

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held

Thursday 9th July, 2026 at 7:30p.m.

at The Hub, Elmstead Road, Chelford.

Present Councillors C. Montaldo (Chairman), B. Brindley, C. Howlett, S. Mort, D. Wilson.
Members of the public (0).

Dr. E. M. Maddock – Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer.

1. Apologies for absence

Cllr. J. Fielding – Personal reason

Cllr. T. McCrum – Personal reason

Cllr. S. Wilson – Personal reason

Cllr. E. Michell – Personal reason

250/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive the apologies for absence.
(b) That the reason for absence provided by Cllr. E. Michell be formally approved and accepted in accordance with Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. (All in favour)

Councillor M. Shepherd was absent from the meeting.

2. Declarations of interest

Councillor C. Montaldo – Item 9(d) – Involved with suggestion of project.

Councillor D. Wilson – Item 7(b)(ii) – Governor at Chelford Primary School.

251/26 RESOLVED (a) To note the declarations of interest. (All in favour)

3. Public forum for questions

(a) **Questions from residents:** A Member reported that queries had been received relating to Chelford Parish Hall.

252/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note that queries had been raised and to consider further at the next meeting. (All in favour)

(b) **Issues raised via social media:** It was reported that residents had raised concerns about recent irregular and inconsistent refuse collections across the parish.

253/26 RESOLVED (a) That the Clerk seek clarification from Cheshire East Council regarding current refuse collection issues. (All in favour)

4. Cheshire East Ward Member Cllr. A. Harrison: report on matters of interest: Borough Councillor A. Harrison was not present at the meeting to report.

254/26 RESOLVED (a) To note that Borough Councillor A. Harrison was not present at the meeting. (All in favour)

5. Minutes

(a) The minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held 11th June, 2026 had been previously circulated to all Members.

255/26 RESOLVED (a) That the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held 11th June, 2026 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. (All in favour)

(b) The minutes of the Joint Parish Council meeting held 1st July, 2026 had been previously circulated to all Members.

256/26 RESOLVED (a) That the minutes of the Joint Parish Council Meeting held 1st July, 2026 be confirmed as a correct record. (All in favour)

6. Finance

(a) **Financial Statement 2026/27 as at 9th July, 2026:** Members considered the financial statement 2026/27 which was unanimously accepted. (Appendix A)

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

(b) **Receipts:** The Chairman outlined the receipts listed at Appendix B.

(c) **Payments:** The Chairman outlined the payments for approval listed at Appendix C.

257/26 RESOLVED (a) That the Statement of Account as at 9th July, 2026 be received and the Chairman's observations duly noted (Appendix A)
(b) That the report on receipts since the last meeting be received and duly noted. (Appendix B)
(c) That the payments listed at Appendix C be approved. (All in favour)

(d) **Invoice for fencing works:** It was reported that the letter and cheque had been issued to the contractor.

258/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive the update. (All in favour)

7. Planning Matters

(a) **Recent planning decisions:** Members noted new planning decisions that had been issued by Cheshire East Council in respect of development within the Parish since the last meeting. (Appendix D)

259/26 RESOLVED (a) To note the new planning decisions. (All in favour)

(b) **Planning applications for consideration:**

- i. 26/2010/OUT: Land at Mere Hills Farm, Chelford Road and Pepper Street. Outline planning application for residential development, including self-build plots; Use Class E commercial area including provision of a new GP Surgery; change of use of the existing barn to Class E(g)(iii); access off Chelford Road/A537; landscaping; drainage including SuDs; and public open space. All matters reserved except for access.

260/26 RESOLVED (a) That the comments at Appendix E be submitted to Cheshire East Council in respect of application 26/2010/OUT. (All in favour)

- ii. Planning applications received since the issue of the agenda:
 - 26/1928/CLPUD: Chelford C of E Primary School, Oak Road, Chelford. SK11 9AY
Certificate of lawful proposed development of a canopy at the front of the school.

261/26 RESOLVED (a) That no comments be submitted to Cheshire East Council in respect of application 26/1928/CLPUD. (All in favour)

8. Chelford Activity Park

(a) **Issues identified during routine inspections:** It was reported that there had been issues, yet again, with the tennis net. Disappointment was expressed that there appears to be a small number of individuals who are abusing the equipment.

262/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the report. (All in favour)

(b) **Maintenance tasks:** It was reported that a meeting had taken place with the contractor to review progress with the list of maintenance tasks. Some had been completed, however, others would be addressed over the coming weeks.

