risk and similar constraints have not been assessed in this study and will be considered during the preparation of the Preferred Option. |
| Decoy Farm and open views over green belt and agricultural land should be preserved   | The views both into and out of the area are included in the assessment of <i>Setting</i> .  |
| This is a special area separating the A55 from urban Chester.   | Separation between settlements is one of the purposes of the Green Belt, and an assessment of the distance between the built edge of the city and the nearest settlement (Dodeleston) has been made.  |
| Overleigh roundabout problems have not been addressed   | The study does not assess the infrastructure or traffic issues within each area, these issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.  |
| Agree with its green rating   | Comments noted  |

| <b>Area Two</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| Cheshire CPRE  | Area 2 – Chester Business Park lies in a parkland setting which is subject to special Green Belt policy in Chester Local Plan.   | The setting of the Duke's Driveway and the parkland / woodland will inform the assessment of Area 2 and Area 3.   |
| Mr and Mrs Mistry  | <p>For Chester to retain its international tourist appeal as a historic city of importance it should maintain its current countryside setting to preserve its character, more housing would not improve its appeal; Chester's Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and ensures Chester retains its setting as a compact and historic city;</p> <p>There are a number of Brownfield and urban areas that would greatly benefit from redevelopment;</p> <p>Grosvenor Bridge is an idyllic route into and out of Chester and any modern development would reduce such a scenic route in to the city thus destroying its unique appeal;</p> <p>The infrastructure around Chester will not be able to sustain higher volumes of traffic;</p> <p>Planned growth for new housing will not be sustainable and will have a detrimental effect on the existing residential areas and Chester housing market; Impact on flora and fauna;</p> <p>Support growth in Chester but not to detriment of its idyllic settings, increase traffic and most importantly to ensure Chester city is not surrounded by housing and modern developments;</p> <p>(sent to Stephen Mosley MP)</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Urban sprawl is assessed by looking at natural and physical boundaries and at how well an area of land is contained by the urban/built form.</p> <p>Grosvenor Bridge is identified in the 1997 Environmental Capacity study as a historic building / monument.</p> <p>Issues such as infrastructure, land use and traffic will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| Mrs Stobbs   | <p>Extreme concern over housing development proposed in Lache Eyes, Wrexham Road, Dukes Drive area due to massive increase in traffic congestion since the expansion of Chester Business Park and the narrowing of Wrexham Road due to the bus lane.</p> <p>Peak time traffic on Lache Lane has increased 10 fold since 2000 and has reached unacceptable levels.</p> <p>Worried about effects on property values on Lache Lane and ability to sell in future.</p>   | The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan in the context of the overall strategy.  |

| <b>Area Two</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>The development along the eastern side is not too obtrusive but I don't think there should be any more on this side. May be if any is to be developed it should be along the western edge.</p> <p>Agree with above comment. The land to the west of Wrexham Road right across to Lache Lane (including some of area 1) needs further study. However any further major housing and employment development south of the river needs a third Dee crossing by extending Sealand Road and crossing the Dee in Saltney (Wales) to handle increased traffic movements.</p> <p>There may be a case for limited expansion of the business park. This needs to be undertaken with care.</p> <p>I do not see too much problem with considering new development between Lache Lane and the Wrexham Road and in addition the area between the business park and the A55 (i.e. close to the garage and the hotel)</p> <p>Present employment land could go for housing (in part)</p> <p>If Green Belt has to be used this would be the preferred site</p> <p>Good use of land would be ideal as has road / network infrastructure. Would need schools etc but the rest is all there and I think people would be comfortable with it.</p> <p>Preferred site for Green Belt development providing it was landscaped and well maintained.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The existing level of development within an area is taken into account in the assessment of <i>Safeguarding and Encroachment</i>.</p> |

| Area One<br>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions  |  |
|---|--|
| Comments  | Response   |
| Need to remember Wrexham Road is an important gate-way into the city centre: and that expansion into the green belt has to be justified.  | Wrexham Road is an important gateway into the centre and Grosvenor Bridge is identified in the 1997 Environmental Capacity study as a historic building / monument.  |
| Please leave things as they are. Retain Green Belt  | Comments noted   |
| I think it would be vital to protect the area of agricultural land in the east of area 2; i.e. between the water works, the glebe and Kings School. This area provides one of the best views (key views) west towards the Welsh Hills, in an area of significant archaeological remains (Claverton Village). The whole nature of the Dukes Drive would be diminished if this open aspect was developed. I don't however have too much problem with development in the area west of Kings School across to Five Ashes Road.  | Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.<br><br>The importance of the corn field between the urban edge and the Business Park and the Park and Ride should be recognised in this assessment.<br><br>Wider views beyond this area towards the Clwydian Hills are attributed to this area. |
| It is important to keep the agricultural land remaining here and not join up infill in this area with houses.<br><br>I feel it is vital to keep this area green. Hardly anyone actually 'lives' here – mostly it is good agricultural land – and feels like a breathing spot on the edge of the city. It does afford views from the Dukes Drive, from the Wrexham Road, and from housing in Westminster Park. The Business Park has already taken an unfortunate site from this area. If this area went it would push buildings etc right up to the ring road – not a good thing. Please leave some agricultural land which we can reach by walking.<br><br>Green belt in this area has already been eroded by the Business Park – it's therefore particularly important to maintain what agricultural land remains to provide a green space. | The importance of agricultural land has been taken into account within the assessment of ' <i>openness and open setting of the countryside</i> '.  |

| <b>Area One</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| Whilst woodland belt forms a district boundary – additional development would add excessive pressure on the woodland which is already well used.   | The setting of the Duke's Driveway and the parkland / woodland will inform the assessment of Area 2 and Area 3.   |
| The green belt here has already been eroded by the P&R site and the Business Park. The remainder needs to be kept as a green boundary to Chester or the city will expand to urban sprawl using a by-pass as a boundary.  | The restriction of urban sprawl has been assessed using two criteria: containment (how much of the area is currently directly adjacent to the urban area) and the strength of boundaries (hard defensible boundaries are less likely to be allow change to take place beyond them). |
| The division of Area 1 and Area 2 seems illogical. Would it not make more sense to make 3 areas for analysis:<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To west of railway line</li><li>2. Between railway and Wrexham Road</li><li>3. To east of Wrexham Road</li></ol><br>Land to the west of the woodland should be included in Area 3 as part of the green corridor. | The boundaries in the draft study have been applied for the purpose of carrying out assessments on logical geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environment and the character of the area.   |
| Question of access – Overleigh roundabout and A55/483 both pinch points and already congested due to access to city centre, Business Park and P&R site.<br><br>Problems of the Overleigh roundabout  | The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic issues within each area. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy of the Plan.   |

| <b>Area Three</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| Mr and Mrs Mistry  | <p>For Chester to retain its international tourist appeal as a historic city of importance it should maintain its current countryside setting to preserve its character, more housing would not improve its appeal;</p> <p>Chester's Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and ensures Chester retains its setting as a compact and historic city;</p> <p>There are a number of Brownfield and urban areas that would greatly benefit from redevelopment;</p> <p>Grosvenor Bridge is an idyllic route into and out of Chester and any modern development would reduce such a scenic route in to the city thus destroying its unique appeal;</p> <p>The infrastructure around Chester will not be able to sustain higher volumes of traffic;</p> <p>Planned growth for new housing will not be sustainable and will have a detrimental effect on the existing residential areas and Chester housing market; Impact on flora and fauna;</p> <p>Support growth in Chester but not to detriment of its idyllic settings, increase traffic and most importantly to ensure Chester city is not surrounded by housing and modern developments;</p> <p>(sent to Stephen Mosley MP)</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Urban sprawl is assessed by looking at natural and physical boundaries and at how well an area of land is contained by the urban/built form.</p> <p>Grosvenor Bridge is identified in the 1997 Environmental Capacity study as a historic building / monument.</p> <p>Issues such as infrastructure, land use and traffic will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| WM Cobden  | <p>Historic nature of city has changed;</p> <p>Development in the green belt in this area will be to the detriment of flora and fauna, hedgerows, trees and open space which have been awarded preservation status;</p> <p>(sent to Stephen Mosley MP)</p>  | Comments noted  |

| <b>Area Three<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| SSSI, many species of flora and fauna and wildlife and much of area is a flood plain.  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Flood risk and similar constraints have not been assessed in this study and will be considered in the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |
| <p>The flood plain of the Dee is obviously not suitable for development but the agricultural land and woodland is also of great value and needs continued protection.</p> <p>A significant part of the area is flood plain and therefore needs protection from development.</p> <p>Mostly flood plain and triple SI</p> <p>Flood plain unsuitable for development; road access would also be difficult</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Flood risk and similar constraints have not been assessed in this study and will be considered in the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |
| <p>I would expect that the ancient woodland has protection and flooding is an obvious issue. There are also archaeological issues in this area.</p> <p>A “gateway route” into Chester, creating a pleasant impression of the city. A very valued “green lung” in an area with many schools, a college, retirement communities and family households.</p> <p>This is an important green gateway to Chester and well used by walkers and visitors. It should be retained as greenbelt.</p> <p>Dukes Drive and the Meadows, and the edges of the river on both sides of the Dee should definitely be protected and retained in Chester.</p> | <p>Wrexham Road is a important gateway into the centre that leads to Grosvenor Bridge which is identified in the 1997 Environmental Capacity study as a historic building / monument.</p> <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p> |

| <b>Area Three<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b> |
| <p>The green spaces of Earls Eye, Meadows to Eccleston and Dukes Drive must be preserved.</p> <p>Dukes Drive area and Meadows – a delightful and vital 'green living' for Cestrians.</p> <p>One of the few areas where it is possible to have a 'green' access from the city to the surrounding countryside. Important not to leave the Meadows and Dukes Drive as isolated green areas. These areas and the playing fields need to be protected and not closed in with development.</p> <p>This area is an important area of green relaxation, well used by all Cestrians, not just local to the area.</p> <p>This parcel of land is one of the most accessible for Chester residents and should be preserved for our future residents to be able to enjoy open space on the "city doorstep".</p> <p>Very important green corridor used extensively by public and very accessible. Links to longer walks. Important river and woodland habitats and scenery.</p> <p>An area of open space valued by the public – keeps Handbridge distinctive</p> <p>Both are probably among the most popular and used recreational areas by residents in Chester. Friends of the Meadows and Friends of Duke's Drive are extremely active. Also Duke's rive borders MBNA's field of dreams with its newts, would imagine both sites are of environmental importance.</p> <p>Somewhat confusing to include the Huntington side of the River Dee. River is a natural boundary and the parcel should be divided up to respect that.</p> |                 |