263/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

(c) **Broken fencing rail:** It was reported that quotations had been sought for the replacement of a broken fencing rail to the rear of the activity park site. Three contractors had been approached, two had provided quotations and the third indicated that they did not have current capacity to undertake the work.

264/26 RESOLVED (a) That the quotation, in the sum of £100, from Home Assist be accepted. (All in favour)

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

- (d) **Gym and trim trail equipment:** It was reported that the gym and trim trail equipment was currently being installed. Spatial constraints had required equipment locations to be amended from the original masterplan. It was suggested that a launch event may be a good opportunity to raise awareness of the new equipment within the community.

265/26 RESOLVED (a) That Councillors C. Howlett and S. Mort approach the local gym owner to gauge interest in supporting a launch event. (All in favour)

- (e) **Tree management:** It was reported that no further communications had been received from Chelford Parish Hall regarding the trees. Chelford Scouting Group had acknowledged the information.

266/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- (f) **Summer tree inspection:** It was reported that the inspection had been scheduled to take place recently. The outcome of the inspection had not yet been received.

267/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

9. Parish Council projects

(a) Ongoing projects

- i. **New bin at Dixon Drive:** It was reported that the bin had been ordered and delivery was awaited.

268/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- ii. **Picnic tables at Mere Court Park:** It was reported that Cheshire East Council has still not yet made funds available to the open spaces officers to progress the purchase and installation of the picnic tables.

269/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update.

(b) That the Clerk request Borough Councillor A. Harrison to follow up on the reasons for the delay in releasing the funds. (All in favour)

- iii. **Village gateways:** It was reported that a response to the queries raised in respect of the draft gateway design had not yet been received.

270/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- iv. **Christmas tree at Chelford Roundabout:** It was reported that no response had yet been received from Cheshire East Council regarding electricity supply. The electricity supplier was ready to issue the necessary certificates to set up an account. Relevant utilities searches had been completed and tree suppliers had been approached about the proposal.

271/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- v. **Notice board at Chelford Station:** It was reported that Northern Rail had agreed for a board of the same design as that at Highland Drive to be installed at the station.

272/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- vi. **Highway sign cleaning:** It was reported that a start date was still awaited.

273/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- (b) **Traffic calming at Knutsford Road:** It was reported that a poll had been put on the Parish Council website seeking views about traffic calming within the parish. Initial responses had included a range of suggestions. It was noted that accident data indicated there had been 4 'slight' incidents in the centre of the village over the last five years. It was suggested that consideration should be given to speed activated traffic lights as a potential traffic calming option.

274/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the report.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

(b) That the Clerk explore traffic calming options which could be employed at this location. (All in favour)

- (c) **Short term pump track hire:** Members reviewed possible track designs and costs. It was suggested that consultation with residents should take place to determine how to proceed.

275/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the updates.

(b) That the Clerk arrange for information to be made available to the public regarding a possible hire of a pump track. (All in favour)

- (d) **Notice board at The Hub:** It was suggested that a new Parish Council notice board should be installed at The Hub. This would increase access to Parish Council notices and provide a further opportunity for community notices to be displayed and viewed.

276/26 RESOLVED (a) That approval be given to proceed the purchase of a new notice board for installation at The Hub.

(b) To approve the design, price and supplier of the board as the same as that to be installed at Chelford Station (approved June, 2026). (All in favour)

10. Highway Matters

- (a) **Updates on previously reported highway defects:** Members noted updates relating to highway defects as listed at Appendix F. It was noted that the flood on the footway at Knutsford Road had caused pedestrians to walk in the road. Images of the flood would be provided to the Clerk when it next rains.

277/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the updates.

(b) That the Clerk continue to pursue outstanding highway issues. (All in favour)

- (b) **New highway defects:** It was reported that the street sign at Hitchlowes was damaged. It was also reported that the highway surfaces of Drumblefield, Barncroft Close, Hitchlowes and Broomfield Close were deteriorating.

278/26 RESOLVED (a) That the Clerk report the above issues to Cheshire East Council for attention. (All in favour)

- (c) **Road closure notice:** Members noted the following road closure notice:

- i. Holmes Chapel Road (from Chelford Roundabout to Manor Lane, Holmes Chapel) - 27th - 29th July, 2026 for road marking fur surface dressing 09:30 – 14:30, 18:00 – 23:00. These works are highly dependent on weather conditions and temperatures, meaning they may change at short notice.

279/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the road closure. (All in favour)

11. Community Matters

- (a) **Chelford Ward Policing Team:** It was reported that the latest police update had not identified any incidents within the parish. It was noted that a local Parish had raised a query to the Police and Crime Commissioner about the scope of the reports which did not appear to reflect local knowledge of incidents.

280/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update

(b) That Chelford Parish Council support the representations made by a local Parish to the Police and Crime Commissioner. (All in favour)

- (b) **Community Speed Watch:** It was reported that no activities had taken place over the last few weeks. There are plans for activities to resume next week.

281/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

- (c) **Speed Indicator Device data:** Members noted the speed indicator device data at Appendix G.

282/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- (d) **Broadband upgrades:** It was reported issues relating to current works by Openreach had been raised with Cheshire East Council. Cheshire East Council was under the impression that Openreach had consulted with residents prior to works commencing. Digital Cheshire were unaware of the works taking place at present as they were expecting the project to commence in the autumn. Members noted that the contractors were working across the estate at pace, however, had reservations as whether the re-tarmacked areas were adequately sealed to prevent potholes developing.

283/26 RESOLVED (a) That the Clerk continue to follow up on issues relating to the works. (All in favour)

- (e) **Handrail along pathway to southbound platform:** It was reported that no updates had been received.

284/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- (f) **Mere Court Park: Tree safety:** It was reported that Cheshire East Council had confirmed that the trees had been subject to routine inspections and maintenance work where necessary.

285/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

12. Correspondence

- (a) To consider specific correspondence received by the Parish Council since the date of the last ordinary meeting and determine such actions as Members consider appropriate thereto:
- i. ChALC: Invitation to submit motions for debate at the Annual Meeting.

286/26 RESOLVED (a) That no motions be submitted to ChALC for consideration at the Annual Meeting. (All in favour)

- ii. Cheshire East Council: Changes to Flexilink services.

287/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the information. (All in favour)

- iii. Cheshire East Council: Weekly food waste collections update.

288/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the information. (All in favour)

- iv. Cheshire East Council: Housing Allocations Policy consultation.

289/26 RESOLVED (a) That no comments be submitted to the consultation. (All in favour)

13. Meetings of external organisations

- (a) **Cheshire East Town and Parish Council Network meeting (16/06/26):** It was reported that the meeting had focussed on asset transfer to Town and Parish Councils as part of cost saving measures being pursued by Cheshire East Council.

290/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the report. (All in favour)

- (b) **Cheshire East Local Service Delivery Task and Finish Group**

- i. **Meetings held 08/06/26 and 29/06/26:** It was reported that the asset transfer project outlined at the Cheshire East Town and Parish Council Network meeting held 16th June, 2026 was the outcome of work being carried out by the Task and Finish Group. This group is looking at how to progress the scheme in a timely manner and how to ensure that all Town and Parish Councils participating in the scheme receive access to a consistent and fair process.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

291/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the report. (All in favour)

- ii. **Appointment to Cheshire East Local Service Delivery Task and Finish Group:** It was reported that the Clerk had been invited to be a member of the Task and Finish Group. This follows participation in a ChALC focus group looking at ways to improve communications with Cheshire East Council.

292/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update.

(b) To approve the appointment of the Clerk to the Cheshire East Local Service and Delivery Task and Finish Group.

(c) That the appointment of the Clerk to this group be approved as a progression of the Clerk's 2026 target to participate in the ChALC focus group. (All in favour)

- (c) **Manchester Airport Town and Parish Council Forum (24/06/26):** It was reported that the number of passengers using the airport was growing each year. There were 31.5 million passengers in 2025 and projections suggest numbers to grow to 50 million by 2048. The number of destinations and carriers available at Manchester Airport continues to grow. The final stages of the ManTP project are currently being delivered with increased retail units and the re-use of the former terminal 1 building to accommodate expansion of terminal 3. Rail travel to the airport is being reviewed with a view to increasing connections to Liverpool, Birmingham and via Northern Powerhouse Rail. The airspace review has not progressed over recent months, however, it is expected that more information will be available in late 2026 / early 2027 on this project.

293/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the update. (All in favour)

- (d) **Cheshire and Warrington Combined Authority: Town and Parish Councils meeting (01/07/26)**

294/26 RESOLVED (a) To note that the meeting had been cancelled. (All in favour)

14. Matters for inclusion on next/future meeting agenda

- (a) Proposed upgrades to the bike track.
(b) Chelford Parish Hall.