| <b>Area Three<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| No mention in the purpose / criteria of the impact on Huntington of any further development (Saighton Camp) on the Huntington side of the River.   | geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environment and character of the area.  |
| I don't think there is any need or reason for this area to be developed.<br><br>This is an important area to preserve from future development.<br><br>Please do not plan any buildings in this area – keep Chester green               | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.  |
| I doubt that <i>landowners</i> would be too pleased with "affordable homes" nearby!  |   |
| I'm still waiting for the promised, voted for, foot bridge across the Dee so that people living to the east of the Dee around Huntington could enjoy the Meadows.<br><br>More support for the ferry for access to meadows and woodland | The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy. |
| Where are the plans to address the Overleigh roundabout traffic nightmare?   |   |

| <b>Area Four</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Respondent</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| Christleton Parish Council  | <p>Green Belt designation essential to the preservation of Christleton as an entity distinct from the built-up area of Chester.</p> <p>Nothing of substance has changed since the Chester District Local Plan was adopted.</p> <p>The purposes of the Green Belt have been modified by the NPPF Section 9 paragraphs 79 &amp; 80.</p> <p>Understand CWAC conducting review of Parish boundaries their comments are based on the current boundary and in particular to Area 4 &amp; 5 of the study. PC question what should be considered urban and questions the strength of the boundary between Christleton and Great Boughton. PC believe criterion have been misapplied and should be reassessed.</p> <p>Area 4 provides a significant strategic gap between the urban area and the built-up area of Christleton, should be green.</p> <p>Illogical argument around the impact of the Park and Ride on the Green Belt. PC question the criterion used when assessing whether land assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>PC consider there is a considerable change of emphasis in NPPF as it encourages councils to plan</p> | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.</p> <p>NPPF came into being after work had commenced on the Green Belt study, however the framework has informed the study, and modifications have been taken on board.</p> <p>The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation. There is less than a 0.1 mile gap between the built edge of Whitchurch Road and the settlement of Christleton in the north of this area. The gap between the built edge in the south of the area and Christleton is approximately 0.4 miles</p> <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for</p> |

| Area Four<br>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Respondent  | Comment   | Response   |
|   | <p>positively for opportunities for access to the Green Belt for recreation, sport, enhancing biodiversity, visual amenity and improving damaged and derelict land. In PC's view the nursery should be considered as an agricultural use rather than employment.</p> <p>Concern over development at Saighton Camp urbanising openness of Green Belt and setting of Chester.</p> <p>PC strongly disagrees with the grading of the criterion used to assess how well areas prevent neighbouring towns from merging onto one another.</p> <p>Analysis neglects the important view from the A41 from which Area 5 north of the canal provides significant openness.</p> | <p>recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The criteria provide a general basis for the assessment and do not seek to score or rank each area.</p> <p>Views both into and out of each area have been assessed as part of the study and inform the overall assessments</p> |
| Cheshire CPRE                                       | <p><b>Areas 4 &amp; 5</b> – Previous drafts stated that “The area acts as an important buffer between Chester and Christleton”, quoted from the Chester District Landscape Assessment &amp; Guidelines. This statement, although evidently true, has been omitted from the final draft.</p>   | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.</p> <p>Landscape Officers were involved in the assessment of each area through the officer working group.</p>   |

| <b>Area Four<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>Will this development (Area 4) affect the Boughton Heath Park and Ride, the Garden Centre and allotments? If so would these be moved elsewhere?</p> <p>As with area 5 this area could merit from further investigation – provided expansion into green belt can be justified.</p> <p>Further development in this area would be foolish</p> <p>No encroachment of Green Belt, please.</p> <p>Any further building in the area would remove open fields from the area.</p> <p>Areas 4 and 5 – consider carefully the quality of life of people living in housing between major arterial roads</p> <p>Releasing this land would set a precedent for adjacent land between A41 and A55 and could result in urban sprawl.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential. The focus of the study is on the existing features, roles and functions in each area.</p> |
| <p>I can see the logic in areas 4 and 5 being considered for development, but the roads could not cope with added traffic.</p> <p>Whitchurch Road and Tarvin Road already heavily congested. Increased traffic would affect homes along these main roads into the city.</p> <p>I agree with the comment above (Whitchurch Road and Tarvin Road already heavily congested. Increased traffic would affect homes along these main roads into the city.) I would never buy a house sandwiched between 3 very noisy roads – it would result in poor quality of lifestyle.</p>   | <p>The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>                              |

| <b>Area Four<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>The new roundabout is a disgrace – need to rip it up and start again.</p> <p>The Boughton Heath roundabout is incapable of coping with existing traffic at peak times – the changes made by the Saighton Camp development do not work, and that is not built yet.</p> <p>I endorse all above comments, and would add that the traffic lights at the Rugby Club have further jammed up access to town, Upton etc.</p>  |   |
| <p>Saighton Camp has been given planning permission which would have huge impacts on road / schools etc which are already well over capacity</p> <p>Saighton Camp should be fully developed first as it is brownfield land and should be the first choice before the release of Green Belt in the area</p>   | <p>The study does not assess issues related to individual sites / planning applications. These issues are dealt with through the development management process when a planning application is considered. Issues such as infrastructure or traffic will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>                      |
| <p>This is already well developed and the nursery and allotments should be retained.</p> <p>The map does not show the allotments at all. This provision needs to continue on the same site to provide continuity for tenants. Otherwise they are very disadvantaged.</p> <p>The allotments are a real concern to many people and the map appears to afford no protection for them at all. They are clearly vulnerable in a way which the Park and Ride is not!</p> | <p>Allotments are an important resource and continue to be promoted through the Council's Open Space Assessment. The allotments are not specifically identified on the base map for this area due to the scale at which the map was produced, however they are referenced in the general description of the area and form part of the assessment of 'Safeguarding'.</p> |
| <p>This is one of the few remaining areas of green between Chester and Christleton.</p>  | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p>   |
| <p>Maintenance of areas 4 and 5 as green belt is essential to prevent</p>  | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose</p>  |

| <b>Area Four<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| coalescence of Christleton into Chester (Great Boughton)<br><br>The definition of gap between Chester and Christleton seems to be set on principles that are set up to defeat the generally understood meaning of “green belt”. | of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements.<br><br>There is less than a 0.1 mile gap between the built edge of Whitchurch Road and the settlement of Christleton in the north of this area. The gap between the built edge in the south of the area and Christleton is approximately 0.4 miles |
| This land was farmed by my grandfather – the best soil in England!  | Agricultural land use is recorded in the assessment of the objectives of Green Belt.   |

| <b>Area Five</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <b>Christleton Parish Council</b>                                 | <p>Green Belt designation essential to the preservation of Christleton as an entity distinct from the built-up area of Chester.</p> <p>Nothing of substance has changed since the Chester District Local Plan was adopted.</p> <p>The purposes of the Green Belt have been modified by the NPPF Section 9 paragraphs 79 &amp; 80.</p> <p>Understand CWAC conducting review of Parish boundaries their comments are based on the current boundary and in particular to Area 4 &amp; 5 of the study. PC question what should be considered urban and questions the strength of the boundary between Christleton and Great Boughton. PC believe criterion have been misapplied and should be reassessed.</p> <p>Area 4 provides a significant strategic gap between the urban area and the built-up area of Christleton, should be green. Illogical argument around the impact of the Park and Ride on the Green Belt.</p> <p>PC question the criterion used when assessing whether land assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>PC consider there is a considerable change of emphasis in NPPF as it encourages councils to plan positively for opportunities for access to the Green Belt for recreation, sport, enhancing biodiversity, visual amenity and improving damaged and derelict land.</p> | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.</p> <p>NPPF came into being after work had commenced on the Green Belt study, however the framework has informed the study, and modifications have been taken on board.</p> <p>The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation. There is less than a 0.1 mile gap between the built edge of Whitchurch Road and the settlement of Christleton in the north of this area. The gap between the built edge in the south of the area and Christleton is approximately 0.4 miles</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential. The focus of the study is on the existing features, roles and functions in each area.</p> <p>The criteria provide a general basis for the assessment and do not seek to score or rank each area.</p> |

| <b>Area Five</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Respondent</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
|   | <p>In PC's view the nursery should be considered as an agricultural use rather than employment.</p> <p>Concern over development at Saighton Camp urbanising openness of Green Belt and setting of Chester.</p> <p>PC strongly disagree with the grading of the criterion used to assess how well areas prevent neighbouring towns from merging onto one another.</p> <p>Analysis neglects the important view from the A41 from which Area 5 north of the canal provides significant openness.</p> | <p>Views both into and out of each area have been assessed as part of the study and inform the overall assessments</p>   |
| <b>Cheshire CPRE</b>  | <p><b>Areas 4 &amp; 5</b> – Previous drafts stated that “The area acts as an important buffer between Chester and Christleton”, quoted from the Chester District Landscape Assessment &amp; Guidelines. This statement, although evidently true, has been omitted from the final draft.</p>   | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.</p> <p>Landscape Officers were involved in the assessment of each area through the officer working group.</p> |

| <b>Area Five</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>Development here would effectively merge Chester and Christleton.</p> <p>Removal of this piece of Green Belt will allow Chester to merge with Christleton.</p> <p>The area north of the canal to Pearl Lane is vital greenbelt, preventing the merging of Christleton with Vicars Cross – coalescence.</p> <p>Merger of Vicars Cross – this area must be retained as a part of the Green Belt</p>   | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.</p> <p>There is less than a 0.1 mile gap between the built edge of Whitchurch Road and the settlement of Christleton in the south of this area. The gap between the built edge in the north of the area and Christleton is approximately 0.3 miles.</p> |
| <p>Strategically important to retain Green Belt to retain character of Littleton and Christleton.</p>  | <p>The historic character and the setting of the city are reflected in the assessment of the relevant purpose(s) of Green Belt</p>   |
| <p>This site off the A41 is a natural break on the edge of the City and would be unacceptable for development.</p> <p>This area would merit further investigation (together with part of 6) but only if expansion into the green belt is shown to be necessary.</p> <p>Do residents realise the danger in this option!</p> <p>Forget “affordable housing” as an exception to usual planning rules – in the larger picture we cannot and should not pursue this policy.</p> <p>It's an opportunity for hostile planning applications.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>  |

| <b>Area Five</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>Greater weight should be given to the historic setting and character (separation) of the Chester Villages.</p>   | <p>Each of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt have been assessed independently of each other and no weighting has been applied</p> <p>The historic character and the setting of the city are reflected in the assessment of the relevant purpose(s) of Green Belt.</p> |
| <p>This is an important green belt area adjacent to the canal and therefore well used by walkers.</p> <p>Any change to this area would remove open land from public use.</p> <p>Much valued and required greenspace.</p>  | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p>  |
| <p>The Boughton Heath roundabout is incapable of coping with existing traffic at peak times. The changes made for the Saighton Camp development do not work, and that is not built yet. Further development in this area would be foolish.</p> <p>Additional traffic capacity issues at Vicars Cross junction and air quality issues being adjacent to A55 and A41.</p> <p>Since the new roundabout at Sainsburys and the extra traffic lights at the Rugby Club, my journeys into town (and Sainsburys) have been severely restricted and spoiled. Any more development of housing, which was the reason given for those backward steps, should cease.</p> <p>Impact on local highways, schools and other infrastructure is already over capacity.</p> | <p>The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |

| <b>Area Six</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| Cheshire CPRE  | Area 6 – Omission in final draft - “The area acts as an important buffer from Chester to Pipers Ash and Guilden Sutton”.  | Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.<br><br>Landscape Officers were involved in the assessment of each area through the officer working group. |
| JFL Coates   | Extreme disquiet to changes that are mooted especially that relate to A41; Pipers Ash, Long Lane Upton, Liverpool Road Demage Lane Upton; Canal corridor;<br>Need undeveloped farmland to act as green lung residents health and well being;<br>Development means more traffic, noise and dust.       | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.<br><br>The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.               |
| Sara Pulford   | Pipers Ash already has too much traffic passing through it;<br>Area used by residents of Vicars Cross and Hoole Lane for recreation;<br>Loss of trees through development;<br>Area very soggy in bad weather;<br>Cannot envisage anything being done to east traffic bottlenecks on east side of city | The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.   |
| Miss L Wakley  | Why has Chester been singled out for the review when the green belt covers the much wider area of West Cheshire?<br><br>Who is driving force behind review – CWAC or developers?<br><br>Outskirts will become urban sprawl and the loss of green  | A report setting out the justification for carrying out a (Chester) Green Belt Study was submitted to the CWAC Local Development Framework Panel on 1 <sup>st</sup> August 2011. The study will be used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.   |

| <b>Area Six</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  | <p>space will make it a less desirable place to live and visit. Pipers Ash is an important recreational area for the residents of Vicars Cross, Hoole, Guilden Sutton. When the Government is encouraging us to take more exercise to damage this area would be inexcusable;</p> <p>Have brown field sites been considered for redevelopment?</p> <p>What are the criteria behind the traffic light system?</p>   | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>In order to assess the 5 purposes of including land in the Green Belt robust and measurable criteria are required for each purpose. The assessment of each criteria is now recorded using summary text as opposed to the colour scores / grading.</p> |
| Cllr Robert  | <p>Chester is fortunate to have a Green Belt around the city. It provides a break from other settlements and more importantly is integral to the future of the city. Area 6 (Piper's Ash) should be protected.</p> <p>Main arterial roads that connect city with motorway system pass through the area which are integral to the journey into Chester. The area would appear to meet most criteria to retain as green belt and would certainly support that.</p> <p>No doubt there will be pressure to put another park and ride somewhere close.</p> | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |

| Area Six<br>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions  |  |
|---|--|
| Comments  | Response   |
| <p>Removal of this G.B would allow merger of Littleton and Guilden Sutton with Chester</p> <p>This would merge Pipers Ash and Guilden Sutton with Chester.</p> <p>Removal of this parcel would set a dangerous precedent for other sites between A41 and M53/A55. Filling the gap between Pipers Ash and Guilden Sutton would result in urbanisation of the rural area.</p> <p>Merger with nearby villages</p> <p>The maintenance of the southern portion of Area 6 (A51 to Pearl Lane) is essential to prevent coalescence of Littleton / Christleton with Chester (Vicars Cross).</p> <p>Strategically very important to retain distinctive nature of Guilden Sutton, therefore must be Green Belt.</p> | Maintaining separation between urban areas is a key purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation. |
| <p>The last study took account of distances between Chester and the Chester Villages – greater weight should be given to this.</p>  | Each of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt have been assessed independently of each other and no weighting has been applied to any individual purpose or set of criteria at this stage in the preparation of the study.                    |
| <p><i>How well contained by the urban area is the defined parcel – if the piece by the Hoole Hall is excluded the majority is detached from the urban area so should be in green band.</i></p>  | The western edge of this area is formed by the built up area of Vicars Cross and Hoole, and is therefore not classed as detached from the urban area.  |
| <p><i>Strength of boundary – the A41 and A51 are already hard boundaries which are strong durable boundaries so really should be amber at worst.</i></p>  | The presence of hard / robust boundaries results in an area being defined as having a greater ability to defend / prevent additional or further sprawl into the open countryside.  |
| <p><i>Preserving setting – Key views: Pipers Ash Beacon was sited at one of</i></p>   | The Beacon is a key feature of this area and also identifies   |

| Area Six<br>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions   |   |
|--|---|
| Comments   | Response  |
| <p>the highest points between Dee Valley and Gowy Valley. View of Cathedral, Town Hall, Shot Tower and much of the city – that is why the seat was placed there before the Beacon (Milestone 1898).</p> <p><b>Views</b> – Great Boughton Beacon was sited at Hare Lane at what is believed to be one of the highest points in the vicinity. It provides good, if not excellent, views over Chester towards the hills and North Wales. These views would be lost if this land was developed. There are good views to the south / west</p> | <p>views into the city and out of the area to the north, east and south.</p>  |
| <p><b>Openness and Setting</b> – From view point, the Beacon is in straight line of sight from Moel Famma, Helsby and Eddisbury beacon sites. From this point and along there have the whole vista of hills and settlements from Worlds End to Moel Famma and even top of the Flint suspension bridge. One of the best views over the City to Wales beyond – should justify a higher rating.</p>   | <p>Information regarding the historic character of each area has been provided by Officers from the Specialist Environment Services team.</p> <p>The Beacon is a key feature of this area and also identifies views into the city and out of the area to the north, east and south.</p> |
| <p><b>Historic Character</b> – Hare Lane went across to what is now Pipers Lane and is an ancient part of Watling Street. Area used for pipe making for agriculture. Grade 1 agricultural land.</p>  | <p>Agricultural land classification is included in the general profile of the area. The historical context of an area is included in the assessment of '<i>Special Character</i>'.</p>  |
| <p>The land is currently well used for farming and should continue to be.</p>  | <p>Agricultural land classification is included in the general profile of the area. The historical context of an area is included in the assessment of '<i>Special Character</i>'.</p>  |
| <p>Any release of land on this corridor would affect opportunities to develop vacant sites within the urban area. These should be used before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>North of Tarvin Road should remain green belt; the area south of Tarvin Road ?? Area 5 would merit further investigation.</p> <p>I think it is frightful to even consider this option – when it is not needed.</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>                                     |

| <b>Area Six<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>Development of contaminated land (off Guilden Sutton Lane) would utilise land which is a “problem”.</p> <p>Do not change anything please.</p> <p>Why not utilise infill at places like Littleton where there are already roads and services.</p> <p>Area should be considered on a phased release using the M53 and A41 as natural barriers to stop and further urban spread towards Guilden Sutton.</p> <p>Land east of A41 should not be developed. There should not be development both sides of A41 here. Build nearer to Guilden Sutton leaving a green swathe.</p> <p>Junction of Hare Lane and Guilden Sutton Lane may have development potential</p> |   |
| This is the start of the countryside from Chester and should not be disturbed.  | Comment noted.  |
| <p>Hoole Road / Tarvin Road / Whitchurch Road all heavily congested at peak times. Further development would aggravate these problems and hamper access to the city centre</p> <p>Any new build on this side of the city will further wreck access to and egress from the city. Christleton Road, Vicars Cross Road, Sandy Lane are at capacity – the Boughton gyratory was over capacity when Saighton Camp development was agreed. Hoole Road is at capacity</p>  | The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy. |

| <b>Area Six<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>(at best) during peak times.</p> <p>Chester needs an eastern P&amp;R which should be next to the slip road of the A55 at the junction with the A56. The exit would be onto the slip road to reduce traffic having to go to the roundabout at A56 / A41 and then back again to the M53 / A55</p> <p>The local infrastructure for roads, schools, green space is non-existent as the current provision is already well over capacity</p> |  |
| <p>This is an important green oasis and should be retained</p> <p>It is well used by walkers / strollers from Vicars Cross and Hoole. This amenity in such close proximity would be lost.</p> <p>The whole of this area is very heavily and widely used by recreational walkers, cyclists, mums with prams etc who find it most accessible from Vicars Cross and Hoole area.</p>  | Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.   |
| <p>This area doesn't have the interesting biodiversity of other areas being considered</p>  | Nature conservation has been assessed through the criteria used in the assessment.   |
| <p>Southern end of area 6 should be in area 5 and potentially area 4.</p>   | The boundaries in the draft study have been applied for the purpose of carrying out assessments on logical geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environment and the character of the area. Boundaries may change as the study progresses. |

| <b>Area Seven</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| Cheshire CPRE  | Area 7 - Omission in final draft - "The area acts as an important buffer from Chester Mickle Trafford". The draft also fails to recognise the merger of Chester with the settlement of Hoole Bank if the area is removed from Green Belt   | Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements and as such forms part of the assessments made in the study.<br><br>Landscape Officers were involved in the assessment of each area through the officer working group. |
| Mr Skinner   | Informed by CPRE;<br>Approach to study very amateurish;<br>Councillors and officers paid to represent the residents of Chester not the vested interests of developers;<br>Study bias in favour of development and does not uphold the principles of Green Belt.                                      | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt as detailed in NPPF. The methodology seeks to assess the purposes of the Green Belt in line with the Framework.   |
| JFL Coates   | Extreme disquiet to changes that are mooted especially that relate to A41; Pipers Ash, Long Lane Upton, Liverpool Road Demage Lane Upton; Canal corridor;<br>Need undeveloped farmland to act as green lung residents health and well being;<br>Development means more traffic, noise and dust.      | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.<br><br>Issues such as traffic, health and the environment will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.   |
| Mr R Astley  | Before any development proposals are considered there is a more important need to examine Chester District's Infrastructure;<br><br>A very serious drainage problem exists;<br>The road system has been developed without a long term plan;<br>Further development will exacerbate current problems; | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.<br><br>Issues such as drainage, land uses and housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.   |

| <b>Area Seven</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  | What about the smaller local firms who would be only too glad to work, especially on the many Brownfield sites within the city itself especially low cost housing for first time buyers.  |   |
| Brian Hall   | <p>I am very concerned at any serious intention to change the established Green Belt and I am also worried about the rather rudimentary scoring system using the three element Traffic Light method.</p> <p>My particular interest would be parcel 7. I know that the argument about diminishing the green belt between Chester suburbs and Ellesmere Port has been voiced many times but I feel that it is essential that no movement of the green belt boundary in parcels 7, 8 and 9 should be allowed. After all, I imagine there could also be the possibility of Ellesmere Port's boundary being moved in Chester's direction?</p> <p>A green agricultural landscape between the conurbations is much to be preferred when travelling between these two places. Whilst I have concentrated on the northern parcels I am fully supportive of residents in other Chester districts who wish the established Green Belt to remain.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| Ms E Croft   | <p>Urban sprawl, do we want to end up with no gap between Chester and Ellesmere Port;</p> <p>The character of the villages around Chester should be preserved;</p> <p>Do we need more housing when Chester seems to be surrounded with apartment buildings already;</p> <p>Access to green areas is vital to peoples mental and physical well being.</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as health and housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |

| <b>Area Seven<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Session</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>Any development in areas 4, 5, 6 and 7 (i.e. between A41 and M53/A55) would set a precedent for future development. This would impact on the need to develop vacant sites within the urban area.</p> <p>The area to be developed contains ponds, areas for fishing that need to be protected.</p> <p>Some architectural pleasing development would be beneficial to this area, to expand housing choice for the towns people in this vibrant city. Our company has a rolling programme to employ workers for our expanding company.</p> <p>Long Lane is an important boundary between the housing in Upton and the countryside in area 7, and any changes to the Green Belt land here would affect this. Any housing allowed in this area would set a precedent for further housing, currently some / most of this land is agricultural.</p> <p>Land between A55 and Mannings Lane – This was designated for a superstore and terminus for CDTs. Is this land identified for development under this review? As the area is substantially flat, any development will give a substantial visual impact on road access to the city of Chester.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>  |
| <p>City centre traders need customers with easy access. Main routes into the city are already heavily congested so further development would aggravate this.</p>   | <p>The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>Setting: lots of open vistas and attractive landscapes</p>  | <p>Views in to and out of the area should be considered in the context of setting and landscape.</p>   |

| <b>Area Seven</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Session</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>Merging of settlements – Yes this applies to Mickle Trafford as stated but nearest areas are the Parishes of Hoole Bank/Village and Picton so are both much closer. Is amber the correct classification?</p> <p>Distance to Hoole Bank (Hammond School) should be included.</p> <p>The areas in 7 and 8 are very important in preserving the countryside and ensuring that the towns of Chester and Ellesmere Port do not merge into one sprawling mass of housing estate. The removal of this piece of Green Belt would merge Hoole Bank with Chester.</p> | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation. The distance between the urban edge and Picton is included in the assessment of this area.</p> |
| <p>Good quality agricultural land and sports facilities on important green barrier to Chester and Upton.</p>   | <p>The range of facilities and land uses in this area has been recorded for the assessment of 'Safeguarding'.</p>   |
| <p>The boundary criteria should not be red.</p>  | <p>The assessment method has been altered and the assessment of each of the criteria is reported in written text as opposed to the scores / levels depicted by colours.</p>   |
| <p>Urban sprawl purpose – disagree that 50% is adjacent to the urban area.</p>   | <p>The boundary running from the south to the west of this area is the built edge of Upton and Upton Heath which equates to almost 4km. This is over 50% of the total perimeter of the area.</p>  |
| <p>Do not redefine Green Belt protection.</p>  | <p>The aim of the study is to look at the performance of the Green Belt in its current state. The study does not seek to change or redefine the national Green Belt designation.</p>  |

| <b>Area Eight</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| Cheshire CPRE  | Area 8 – The measurement of the gap has been taken from a projection of the Dale Barracks to Backford and to Ellesmere Port, instead of from the existing Green belt boundary  | The assessment of distance for each area has been made from the edge of the built form and not from the Green Belt boundary.  |
| SM Snewin  | <p>The division of the Green Belt into parcels is interesting but creating ten separate parcels, some quite small mitigates against the concept of green belts around towns and cities; The cushion of Green Belt within these (encircling) roads serves a vital purpose in making a smooth separation between town and country;</p> <p>In the northern section, your parcels 8,9,&amp; 10 form an important block between the city and the separate entities of Blacon and Ellesmere Port;</p> <p>This section with its existing attractive green spaces adjoining the Canal and railway land , the open land round the Countess Hospital and the two golf courses is a welcome entrance to the city on the main approach road;</p> | <p>The boundaries in the draft study have been applied for the purpose of carrying out assessments on logical geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environment and character of the area</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| Mr Skinner   | <p>Informed by CPRE;</p> <p>Approach to study very amateurish;</p> <p>Councillors and officers paid to represent the residents of Chester not the vested interests of developers;</p> <p>Study bias in favour of development and does not uphold the principles of Green Belt.</p>   | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt as detailed in NPPF. The methodology seeks to assess the purposes of the Green Belt in line with the Framework.   |
| JFL Coates   | <p>Extreme disquiet to changes that are mooted especially that relate to A41; Pipers Ash, Long Lane Upton, Liverpool Road Demage Lane Upton; Canal corridor;</p> <p>Need undeveloped farmland to act as green lung residents</p>   | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.  |

| <b>Area Eight</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>health and well being;<br/> Development means more traffic noise and dust.</p>  | <p>Issues such as traffic and noise will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |
| Mr R Astley  | <p>Before any development proposals are considered there is a more important need to examine Chester District's Infrastructure;<br/> A very serious drainage problem exists;<br/> The road system has been developed without a long term plan;<br/> Further development will exacerbate current problems;<br/> What about the smaller local firms who would be only too glad to work, especially on the many Brownfield sites within the city itself especially low cost housing for first time buyers.</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as traffic, land use and housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |
| Mrs C Surfleet   | <p>Green Belt to north of Chester is vitally important to protect the narrow corridor of open space between Ellesmere Port and Chester;<br/> Very concerned about the position of Backford with regards its Green Belt status;</p> <p>Development in this village would greatly damage the green corridor between Ellesmere Port and Chester; result will be one enormous conurbation at the bottom of the Wirral.</p>   | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> |
| Brian Hall   | <p>I am very concerned at any serious intention to change the established Green Belt and I am also worried about the rather rudimentary scoring system using the three element Traffic Light method.</p> <p>My particular interest would be parcel 7.<br/> I know that the argument about diminishing the green belt between Chester suburbs and Ellesmere Port has been voiced many times but I feel that it is essential that no movement of the green belt boundary in parcels 7, 8 and 9 should be allowed. After all, I imagine there could also be the possibility of Ellesmere Port's boundary being moved in</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a key purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>  |

| <b>Area Eight</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>Chester's direction? A green agricultural landscape between the conurbations is much to be preferred when travelling between these two places.</p> <p>Whilst I have concentrated on the northern parcels I am fully supportive of residents in other Chester districts who wish the established Green Belt to remain.</p>                             |   |
| Ms E Croft   | <p>Urban sprawl, do we want to end up with no gap between Chester and Ellesmere Port;</p> <p>The character of the villages around Chester should be preserved;</p> <p>Do we need more housing when Chester seems to be surrounded with apartment buildings already;</p> <p>Access to green areas is vital to peoples mental and physical well being.</p> | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a key purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>Issues such as housing and the environment will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |

| <b>Area Eight</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>This area is already well developed. It would substantially detract from the quality of life of its inhabitants if it were further developed. Traffic is already very congested and further development of this area would have serious implications. Developments (housing) which have been allowed to take place i.e. Countess of Chester are significantly undersubscribed.</p> <p>This area is already well developed. It should not be used for housing but the health – country park idea would be good and would protect some of the greenbelt.</p> <p>Any more development in this area will have a significant impact on the</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The development that has taken place in this area to date is predominantly on major developed sites that are identified in the Chester District Local Plan which allows a certain level and type of development to take place.</p> <p>Issues such as housing, health and well being, and the environment will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |

| <b>Area Eight<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>character of Upton. Any more development will take it from being a village to part of a larger urban sprawl. Please, no development that brings Chester and Ellesmere Port closer together.</p> <p>Please no development for housing between zoo and canal or below barracks.</p> <p>What is the area left with if this area is swallowed up with development? No space for leisure activity etc.</p> <p>We need more houses but I think only a small incursion into the Green Belt should be built on.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be built on first. More affordable housing is important.</p> <p>Safeguarding land at hospital for future expansion to meet needs.</p> <p>Land here should only be used for zoo related development and agriculture.</p> <p>Will we plan for the future use of Dale Barracks</p> |  |
| Retain all Green Belt protection, please  | Noted  |
| <p>The land beyond Area 8 up to the A5117 is owned by a few individual farmers. The spatial planning review must allow for diversification of use of farmland here. The next generation won't be able to afford the mortgage needed to buy the land. If sold as small parcels of land then gross development of the A41 corridor will become inevitable.</p>  | Issues such as rural employment, land use and the economy will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy. |

| <b>Area Eight<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| Farmers need to be allowed to develop their own spare buildings or poorly productive areas on proviso that wealth generated is put back into their own farming businesses. Otherwise wealth will go into developers' pockets. Small scale hamlets e.g. Badgers Walk could save this green belt. This needs to happen within the next 10yrs before the few retire.  |   |
| Area 8 is too large – the area north of the hospital and south of Moston needs further study; so does the triangular area north of Upton (provided expansion into Green Belt can be justified). This area is too large; it covers a number of distinct characters of the Green Belt. Ellesmere Port has walked close enough to North Chester. What are you going to do with the land anyway? More houses – you are already building more than the projected increase in population. Why don't you work on building on the large number of brown sites in the District? | The boundaries in the draft study have been applied for the purpose of carrying out assessments on logical geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environment and character of the area. |
| This is a very poor description of this area. The map fails to show the critical narrow space between Chester and Ellesmere Port.  | The area covered by the whole study is shown on maps within the methodology.  |
| Valuable agricultural land – cultivated for many years – is at risk with zoo development.  | Agricultural land classification is included in the general profile of the area.  |
| Traffic problems in 'country' lanes around Backford, Chorlton, Croughton, Wervin are increasing now.<br><br>There is already far too much traffic congestion which has a detrimental impact on the residents of Upton.   | The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.   |
| Upton is an area with very little green space so Green Belt around it is especially important<br><br>Community nature park needs improvement: poor quality<br><br>Health benefits of green land for hospital patients  | Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.  |

| Area Nine<br>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Respondent  | Comment  | Response   |
| Cheshire CPRE                                       | <p>Area 9 – The draft states that the “Golf course (Mollington) [was] constructed on derelict land”. Originally the land was high grade agricultural land. It was given permission for a golf course. The owner spent several years allowing (illegal?) dumping of unsupervised waste over the entire site for “landscaping and contouring”. The content and height of the “contouring” was under Council enforcement action for many years. The ‘dumping’ remains on the land.</p>  | Noted  |
| SM Snewin   | <p>The division of the Green Belt into parcels is interesting but creating ten separate parcels, some quite small mitigates against the concept of green belts around towns and cities;</p> <p>The cushion of Green Belt within these (encircling) roads serves a vital purpose in making a smooth separation between town and country;</p> <p>In the northern section, your parcels 8,9,&amp; 10 form an important block between the city and the separate entities of Blacon and Ellesmere Port; This section with its existing attractive green spaces adjoining the Canal and railway land , the open land round the Countess Hospital and the two golf courses is a welcome entrance to the city on the main approach road;</p> | <p>The boundaries in the draft study have been applied for the purpose of carrying out assessments on logical geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environmental and historic character of the area. Boundaries may change as the study progresses.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| JFL Coates  | <p>Extreme disquiet to changes that are mooted especially that relate to A41; Pipers Ash, Long Lane Upton, Liverpool Road Demage Lane Upton; Canal corridor;</p> <p>Need undeveloped farmland to act as green lung residents health and well being;</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The study does not assess issues such as health</p>   |