15. Date of next meeting: Thursday 13th August, 2026 at 7:30p.m. at The Hub.

16. Exclusion of public and press

295/26 RESOLVED (a) That a resolution to exclude the public and press from the following item of business be made on the grounds that it could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information. (All in favour)

- (a) Matters for consideration including those transferred from above items
i. Matters relating to asset management.

296/26 RESOLVED (a) To receive and note the verbal reports from the Clerk.

(b) To give approval for the Clerk to proceed with the actions required to progress the work.

(c) That costs associated with the actions at (b), expected to be in the region of £2,500, be approved. (All in favour)

The meeting was declared closed by the Chairman at 10:00p.m.

Signed:.....

Approval date: 13th August, 2026

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Appendix A: Financial Statements

Financial Statement – 2026/27 as at 9 th July 2026					
Actual 2025/26 £	Details	2026/27 Budget £	Actual to Jun. 26 £	Agenda Jul. 26 £	Budget Balance £
	Receipts				
53,587.00	Precept	54,415.00	27,207.50		27,207.50
0.00	Balances		0.00		0.00
3,169.55	Investment interest		276.25	29.99	0.00
0.00	Sale of assets		0.00		0.00
0.00	Grants, donations & refunds		0.00		0.00
100.00	Newsletter		0.00		0.00
0.00	Unpresented cheque		0.00		0.00
4,265.44	VAT refund		4,087.11		585.00
61,121.99	Total receipts	54,415.00	31,570.86	29.99	27,792.50
	Payments				
17,643.60	Salary (Clerk)	18,942.00	4,520.88	1,506.96	12,914.16
1,951.45	National Insurance (Employer)	2,018.00	504.36	168.12	1,345.52
3,793.34	Pension contributions (Employer)	3,888.00	926.79	308.93	2,652.28
1,005.47	Allowances (Clerk)	1,006.00	227.11	81.13	697.76
300.93	Administration	325.00	0.00		325.00
0.00	Chairman/Member allowances	0.00	0.00		0.00
593.00	Audit fees (internal & external)	710.00	311.00		399.00
1,091.52	Insurance	1,000.00	0.00		1,000.00
1,158.22	Donations (inc. s.137)	370.00	0.00		370.00
150.00	Grants	3,000.00	0.00	200.00	2,800.00
121.98	Website	146.00	25.50	5.00	115.50
1,255.00	Professional services	2,171.00	0.00		2,171.00
0.00	Advertising	100.00	0.00		100.00
716.66	Subscriptions/affiliation fees	729.00	577.60		151.40
335.00	Room hire	440.00	385.00		55.00
172.00	Training	550.00	0.00	50.00	500.00
10,078.01	Chelford Activity Park maintenance	9,700.00	1,286.07	1,156.00	7,257.93
4,059.52	Parish and asset maintenance	8,320.00	1,224.61	82.12	7,013.27
100.00	Contingency	1,000.00	0.00		1,000.00
5,500.00	Assets – purchase (2025/26)	0.00	0.00		0.00
122.45	Newsletter (2025/26)	0.00	0.00		0.00
4,087.11	VAT		339.22	245.78	-585.00
54,235.26	Total payments	54,415.00	10,328.14	3,804.04	40,282.82

Cash/Bank reconciliation	01/04/26	11/06/26	09/07/26	31/03/27
Balance B/Fwd	139,479.26	139,479.26	160,721.98	156,947.93
Add total receipts	54,415.00	31,570.86	29.99	27,792.50
Less total payments	54,415.00	10,328.14	3,804.04	40,282.82
Balance C/Fwd	139,479.26	160,721.98	156,947.93	144,457.61
Cumulative balances	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance
	01/04/26	11/06/26	09/07/26	31/03/27
General funds	34,022.74	56,385.46	53,246.41	40,756.09
Earmarked reserves	105,456.52	104,336.52	103,701.52	103,701.52
	139,479.26	160,721.98	156,947.93	144,457.61

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Cash/Bank Reconciliation as at 9th July, 2026

Cash

Balance brought forward 01/04/26	
Current Account	297.89
Business Reserve Account	10,393.05
Liquidity Manager Account (35)	31,939.51
Liquidity Manager Account (95)	15,248.58
Skipton Building Society	81,600.23
	<u>139,479.26</u>
Plus receipts	31,600.85
Less payments	<u>14,132.18</u>
Balance carried forward 09/07/26	<u>156,947.93</u>

Bank (NatWest)