| <b>Area Nine</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   | Development means more traffic, noise and dust.   | and well being or traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.  |
| Mr R Astley   | <p>Before any development proposals are considered there is a more important need to examine Chester District's Infrastructure;</p> <p>A very serious drainage problem exists;</p> <p>The road system has been developed without a long term plan;</p> <p>Further development will exacerbate current problems;</p> <p>What about the smaller local firms who would be only too glad to work, especially on the many Brownfield sites within the city itself especially low cost housing for first time buyers.</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The study does not assess issues such as infrastructure and traffic. These issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |
| Mrs C Surfleet  | <p>Green Belt to north of Chester is vitally important to protect the narrow corridor of open space between Ellesmere Port and Chester;</p> <p>Very concerned about the position of Backford with regards its Green Belt status;</p> <p>Development in this village would greatly damage the green corridor between Ellesmere Port and Chester; result will be one enormous conurbation at the bottom of the Wirral.</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. . The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| Brian Hall  | <p>I am very concerned at any serious intention to change the established Green Belt and I am also worried about the rather rudimentary scoring system using the three element Traffic Light method.</p> <p>My particular interest would be parcel 7.</p> <p>I know that the argument about diminishing the green belt between Chester suburbs and Ellesmere Port has been voiced many times but I feel that it is essential that no movement of the green belt boundary in parcels 7, 8 and 9 should be allowed.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. . The</p>  |

| <b>Area Nine</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Respondent</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|   | <p>After all, I imagine there could also be the possibility of Ellesmere Port's boundary being moved in Chester's direction? A green agricultural landscape between the conurbations is much to be preferred when travelling between these two places. Whilst I have concentrated on the northern parcels I am fully supportive of residents in other Chester districts who wish the established Green Belt to remain.</p> | <p>gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |

| <b>Area Nine</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>Please don't ruin the green corridor along the canal and all the associated wildlife.</p> <p>This is a unique corridor and epitomises the Green Spaces and Corridors entering the unique city of Chester. To even consider any alternative for this land indicates that its current role is not understood.</p> <p>Canal Corridor is important for wildlife and needs at least ½ mile either side of it to keep the wildlife chain. The area also has ponds and woodland.</p> <p>This is a very special area and provides a "green lung" to the densely populated area of Blacon. The canal environs area sensitive nature area.</p> <p>An extremely important 'Green corridor' in what is already a dense urban area.</p> | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p> |

| <b>Area Nine<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| <p>This is a very important green corridor and should remain green belt.</p> <p>Green space is precious – who wants to live in a country where we have nothing but a concrete jungle without countryside and green belt.</p> <p>Keeping a green route into the city centre along the canal corridor</p> <p>Green corridor into city is important</p> <p>This is a lovely green corridor – which must be retained</p> <p>The use of the land for cycling, walking and fishing is important for residents around the canal and the bridle path through the zoo. Also lots of workers cycle along the towpath between Chester and Ellesmere Port using the route through the zoo and on to Ellesmere Port</p> <p>Shropshire Union canal goes through Blacon part of the amenity of the area</p> <p>Connection from A5116 to Ellesmere Port via canal path is well used</p> <p>Land to the north of Blacon has been used as a recreation / walking area for over 30 years</p> <p>Adjacent to 10 and shares same value as land is within/adjacent to most populated / densely populated area in CW&amp;C. Vital to resident welfare.</p> |  |
| Otters in this section of the canal   | Noted  |
| No scope for building in the southern area if the Council is progressing with the Country Park west of the hospital. NO development here.   | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential. |

| <b>Area Nine<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>The old city tip – this would prevent building – the use of this area as a Country Park therefore should be supported.</p>  |   |
| <p>Upton boundary is yards not miles away from here.</p> <p>This forms a vital part of the northerly boundary of Chester and protects against urban sprawl – there is little green space between here and Ellesmere Port so this should be kept intact.</p> <p>Absolutely NOT – this green belt land is here to stop urban sprawl – in years to come how could you then stop Ellesmere Port being joined up to the City of Chester.</p> <p>Area 9 (Green Corridor) should be retained as Green Belt, any development north of Moston and the zoo is narrowing the gap between Chester and Ellesmere Port.</p> <p>Is the most vital area of Chester's green belt as helps prevent merging sprawl in nearby Ellesmere Port / Saughall / Mollington / Upton.</p> <p>Land to the north needs to be retained in Green Belt to keep Chester / Ellesmere Port distinction</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| <p>NPPF retains greenbelt first policy / promotes brownfield 1<sup>st</sup> / states that lack of a local plan is not a valid reason to develop.</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential. The assessment methodology was prepared in line with the relevant national planning guidance and the Framework.</p>   |
| <p>One of the issues with the southerly and middle part of this section is flooding or potential flooding. The environment agency maps show this clearly.</p>  | <p>The study does not assess issues such flood risk, such issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |

| <b>Area Nine<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| Protects emergency routes into/out of Blacon for Police etc. | The study does not assess issues such as access and emergency services, such issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy. |

| <b>Area Ten</b><br><b>Responses Received by Letter or e-mail</b> |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Respondent</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| S M Snewin   | <p>The division of the Green Belt into parcels is interesting but creating ten separate parcels, some quite small mitigates against the concept of green belts around towns and cities; The cushion of Green Belt within these (encircling) roads serves a vital purpose in making a smooth separation between town and country;</p> <p>In the northern section, your parcels 8,9,&amp; 10 form an important block between the city and the separate entities of Blacon and Ellesmere Port;</p> <p>This section with its existing attractive green spaces adjoining the Canal and railway land , the open land round the Countess Hospital and the two golf courses is a welcome entrance to the city on the main approach road;</p> | <p>The boundaries in the draft study have been applied for the purpose of carrying out assessments on logical geographical areas and are based upon information about the general environment and character of the area.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| Mr R Astley  | <p>Before any development proposals are considered there is a more important need to examine Chester District's Infrastructure;</p> <p>A very serious drainage problem exists;</p> <p>The road system has been developed without a long term plan;</p> <p>Further development will exacerbate current problems;</p> <p>What about the smaller local firms who would be only too glad to work, especially on the many Brownfield sites within the city itself especially low cost housing for first time buyers.</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The study does not assess issues such as drainage, land use or traffic; such issues will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |

| Area Ten<br>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions  |   |
|---|---|
| Comments  | Response  |
| <p>Don't ruin the character of Mollington by allowing buildings to be built between Blacon and Mollington.</p> <p>This is a very special area and maintains the separation of Blacon and Saughall.</p> <p>The area is also vital in preventing Blacon spread into Saughall.</p> <p>Area 10 (and 9) must remain Green Belt to prevent creeping erosion leading to merge of Chester and Ellesmere Port.</p> | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> |
| <p>An extremely important boundary to the large estate at Blacon, should be protected farmland</p> <p>Please protect all existing Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Where do you stop as there are no natural boundaries?</p> <p>No definable boundaries to stop further encroachment until you reach A5117</p> <p>Hedges are probably boundary of Little Mollington.</p>                                     | <p>Comments noted</p>   |
| <p>Your first analysis shows that the majority of criteria, the Green Belt purposes are being achieved – so the whole of this area should be retained as Green Belt.</p> <p>I agree with the categories but this is important green belt and should be retained.</p>  | <p>The importance of the Green Belt is reflected throughout the assessment and the detailed range of criteria that have been applied.</p>   |
| <p>Green Belt land provides a unique breathing space between the City of Chester and its neighbours. The green belt should, as far as possible, remain sacrosanct for future generations. The green spaces within Blacon are very limited. Keeping as much green space around it as possible is essential.</p>  | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p>   |

| <b>Area Ten</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>It is also a very major part of “lung” around that area.</p> <p>Absolutely NOT – no need and it is a green lung for Blacon.</p> <p>The green lung is vital as a healthy amenity and should be kept for this reason alone.</p> <p>This area is important for recreational use in Blacon – already one of the most “green space” deprived areas of the city</p> <p>No development – a green lung</p> <p>Please keep green spaces, otherwise we will not have any nature areas for wildlife etc. As I live in Blacon with my wife and our health is affected with all the new build.</p> <p>There are not many green areas accessible from Blacon.</p> <p>Blacon is the most densely populated area within CW&amp;C with a severe lack of quality green space. Greenbelt is therefore essential to community life and also (see PCT reports on health stats) vital to saving money.</p> <p>Shropshire Union Canal part of amenity of Blacon.</p> <p>Access to land to north of Blacon used for recreation / exercise for at least thirty years</p> |   |
| Blacon is eight times urbanely dense than the average ward in the borough  | Comments noted  |
| Please keep our Greenbelt, it is so important. DO NOT DESTROY IT!!   | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development |

| <b>Area Ten</b><br><b>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>  |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>I am against any development in the green belt including all greenfields. Villages being overtaken by building (infill)</p> <p>There is potential for any development to be carried out on brownfield sites within the confines of the existing development. Independent studies throw doubt on Cheshire West projections for the amount of new housing that is likely to be needed in any case. The council needs to listen to, and work with, local people, not developers in order to protect our heritage and current amenity land.</p> <p>We feel that CW&amp;C are taking the soft option by looking at Greenfield sites rather than Brownfield Areas. How many infill single plot sites are there in our area?</p> <p>Take the green belt from the Blacon area and what is left – no development in this area.</p> <p>Please protect our green belt area. In particular I am concerned about the Blacon / Parkgate area. I am against any development in that area.</p> <p>I strongly object to any development in the Green Belt. We must keep it as our village will get swallowed up eventually by developers.</p> <p>It would be a mistake to extend the urban area of Blacon and encroach on the Green Belt.</p> <p>This is a critical area of green belt land, currently fulfilling all 5 purposes (to greater or lesser degree) of the NPPF. Development on any of this land should not be allowed, for this reason and because to develop here would set a dangerous precedent for development of Areas 1 – 9, all of which are</p> | <p>potential.</p> |