Current Account	26,067.48	05/06/26
Add receipts/transfer since above statement		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
Less unrepresented cheques		
2025/26	-40.00	
2026/27	-4,763.12	
For approval	<u>-3,804.04</u>	
	-8,607.16	
	17,460.32	09/07/26

Business Reserve Account	10,533.74	02/04/26
Add receipts/transfer since above statement		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
Less unrepresented cheques		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
	10,533.74	09/07/26

Liquidity Manager Account (35 day)	32,041.82	05/06/26
Add receipts/transfer since above statement		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
Less unrepresented cheques		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
	32,041.82	09/07/26

Liquidity Manager Account (95 day)	15,311.82	15/06/26
Add receipts/transfer since above statement		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
Less unrepresented cheques		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
	15,311.82	09/07/26

Skipton Building Society Community Saver Account	81,600.23	01/04/26
Add receipts/transfer since above statement		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
Less unrepresented cheques		
	<u>0.00</u>	
	0.00	
	81,600.23	09/07/26

Total bank balances 09/07/26 156,947.93

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Appendix B: Receipts

NatWest Bank plc	£29.99	Gross interest – May 26 (LM95)
------------------	--------	--------------------------------

Appendix C: Payments for approval

Cheque No 001740	JRB Enterprise Ltd	£75.78	Dog gloves [A]
Cheque No 001741	Chelford Social Committee	£200.00	Grant towards Summer Fete [B]
Cheque No 001742	Cheque cancelled		
Cheque No 001743	Northwich Town Council	£234.00	Fencing work [C]
Cheque No 001744	E. M. Maddock	£1,348.63	Salary and allowances: Jul.26 [D]
Direct Debit	HM Revenue and Customs	£324.70	PAYE payments [E]
Standing Order	Cheshire Pension Fund	£391.81	Pension contributions: Jul.26 [F]
Cheque No 001745	Cheshire Association of Local Councils	£50.00	Training fees (25/03/26) [G]
Cheque No 001746	Northwich Town Council	£655.20	Ground maintenance: May 26 [C]
Cheque No 001746	Northwich Town Council	£498.00	Replacement signage [C]
Direct Debit	IONOS Cloud Ltd.	£6.00	Web hosting: Jun.-Jul. 26 [H]
Direct Debit	npower	£19.92	Electricity charges: Apr.-Jun.26 [I]

[A] Local Government and Ratings Act 1997 s.31

[B] Local Government Act 1972 s.145

[C] Public Health Act 1875 s.164, Local Government Act 1972 Sch.14 para.27

[D] Local Government Act 1972 s.112; Local Government Act 1972 s.111

[E] The Income Tax (Pay As You Earn) Regulations 2003 s.67G

[F] Pension Act 2008 s.3

[G] Local Government Act 1972 s.111

[H] Local Government Act 1972 s.142

[I] Parish Councils Act 1957 s.3

Appendix D: Planning updates

Recent planning decisions:

25/3036/PIP	Land south of Chelford Road, Chelford. SK10 4TA Permission in principle for three to four dwellings. Decision: Refused (08/06/26)
-------------	---

Outstanding planning applications

25/4503/CLEUD	Holly Tree House, Pepper Street, Chelford. SK11 9BE Certificate of existing lawful use for the confirmation of the existing garden as residential garden land.
26/1833/HOUS	Heath Wood, Pepper Street, Chelford. SK11 9BE Single storey extension to side of domestic garage.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Appendix E: Chelford Parish Council response to planning application 26/2010/OUT

Objection to application 26/2010/OUT

Mere Hills Farm, Pepper Street / Chelford Road (A537), Marthall

Outline planning application for residential development, including self-build plots; Use Class E commercial area including provision of a new GP Surgery; change of use of the existing barn to Class E(g)(iii); access off Chelford Road/A537; landscaping; drainage including SuDs; and public open space. All matters reserved except for access.

Brief Overview

This response objects to the proposed outline planning application for approximately 150 dwellings, self-build plots, commercial development, a proposed GP surgery site, associated infrastructure and public open space at Mere Hills Farm.

The proposal represents a substantial urban extension into open Green Belt countryside and would fundamentally alter the rural character of Marthall whilst eroding the important physical separation between Marthall and Chelford.

Although the applicant seeks to justify the proposal through Cheshire East's housing land supply position and by presenting a range of claimed public benefits, these arguments are neither new nor compelling. Cheshire East Council has previously refused a substantial Green Belt development on the nearby site at Holly Tree House on the grounds of inappropriate Green Belt development, loss of openness, encroachment, unsustainable location and ecological harm and the present proposal raises many of the same planning issues.