| Area Ten<br>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions   |   |
|--|---|
| Comments   | Response  |
| <p>contributing to preserving Chester's unique layout, character and attraction (to both residents and economy boosting visitors)</p> <p>Land to the north of Chester needs strong Green Belt protection – no development</p> <p>I have concerns that once planning permission is given to develop one part of green belt it would set a baseline for other areas to be developed.</p> <p>We must not be held to ransom by developers who see this as easy picking for housing development. GB review should not be dictated to by builders.</p> |   |
| <p>Two former Secretary of State have said land to the north of Chester should never be built on – strategic Green Belt both locally and for the North West (former Local Plan enquiries)</p>  | Comments noted.   |
| <p>It is also good farmland and has been used until recently for grazing and producing good quality milk / cheese. It is very typical in its physical structure to that of many similar grazing areas across Cheshire.</p>   | Comments noted.   |
| <p>This is a vital part of the northerly belt protecting Chester from urban sprawl. This most critical part of Chester's greenbelt previously defined as such by 2 Secretaries of State must be preserved to stop urban sprawl of Chester into nearby Ellesmere Port / Saughall / Mollington</p>   | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The study takes account of urban sprawl, character and coalescence through the criteria used to asses each purpose of Green Belt.</p>                   |
| <p>This also acts as a flood sump and is really important.</p> <p>With all this nonsense – building on greenbelt, if it should happen, firstly there must be more treatment plants to take sewerage.</p> <p>Drainage cannot cope with extra building</p>   | <p>Flood risk and similar constraints have not been assessed in this study and will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>Some areas could be used more constructively so as to make social areas for families to enjoy: children these days don't have anywhere to ride bikes safely. Gone are the days when children and young people could go out</p>  | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or</p>                     |

| Area Ten<br>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions  |  |
|---|--|
| Comments  | Response   |
| climbing trees and playing in fields without getting told not to – as the streets are so busy with traffic and play areas are not developing for local and up to date with present times. When people have wanted to build a skate park there never appears to be suitable land available. (South Bank in London used some unused space and made it into something that I saw as a resource). There is an advert on TV where a woman holds up a (square) board and shows you what land can be developed into. We are in an age where children need exercise. If land is developed for housing, there is never the correct play facilities built into the project. PCT and health partners are try to promote exercise for us all, where can this take place safely? | agricultural value.  |
| I strongly object to this proposed development, studies show Chester has enough development potential of 'brownfield' sites without the need to develop Greenfield sites. This area is an important green space preventing a continuous belt of development. This area provides a natural green space bordering an extremely large area of development.<br><br>Further I would point out that Liverpool University have stated that they have no need for such a development to cope with student numbers. Bell Developments clandestine approach suggests that this is being earmarked for private development at a future stage.  | This study does not assess individual planning applications. The draft assessments look at the specific purposes of the national Green Belt designation as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework.<br><br>Issues such as the use of brownfield land will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.                           |
| Say no to the proposed Bell development on this site. This is vital green belt and used local children, pet owners and others who enjoy this precious bit of countryside.<br><br>No to Bell Development<br><br>I have no objection to the proposed development in Area 10 by Bell Developments for a student village as if only impact a small part of area 10 bounded by Parkgate Road.<br><br>NO! To the student village/ghetto! The Green Belt for the whole of North  | This study does not assess individual planning applications. The assessments look at the specific purposes of the national Green Belt designation as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework.<br><br>The Green Belt study will form part of the evidence base that will inform the development of policies in the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy. |

| <b>Area Ten<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <p>Chester (Areas 7, 8 , 9 and 10) should receive special protection. All present criteria are being achieved – disagree with the two amber designations – they too should be green.</p> <p>I would like to congratulate the protest organisers of the anti student village on Saxon Way, Blacon. It is a lovely green area of which there is not a lot in Blacon. We don't need yet more student accommodation and I offer my whole hearted support to the campaign.</p> <p>No to the student village, it is in the greenbelt.</p> <p>There is no need for development here. The student village (which is not supported by Chester College) is obviously just an underhand tactic to gain access to green belt land for more lucrative housing development. We, the residents of the area, are watching your decisions. Do not allow it!</p> |   |
| <p>We need to be sure CWAC is being led by people with the full interest of the inhabitants and living there, our poorly performing personal companies.</p>  | <p>This study does not assess individual planning applications. The assessments look at the specific purposes of the national Green Belt designation as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Green Belt study will form part of the evidence base that will inform the development of policies in the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>This proposal is an absolute disgrace. Too much green field would be taken up with the un-needed development. I myself have been turned down for an “in-fill plot” and been twice refused. A strong reason given was the connecting up of Ellesmere Port to Chester. The Planners said this would never happen! We will see! Too much money is involved in the backing of this scheme and usually money talks! So I hope Chester rate payers are not going to be embarrassed.</p>   | <p>This study does not assess individual planning applications. The assessments look at the specific purposes of the national Green Belt designation as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Green Belt study will form part of the evidence base that will inform the development of policies in the</p>   |

| <b>Area Ten<br/>Responses Received At Drop-In Sessions</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| The greenbelt needs to be retained everywhere. Nowhere is safe from CWAK and their greed for money. The new C.I.L will give them thousands of pounds to fritter away for their own use. The leader of CWAK needs to put his own house in order, then maybe CWAK will have a leader with more interest in the people of Cheshire West and Chester not have his own personal interest. | emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.<br>Comments noted |

| General Comments received at the drop-in event  |   |
|---|---|
| Comments  | Response  |
| <p>Areas 1 through to 10 should be kept a green belt. Please protect Chester from more devastating development for future generations</p> <p>Please do not build on green belt land</p> <p>Don't sell off the family silver when there's enough copper and brass in the form of brownfield land. Greenbelt land is precious to us and wildlife.</p> <p>A case can be made for very small developments on green belt as additions to existing villages – could help small communities remain vibrant and viable particularly if social housing is the main focus.</p> <p>I agree with the above comments. What we don't need is the green belt covered in cheaply built 2 bed "apartments" that proliferate in Chester. Families need homes (private and housing association), they also need to have suitably supportive infrastructure. Depending on the above would be my support or otherwise.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>                       |
| <p>Why aren't brownfield sites and sites already within the urban area developed with greater concentration of housing? i.e. 1)small units not 5 and 6 bedroom houses, 2) we've got enough supermarkets – the A51 Waitrose development is clearly, the area could have been developed in line with the area on the city side – small scale commercial units along the road with housing behind.</p> <p>Why aren't local infill sites e.g. Littleton being utilised instead of making areas such as Tattenhall / Tarporley into small towns – Remember Christleton High School is only ½ mile away from Littleton where as Malpas High is 8 miles from Tattenhall and Tattenhall Primary School is too small for the amount of children already – local needs I think not!</p>   | <p>Issues such as the use of brownfield land will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>Appalled at prospect of infill – is all brownfield land well used / considered? We need green spaces.</p>  | <p>Issues such as the use of brownfield land and infill development will be dealt with through the emerging</p>                                 |

| <b>General Comments received at the drop-in event</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| Open up building on in-fill areas in villages i.e. Littleton otherwise these villages will die as young people are forced to move away                               | Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.   |
| Social housing developments should be near to employment areas. Building affordable housing in green belt villages is senseless if it necessitates commuting by car. | Details of emerging housing policies including affordable housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy. |

## Summary of additional comments received

| Respondent        | Summary of Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------|--|---|
| J.F.L Coates      | <p>I understand that a new development plan is in progress which will involve the existing “Green Belt” around Chester.</p> <p>I view with extreme disquiet the changes that are mooted. In particular those that relate to the A41 – the parcels of land that I feel most strongly should remain in the green belt are: Piper’s Ash; Long Lane, Upton; Liverpool Road, Demage Lane, Upton; and Canal Corridor.</p> <p>Chester needs these areas to remain as farm land i.e. undeveloped is a green lung to the local residents health and well being.</p> <p>Development means more traffic, noise and dust etc.</p>  | <p>The Green Belt Study assesses the area of Green Belt land surrounding the urban area of Chester against the 5 purposes of the Green Belt (as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>The study does not include any assessment of development potential, and the parcels of land do not represent development sites.</p> |
| Mrs E Hart        | I am writing in support of the position of the CPRE regarding the Green Belt – close to my home.   | Please see response below to correspondence received from Cheshire CPRE.  |
| Mrs B Illingworth | <p>The study seems to have been undertaken without any understanding of the area. Chester is basically a small country town, surrounded by farmland – previously developed slowly with some taste, currently allowing buildings totally out of keeping with the city itself.</p> <p>The study if carried out will in effect alter the uniqueness of the city. The division of five thousand acres into parcels is far too extensive, will allow random and tasteless building.</p> <p>This potential development could result in many three storey houses crammed together. Chester would become very unattractive.</p> <p>Examples: removal of cinema and theatre – think about the future not just current financial problems. Create a beautiful city not just a crowded area without any green spaces.</p> <p>There is still plenty of land within the city which could be used for building small units. Look to the future not next four years. Create a beautiful city with small compact suburbs that are unique and not part of ‘urban sprawl’.</p> | <p>The Green Belt Study assesses the area of Green Belt land surrounding the urban area of Chester against the 5 purposes of the Green Belt (as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>The study does not include any assessment of development potential, and the parcels of land do not represent development sites.</p> |
| Mr M              | Wish to express serious concerns about planned review of Green   | The character and setting of the city are   |

| Respondent             | Summary of Comments  | Response  |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Spencer & Dr H Spencer | <p>Belt around Chester.</p> <p>Chester is a unique city - its overall appearance and cohesion as an ancient urban site with continuous and visible history. Cheshire is renowned for its beautiful and productive countryside, and characterful towns and villages.</p> <p>Urban sprawl should be avoided for benefit of residents and visitors alike. Such as already exists, especially in direction of Ellesmere Port, should not be extended further, and built-up area of Chester should not be allowed to merge with surrounding villages and smaller settlements.</p> <p>A major element contributing to Chester's international fame is the beauty of its surrounding countryside. Development in surrounding areas would have a seriously detrimental effect on visual amenities of exceptional townscape.</p> <p>Degrading land from its Green Belt status could set undesirable precedent for other sites where in equity development would be difficult to resist and resultant cumulative scale of development would erode character of whole area.</p> | <p>recognised in the study through the range of criteria used in the assessment.</p> <p>Colleagues from the Council's Specialist Environment Services team have been involved in the preparation of the study.</p> <p>Urban sprawl is assessed through the strength of boundaries and the containment of areas with regard to their attachment to the existing built up area.</p> |
| Cllr Robert Thompson   | <p>Chester is fortunate to have a Green Belt around the city. It provides a break from other settlements and more importantly is integral to the future of the city.</p> <p>Area 6 (Piper's Ash) should be protected. Main arterial roads that connect city with motorway system pass through the area which is integral to the journey into Chester. The area would appear to meet most criteria to retain as green belt and would certainly support that.</p> <p>No doubt there will be pressure to put another park and ride somewhere close</p>  | <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p>   |
| Chester Civic Trust    | <p>The methodology is ambiguous as there seems to be an assumption that the Green Belt will be eroded. It is not clear whether each parcel of land is really being assessed against the five</p>   | <p>The draft assessment is based on a set of criteria that help to answer whether each of the areas is meeting the individual purpose of the</p>  |

| Respondent    | Summary of Comments  | Response   |
|---------------|--|--|
|               | <p>purposes and therefore remains relevant for the future or whether it is being considered as a future development site with a possible new Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>This study seems to have 'jumped the gun' by evaluating parcels of land within the Green Belt for possible development against the five purposes of Green Belt before the tests in NPPF paragraph 84 have been applied in the plan making process.</p> <p>The application of the criteria is misleading particularly 'how well contained by the urban area is the defined parcel of land?' and 'how strong is the boundary of the defined parcel of land?'. </p> <p>The Green Belt Study is premature as the study should await the strategic objective assessment of the development needs of the housing market area in accordance with NPPF.</p>   | <p>Green Belt as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Development potential is not considered in the assessment however the theoretical impacts of development do feature in the assessment of "<i>Unrestricted Sprawl</i>".</p> <p>A report setting out the justification for carrying out a (Chester) Green Belt Study was submitted to the CWAC Local Development Framework Panel on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011. The study will be used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.</p>   |
| Cheshire CPRE | <p>Best practice would have required a greater level of participation throughout the process including an opportunity for public and community groups to comment and suggest amendments to the methodology before it was implemented and contribute to the assessment process with a more structured method of gathering feedback.</p> <p>We are not aware of an evidence-based justification for focusing a study solely on the Green Belt around Chester, furthermore, to date, the Council has failed to generate sufficient evidence to even consider altering Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>A wide range of evidence needs to be prepared first in order to be able to soundly justify considering alterations to the Green Belt boundary, to demonstrate changes that have occurred since the adoption of the Chester Local Plan and the Regional Strategy which</p> | <p>The draft Green Belt Study will be an evidence base document used to inform the new Local Plan. The methodology has been drafted in consultation with colleagues from a range of specialist services, and CWAC Members</p> <p>A report setting out the justification for carrying out a (Chester) Green Belt Study was submitted to the CWAC Local Development Framework Panel on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011. The study will be used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The draft study does not consider or suggest any amendments to the Green Belt. The aim of the study is to assess the Green Belt</p> |

| Respondent | Summary of Comments  | Response  |
|------------|--|---|
|            | <p>would amount to exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>CPRE is particularly concerned that the study does not have specific regard for the essential characteristic of openness. The first and overarching focus of the study should have been to address this, looking at the overall openness and integrity of the Green Belt and how removing any parcels identifies would impact upon it.</p> <p>Performance of the Green Belt against the fifth purpose (urban regeneration) should be assessed as well.</p> <p>It is highly questionable whether any land assessed can in fact be considered to have a negative impact on maintaining the Green Belt as a 'red' score supposedly indicates. Likewise, it is not clear that where a piece of land does make a positive contribution to achieving one of the Green Belt purposes - amber score – that it has a "neutral impact on maintaining the Green Belt". This method of 'scoring' will be used by applicants and may also have a prejudicial impact on the Local Plan process.</p> <p>It is unclear how scores against each of the criteria will eventually be judged.</p> <p>The criteria chosen do not appear to be appropriate for assessing performance against the purposes of including land in Green Belt.</p> <p>Area 1 – Removal of this area from Green Belt would result in the settlement of Roughill merging with development of the Lache Eyes</p> <p>Area 2 – Chester Business Park lies in a parkland setting which is subject to special Green Belt policy in Chester Local Plan.</p> | <p>immediately surrounding Chester against the 5 purposes of the designation.</p> <p>Openness is assessed in the study as a criteria under the purpose <i>"To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns"</i>. This assessment has been informed by a range of colleagues, English Heritage and comments received through consultation.</p> |

| Respondent    | Summary of Comments   | Response   |
|---------------|---|--|
|               | <p>Areas 4 &amp; 5 – Previous drafts stated that “The area acts as an important buffer between Chester and Christleton”, quoted from the Chester District Landscape Assessment &amp; Guidelines. This statement, although evidently true, has been omitted from the final draft.</p> <p>Area 6 – Omission in final draft - “The area acts as an important buffer from Chester to Pipers Ash and Guilden Sutton”.</p> <p>Area 7 - Omission in final draft - “The area acts as an important buffer from Chester Mickle Trafford”. The draft also fails to recognise the merger of Chester with the settlement of Hoole Bank if the area is removed from Green Belt</p> <p>Area 8 – The measurement of the gap has been taken from a projection of the Dale Barracks to Backford and to Ellesmere Port, instead of from the existing Green belt boundary</p> <p>Area 9 – The draft states that the “Golf course (Mollington) [was] constructed on derelict land”. Originally the land was high grade agricultural land. It was given permission for a golf course. The owner spent several years allowing (illegal?) dumping of unsupervised waste over the entire site for “landscaping and contouring”. The content and height of the “contouring” was under Council enforcement action for many years. The ‘dumping’ remains on the land.</p> <p>Areas 8 &amp; 9 – the study map does <u>not</u> show the line of the built edge of Chester Zoo nor the built edge of Dale Barracks, as stated. The boundaries of areas 8 &amp; 9 are shown across an uncertain line of open fields and wooded landscape.</p> |  |
| Mulbury Homes | <p>General Queries over Assessment Criteria</p> <p>How were the red edge boundaries devised? Opportunity lead? Logical road patterns and defendable boundaries? Ward</p>  | <p>The extent of the area of the study was defined by the outer ring road to the south and east of the city, and the Welsh border to the west of the city.</p> |

| Respondent | Summary of Comments  | Response  |
|------------|--|---|
|            | <p>boundaries?</p> <p>What is the general principle of development opportunities within those red edged areas once, and if, removed from the GB designation?</p> <p>Will there be a policy mechanism that will protect those more vulnerable/sensitive land uses, providing and maintaining 'green lungs' through these areas? I noticed that most of the comments provided could construe an impression of wholesale development within those red edges.</p> <p>Will development be brought through national planning guidance upon development of Greenfield sites, with sustainable development be limited to 'sensible and logical' in fill sites, that will not be to the detriment of the landscaping character and openness of that settlement fringe?</p> <p>Is a process of master planning those identified areas to be removed from the GB envisaged?</p> <p>Land ownership and co-operation – shall there be a process of collaboration with those landowners in those areas identified, as part of the SHLAA and Core Strategy?</p> <p>Will the economic/development plans of the larger land owners be key to any strategic release – I refer to the expansion plans of the Hospital, the Zoo, Law School etc that will have wider economic benefit to the local economy, and regionally?</p> <p>What is the process for review which shall include the sustainable development of those rural settlements washed over with GB, beyond the A55 boundary of Chester City?</p> | <p>Development principles and opportunities do not feature in the study. The Local Plan will set the strategic development principles for the borough which will include the consideration of Green Belt policies.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework provides a national level of protection, and policy guidance for areas designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>This study does not seek to identify land for removal from the Green Belt, and does not consider development potential. These issues would, if applicable, be considered through further work and the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>At this stage only the Green Belt around Chester has been subject to assessment due to the reasons given in the justification paper.</p> |

| Respondent                    | Summary of Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Great Boughton Parish Council | <p>Chester is a unique historic city of which Great Boughton PC have long felt an integral part of the wider community.</p> <p>Green Belt provides valuable agricultural land which in years to come may become increasingly important for self sufficiency</p> <p>Strollers, joggers, walkers, dog-walkers and cyclists use local lanes on daily basis. Important for urban dwellers to have green space to provide and attract high calibre workforce to fuel the success of our economy.</p> <p>CWAC need to understand impact of development i.e. Saighton Camp.</p> <p>Acknowledge there may be a need to increase affordable housing to support our young peoples aspirations, ageing population wanting to live in family homes, jobs mean housing and single parent households all placing pressure on building land</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be used before Green Belt.</p> <p>Any development proposals should be considered in context of local need.</p> <p>Need to consider the particular transport strains that the south east corner of Chester is facing, infrastructure is at breaking point.</p> | <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as affordable housing, use of brownfield and traffic and infrastructure will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| John Davies                   | <p>Comments relating to university and increased student numbers.</p> <p>Area to the north of the city is a buffer zone between Chester and Ellesmere Port...two towns with totally different characteristics, historically and culturally.</p> <p>Both create high volumes of traffic on the A41 and Liverpool Road between Mostyn and the Bache. This has increased with the development of Upton Dene near the hospital. Also, the Park &amp; Ride at the Zoo is already often great pressure. Any future development along these axes would create a traffic nightmare. Change is inevitable, but with some careful planning surely we can protect those things that make Chester so unique...an attractive place to live/work/visit...a compact city with character, not an urban</p>  | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>This study does not assess individual planning applications. The assessments look at the specific purposes of the national Green Belt designation as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Green Belt study will form part of the evidence base that will inform the development of policies in the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |

| Respondent        | Summary of Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------|---|---|
|                   | sprawl....with limits to growth of the University so that people who have lived most of their lives in the city centre are not squeezed out of these student ghettos.   |   |
| Mrs B Illingworth | <p>Study has been undertaken without any understanding of the area;</p> <p>Development in Green Belt will affect the uniqueness of the city;</p> <p>Study area too extensive, the division in to parcels will allow random development ;</p> <p>Create a beautiful city not just a crowded area without any green spaces;</p> <p>City requires people with vision</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as future development and the environment will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |
| Mrs E Hart        | Writing in support of CPRE in regard to green belt near her home.   | Comments noted  |
| Denise Kelly      | <p>Concerns regarding the recent assessment of the green belt surrounding Chester, which I believe have been awarded scores in a traffic light system. Very concerned that this is sending a strong message to developers and landowners that these areas are not of value under the green belt policy.</p> <p>The retaining of these sensitive areas is essential in preserving the critically narrow remaining open space between the built up parts of Chester and Ellesmere Port. It also keeps an open countryside setting around the city which in itself holds national and international importance.</p> <p>The release of any individual parcel of land will only make it harder to defend any remaining green belt.</p> <p>I believe this has been done as part of the high housing figure which has emerged from the recent development plan. The large number of houses for sale in local estate agents however would suggest that there is NOT a shortage of housing in Chester. The problem lies in people being unable to afford housing.</p> <p>No doubt developers would be glad to supply a proportion of "affordable" houses amongst some of their developments. However</p> | <p>The study itself will not score each of the areas. Each area is assessed on an individual basis. This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements. The gap between the urban areas has been calculated to assess the existing separation.</p> <p>Issues such as affordable housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |

| Respondent    | Summary of Comments   | Response   |
|---------------|---|--|
|               | <p>these properties would only fall into this category for the first purchases who will no doubt sell up in a few years and expect market value for their property.</p> <p>To let the green belt go under these conditions would be foolish folly and not something which could ever be repaired.</p>   |  |
| John Chatburn | <p>I have today received the CPRE leaflet explaining the CWAC planning officers' intention of working on a new Development plan for Chester.</p> <p>I am alarmed by this not only because of the reduction in our lovely countryside but also because when I first bought my home nearly 30 years ago I was given the impression that the fields behind my home ( Parcel No 2 on the sketch map) were green belt and would never be built on.</p> <p>About twelve years ago they were sold to a building consortium for development and the Westminster Park residents got up a petition which I believe reached the House of Commons and the result was we were lead to believe that development was stopped. It would appear that our councillors are determined to develop not only these fields but any fields in or around Chester.</p> <p>There seems to be no end of houses for sale in Chester and one wonders why there is a need to build thousands more?</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>National planning policy continues to provide a level of protection for Green Belt.</p> <p>Issues such as affordable housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan and in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| Steve Kelly   | <p>I would like to register my objection to the re-evaluation of Green Belt land surrounding Chester and also the 'Traffic Light' system being utilised by planning offers of CWAC. As stated by the Campaign to Protect Rural England this method sends out the wrong message to developers and landowners as to the quality of various parcels of Green Belt. I believe the traffic light system goes against the Governments own policy whereby land is included within the greenbelt.</p> <p>Equally, the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The extent to which the</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>National planning policy continues to provide a level of protection for Green Belt.</p> <p>The study itself will not score each of the areas. Each area is assessed on an individual basis.</p>                                 |

| Respondent | Summary of Comments  | Response   |
|------------|--|--|
|            | <p>use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The traffic light system clearly goes against the above point by grading the Green Belt land parcels. Green belt land is not a 'land-bank' for planners and developers to pick off when they desire. This land must be protected, not just for the current generation but for future generations.</p> <p>To keep picking away at the Green Belt undermines its purpose and devalues the remaining Green Belt. Examples of this being the Countess of Chester development and the Chester Zoo proposals. More emphasis should be placed on the derelict land already available within Chester that is not currently being developed. There are plenty of example of this, a number of which are on St. Martins Way.</p> <p>The purposes of Green Belt policy and the related development control policies set out in 1955 remain valid today with remarkably little alteration.</p> <p>I see no reason why this does not apply to Chester and that the Green belt should not remain as it is - protected.</p> |  |
| Mr Lee     | Strongly in favour of CPRE views that the Green Belt around Chester should be retained in its current form   | Comments noted   |
| Mr Auty    | <p>Not in essence, against new housing which is needed to house our growing population of youngsters who need a foot on the housing ladder and our genuine immigrants should also feel there is no chance of a decent life in this area , and not be viewed as second class citizens.</p> <p>However! I agree with CPRE sentiments. When I chaired the previous Environmental Forum of Chester City Council ( a group of non aligned politically ) people from all sectors of the city's environmental disciplines, "over the top" plans were always discouraged, UNLESS it was proven that a real case existed for certain plans going ahead.</p>   | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>A report setting out the justification for carrying out a (Chester) Green Belt Study was submitted to the CWAC Local Development Framework Panel on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011.The study will be used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.</p> |

| Respondent          | Summary of Comments  | Response  |
|---------------------|--|---|
|                     | <p>Have all brown field sites been accounted for? Look at the fiasco over Saighton camp. Look at the chaos now at Sainsbury's traffic light system.</p> <p>This is because the planners went over the head of local opinion, to Westminster and were cleared for the houses at the Saighton camp and the traffic system to cope with the increase aforementioned. Will the same thing happen now and the wishes of Chester people be ignored?</p>  |   |
| Mrs D Williams      | <p>We have a unique historical city in a beautiful setting attracting visitors from across the globe please preserve Chester's charm;</p> <p>Fields are a fitting framework to the city;</p> <p>We have empty houses locally;</p> <p>Make Brownfield sites priority</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as use of brownfield land will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |
| Mr and Mrs Aldridge | <p>Resident of Westminster Park with concerns over views, wildlife and infrastructure, particularly traffic and schools if Green Belt is developed.</p>  | <p>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preserving the setting and special character of historic towns are identified as purposes of the Green Belt in the Framework.</p>   |
| Patricia Delany     | <p>We believe that the Green Belt around Chester should be retained to prevent :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chester merging with the surrounding villages and smaller settlements.</li> <li>2. The built up part of Chester and Ellesmere Port becoming one.</li> <li>3. The compact City of Chester becoming an urban sprawl uncharacteristic of the area.</li> </ol> <p>The definition of the detailed boundary of the Green Belt around Chester outlined in the Greater Chester Local Plan in 1983 should be upheld. The council should consider brownfield sites in preference to areas of Green Belt.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>   |
| Jennifer            | I strongly oppose ALL building on the existing "green field" sites, & I  | Comments noted  |

| Respondent     | Summary of Comments   | Response  |
|----------------|---|---|
| Agnew          | would give them ALL a GREEN mark.   |   |
| Mr P Over      | <p>The Green Belt around Chester is comprised mainly of very valuable agricultural land and has protected the surrounding countryside and villages from urban sprawl very effectively; This study will encourage landowners and developers to believe that the Council is open to pressure to grant planning permissions for sites in the green belt rather than using Brownfield sites;</p> <p>The study indicates that Chester and its surround will provide the land for the majority of the housing development required. No mention is made of other areas in the county; Under the traffic lights system all the areas in the study will be open to some development; Such development can only lead to increase traffic.</p> | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as use of brownfield land will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>   |
| Mr H Williams  | <p>Chester like York is a special city;</p> <p>There would be a bumper increase in traffic in and around Chester</p> <p>Green Belt fields are full of flora and fauna;</p> <p>Soil unique with salt and minerals content;</p> <p>There are many unsold properties on the market which would be cheaper;</p> <p>Pleasant approaches to the city should be cherished;</p> <p>Don't let Chester become a big city</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The study does not seek to de-allocate Green Belt land and any amendments to the Green Belt should be dealt with through the Local Plan.</p>   |
| Mrs B Shepherd | <p>Work and emphasis should be put into finding and using Brownfield sites;</p> <p>Why do you appear to be ready to swamp the immediate area around Chester so much? It will ruin the city;</p> <p>Council has a duty to look after residents interest and to keep a worthwhile area for future generations;</p> <p>Developers are waiting in the wings to pounce and make money, leave the Green Belt alone.</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The study does not seek to de-allocate Green Belt land and any amendments to the Green Belt should be dealt with through the Local Plan.</p> <p>Issues such as use of brownfield land will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |

| Respondent              | Summary of Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Mrs D Clift             | <p>Wish to object to removal of areas which are vital to the prevention of the merging of villages and the narrow open space between Ellesmere Port and Chester;</p> <p>Green Belt of great importance to the definition of the character of Chester and surrounding areas</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>The study does not seek to de-allocate Green Belt land and any amendments to the Green Belt should be dealt with through the Local Plan.</p> <p>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of urban areas and neighbouring settlements</p>   |
| Waverton Parish Council | <p>Why is the study been limited to the area around Chester? Why isn't the whole of CWAC been considered to provide housing?</p> <p>Chester is a unique city that needs protection from urban sprawl;</p> <p>Chester cannot cope with the volume of traffic going into the centre and further development around the city will only add to the problem;</p> <p>The open countryside around Chester is a unique aspect;</p> <p>If development is allowed in the Green Belt the character of the individual villages will be lost. Distinct communities will merge and lose their identity which encourages cohesion in communities;</p> <p>Also risk that Chester will merge with Ellesmere Port;</p> <p>Character of historic Chester and its rural setting have been recognised by Secretary of State as important.</p> | <p>A report setting out the justification for carrying out a (Chester) Green Belt Study was submitted to the CWAC Local Development Framework Panel on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011. The study will be used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan</p> <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Issues such as traffic and transport will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p> |

| Respondent        | Summary of Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Ms R Pickering    | <p>Chester is recognised as an historic city and having green belt keeps the city compact and prevents urban sprawl surrounding it which would greatly detract from the present attraction of the city and its surroundings;</p> <p>There appear to be some places in the City which you could develop sympathetically but Ellesmere Port and Winsford have space for development without destroying Chester's green belt</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>A report setting out the justification for carrying out a (Chester) Green Belt Study was submitted to the CWAC Local Development Framework Panel on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011. The study will be used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.</p> |
| Mr and Mrs Bansal | <p>Feel very strongly in the unique community identities of the Chester villages which the green belt contributes to by providing special open rural spaces, walking and cycling opportunities and safe areas for children to explore away from traffic;</p> <p>We agree and support providing affordable housing in urban areas where regeneration and renewal are key to keep the city fresh and vibrant and prosperous;</p>  | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p> <p>Green spaces are assessed as an opportunity for the purposes of this study as they can provide areas for recreation as well as having landscape and/or agricultural value.</p>   |
| J Cavendish       | <p>There is a need to retain Chester's totality. I do not want urban sprawl We must preserve the countryside setting and not allow housing estates to blossom in the green belt</p>   | <p>This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.</p>   |
| Mr and Mrs Gresty | <p>Wish to give council their support (despite receiving CPRE letter); As farmers appreciate value of green belt but change can be a good thing. The GCLP needs revision as enormous change has occurred in last 29 years;</p> <p>New homes around the outskirts of the city will contribute much to the local economy in these difficult times and an influx of people in to our village will enhance the activities and facilities within it;</p> <p>Local residents who complain about the possibility of new homes coming to this area must appreciate that their homes were built on Green Belt land and it is very selfish to deny others the opportunity</p> | <p>Issues such as new housing will be dealt with through the emerging Local Plan in the context of the overall strategy.</p>  |

Cheshire West and Chester Green Belt Study (Stage One) – Consultation Comments

| Respondent  | Summary of Comments   | Response  |
|-------------|---|---|
|             | of living in the countryside;<br>Commuters using country lanes as a cut through is a much bigger problem  |   |
| H Knowles   | Total support for CPRE;<br>It's (Chester's) environment allows one to enjoy the countryside, pursue outdoor activities. Many visitors would endorse this statement and vouch for its special location. In your further studies and conclusions reached please advise/publish details of the Green Belt areas surrounding Chester and restrictions imposed on any area permitted for development and use thereof | Comments noted.   |
| Mr JA Flynn | The traffic light system seems to threaten the preservation of the Green Belt;<br>I am particularly concerned that the open space between Chester and Ellesmere Port be preserved;<br>If we use much more of that space (open countryside) both communities will suffer   | This study is based on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and does not make any assessment of development potential.<br><br>Maintaining separation between urban areas is a purpose of the Green Belt to prevent coalescence of neighbouring settlements. |