The application fails to demonstrate compliance with national planning policy, Cheshire East Local Plan policies and established Green Belt principles. The cumulative planning harm significantly outweighs the uncertain and largely speculative benefits relied upon by the applicant.

1. Green Belt Policy

The proposal must be assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly Paragraph 143 and the subsequent Green Belt policies, together with Cheshire East Local Plan Policy PG3.

The essential characteristics of Green Belt are openness and permanence. Development within the Green Belt should only be permitted where it fully complies with national policy.

The applicant relies heavily upon Cheshire East's housing land supply position. However, a borough wide housing shortage does not automatically justify development within the Green Belt.

The proposal would introduce approximately 150 dwellings, commercial uses, roads, parking, lighting, drainage infrastructure and associated urban development onto presently open countryside.

The proposal results in clear harm to the Green Belt through loss of openness, encroachment into the countryside and erosion of the important gap between Chelford and Marthall. Paragraph 144 of the NPPF requires substantial weight to be given to that harm. When considered alongside the identified impacts on infrastructure, highway safety, pedestrian safety and local services, the applicant has failed to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances capable of clearly outweighing that harm. The resulting loss of openness would be permanent.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

In addition to this the proposed development comprises substantial new built development within the Green Belt and does not fall within any of the recognised exceptions to inappropriate development identified in paragraph 145 of the NPPF. The applicant's reliance on Grey Belt policy is not supported by the evidence, as the site continues to perform important Green Belt functions, including maintaining openness, preventing encroachment into the countryside and preserving the separation between neighbouring settlements.

The adopted Cheshire East SADPD reinforces the Development Plan's objective of protecting the Green Belt and ensuring development is directed towards sustainable and appropriate locations. The proposal would result in substantial encroachment into open countryside and conflict with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan.

The development is inappropriate in principle, causes Green Belt harm to which substantial weight must be given, and the applicant has not demonstrated sufficient planning benefits to overcome that presumption.

2. Failure to Demonstrate Genuine Grey Belt Status

The applicant appears to rely upon the site being capable of classification as Grey Belt.

However, the site remains open agricultural land which is still being used.

The application has not demonstrated that the land has ceased to fulfil Green Belt purposes.

The site continues to-

- preserve openness
- safeguard countryside from encroachment
- maintain separation between settlements
- contribute significantly to the rural landscape.

The site remains open agricultural land that continues to perform Green Belt functions including maintaining openness, preserving countryside character and preventing settlement coalescence. The proposal therefore conflicts with the SADPD's objectives for countryside protection.

Until the applicant provides robust evidence to demonstrate otherwise, the land should continue to be regarded as functioning Green Belt. In addition to this, the applicant's own house which was built a few years ago was only approved on the grounds that barn on the current development site was demolished to enhance open space.

3. Consistency in Planning Decision Making

A highly significant material consideration is Cheshire East Council's refusal of planning application 20/4976M relating to the nearby Green Belt site at Holly Tree House.

That proposal was refused because it represented -

- inappropriate Green Belt development
- loss of openness
- encroachment into the countryside
- development outside the settlement boundary

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

- an unsustainable location
- unacceptable ecological impacts.

Those same characteristics continue to apply to the current application.

Whilst each planning application must be considered on its own merits, consistency in planning decision making is an important principle. The Council must clearly explain why one Green Belt site should be refused while another nearby site with substantially similar characteristics should now be considered acceptable.

The nearby Holly Tree House application was refused for reasons including conflict with the Development Plan. The Council must clearly explain why a materially similar proposal on nearby Green Belt land should now be considered acceptable.

Along these lines, other planning applications that have also been refused due to the green belt argument include –

- Welsh Row, Nether Alderley where the refusal was based heavily on paragraphs 142, 143, 154c) of the NPPF, 153 and it conflicted with Policy PG3 and SADPD Policy RUR11– ultimately there were no special circumstances to justify the proposal which outweighed the Green Belt policy and substantial weight should be given to Green Belt harm. If this applies to one house then surely it should apply to a development for 150 homes.
- Land At Prestbury Road, Macclesfield where the application was refused due to the land not being sufficiently classed as grey belt and again there were no very special circumstances which exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.
- Coppice Road, Poynton where the application was refused as it did not meet grey belt requirements and there was concern over the land sprawling and ultimately, it went against Green Belt policy.

Cheshire East Council has consistently recognised the importance of protecting Green Belt land from inappropriate development. Recent decisions within the Borough have confirmed that substantial weight should be afforded to Green Belt harm, loss of openness, countryside encroachment and settlement coalescence. Planning permission has been refused for developments where the claimed public benefits were insufficient to outweigh Green Belt harm, including proposals for significant residential development.

The current application raises many of the same concerns identified in previous refusals, including loss of openness, encroachment into the countryside, pressure on infrastructure, sustainability concerns and the erosion of separation between settlements. The Council should therefore apply policy consistently unless it can clearly identify material planning circumstances that justify a different conclusion.

4. Harm to Settlement Separation

One of the principal purposes of Green Belt policy is to prevent neighbouring settlements merging into one another which also the SADPD seeks to maintain.

This proposal would substantially reduce the open countryside separating Marthall and Chelford.

The gradual coalescence of the two communities would permanently erode their separate identities and fundamentally alter the rural landscape. This harm should be afforded significant weight.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

5. Misrepresentation of the Site

Throughout the submitted documents the applicant repeatedly refers to the development as being located within Chelford.

In reality, the application site lies within the Parish of Ollerton with Marthall. This distinction is important especially as Marthall is also moving wards to come under Mobberley in 2027 and this development will double their population.

The applicant relies heavily upon Chelford's facilities, including the railway station, village services and medical facilities, to justify the sustainability of the proposal. It would appear the application is trying to utilise the 'Transit-oriented development' notion where there is a mix of housing and mixed-use developments in a well connected site. Again, the Council need to ensure they are referring to the actual location of the site which is in fact Marthall, not Chelford, and considerations also need to be made in terms of that there is no need in Chelford, Marthall or the surrounding area for mixed-use developments as there are already units and locations that are lying empty in these villages. Again, there is no demand or need for these.

The development should instead be assessed according to its true location and the actual accessibility of services from the site, rather than relying upon an association with neighbouring Chelford and Cheshire East Council need to consider and refer to Ollerton with Marthall's neighbourhood plan, especially as this is a heavy greenbelt area. The application should not state anywhere that it is within Chelford and we believe this has been done for strategic reasons. We understand the close proximity to Chelford, however, this does not take away from the point that the proposed development is in Marthall.

6. Housing Need

The applicant relies almost entirely upon boroughwide housing need.

However, the application provides little evidence demonstrating the actual housing requirements of Marthall or Chelford which is also a consideration under the SADPD. The proposed development appears to consist largely of larger detached dwellings together with self build plots.

This raises important questions regarding whether the proposal genuinely addresses -

- affordable housing need
- first time buyers
- younger households
- downsizers
- local people wishing to remain within the parish.

While the proposed development indicates that 49% of the housing would be classified as affordable, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the type, tenure and affordability of the homes proposed would meet an identified local housing need. Previous developments in the area have shown that housing described as 'affordable' does not necessarily translate into housing that is genuinely affordable to local people, particularly younger residents and families who wish to remain close to where they grew up and to their existing family and community support networks.

The concern is therefore not with the principle of providing affordable housing, but whether the proposed development would actually deliver homes that meet the needs and financial circumstances of the local community. Simply allocating a significant percentage of a

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

development as 'affordable housing' should not, in itself, be regarded as evidence that the development responds to local housing need.

Government housing policy seeks to deliver the right homes in the right places. Accordingly, greater weight should be placed on whether there is a demonstrable local need for the particular mix, tenure and affordability levels proposed, and whether those homes would genuinely be accessible to the people whose housing needs the development purports to address.

The proposed housing mix appears far more likely to deliver executive housing than homes addressing identified local need. As it stands, Chelford and the actual location of the development, Marthall, do not have a housing need and many houses are not selling in these villages and are on the market for some time. There have also been examples within Ollerton with Marthall where social housing providers will not take up potential affordable homes into their portfolio and there are examples of failure of the cascade allocation scheme for affordable homes in both Chelford and Ollerton with Marthall parishes.

7. Claimed Public Benefits

The application places significant reliance upon the proposed GP surgery.

However, there appears to be no evidence that the surgery itself will actually be delivered. The application currently identifies only land capable of accommodating a future surgery.

No evidence has been provided confirming -

- NHS funding
- an approved healthcare operator
- Integrated Care Board support
- contractual commitments
- delivery timetable
- planning obligation requiring construction.

Accordingly, only limited weight should be attached to this claimed public benefit as there is no guarantee it will be delivered. NHS policy also needs to be considered in this context.

The applicant refers to discussions with Chelford Primary School and the Pre-School regarding potential provision within the proposed development. However, the Headteacher and Board of Governors of Chelford Primary School have confirmed that neither they nor the School have had any communication with the applicant or its agents regarding such a proposal. The Pre-School is a separate independent charity which simply hires part of the School premises and has no authority to speak on behalf of Chelford Primary School or determine its future accommodation. Any decisions concerning the School and its future provision would ultimately involve Cheshire East Council together with the Headteacher and Governors.

Furthermore, the Pre-School has recently made a significant investment in its existing facilities at Chelford Primary School, with the agreement of the School and Cheshire East Council, using Section 106 funding. Against this background, the suggestion that a new pre-school could form part of the proposed development appears entirely speculative. As with the proposed GP surgery, no evidence has been provided identifying who would fund, construct, occupy or operate such a facility, nor is there any commitment or delivery mechanism securing its provision.

Of greater concern is that the Headteacher and Governors have identified existing pressure on

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

accommodation at Chelford Primary School and consider that further housing development in Chelford and the immediate surrounding area will add to that pressure. This is particularly relevant given the cumulative impact of other committed and proposed housing developments and should be properly assessed by Cheshire East Council when considering education capacity.

In these circumstances, there is serious concern that conversations with an independent Pre-School have been deliberately manipulated and presented in a manner which gives the misleading impression that Chelford Primary School itself has been consulted or is supportive of the proposal, when the Headteacher and Governors expressly confirm that no such communication has taken place. The reference to potential pre-school provision is similarly speculative and unsupported by any evidence of funding, delivery or commitment. These statements therefore present a materially misleading picture of both community engagement and the purported benefits of the development and should be afforded no weight by the Local Planning Authority.

Similarly, the applicant highlights new footpaths and public open space as community benefits. Existing public rights of way already serve this area, and such features cannot outweigh the permanent loss of Green Belt or be relied upon to justify inappropriate development.

8. Existing Infrastructure

Available evidence indicates that local infrastructure is already under considerable pressure.

In particular -

- Chelford Primary School is understood to be operating at or near capacity At a recent planning submission in Chelford, Cheshire East Education (School Organisation and Capital Strategy) made the following statement:

‘Therefore, it is likely no further developments can be accommodated within this locality due to the lack of further expansion options on that school site’

- the existing GP surgery is understood to have limited capacity
- the highway network already experiences congestion and speeding.

The application has not demonstrated that infrastructure improvements will be delivered before occupation of the development and the SADPD requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure. The applicant has not demonstrated that local healthcare, education and community facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand generated by the proposal.

The site is not considered to be ‘well connected’ for transport as it is along a very busy road, the trains are only one an hour and you are not able to safely walk to the nearest town. The A537 is a key route for emergency services and the proposed development will increase traffic which will affect response times.

Furthermore, the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan that have been uploaded seek to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network and represents a sustainable location. However, both documents rely heavily on theoretical modelling, future infrastructure improvements and assumptions regarding changes in travel behaviour, whilst giving insufficient consideration to the practical realities of travelling within Chelford and Marthall.

Although the applicant concludes that the development would generate only a modest increase in vehicle movements and that surrounding junctions would continue to operate within capacity,

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

highway capacity is only one aspect of the planning assessment. The reports place limited emphasis on the existing highway safety concerns experienced by local residents, including significant traffic volumes and speeding along the A537, which are supported by Community Speed Watch activity and Speed Indicator Device (SID) monitoring. The proposals also rely upon new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings and future highway improvements, many of which remain subject to further design and approval, meaning there is no certainty that safe pedestrian routes will be delivered as proposed.

The applicant also overstates the sustainability credentials of the site. The Framework Travel Plan acknowledges that there are no existing footway links connecting the site to destinations outside Chelford village and no cycle routes linking Chelford with neighbouring settlements, yet still concludes that the development will significantly reduce reliance on the private car. This appears unrealistic given that the Travel Plan identifies 86% of existing journeys are currently made by car, whilst seeking to reduce this to 67% without providing convincing evidence that such a significant behavioural change can be achieved in a rural location with limited public transport and active travel opportunities. Instead, the strategy relies largely upon future behavioural initiatives such as travel packs, car-sharing schemes and promotional campaigns rather than established transport infrastructure.

Furthermore, the reports do not adequately address pedestrian safety. Residents will be required to cross the busy A537 to access many local facilities, despite longstanding concerns regarding traffic speeds and the safety of existing uncontrolled crossings, particularly opposite Chelford Farm Supplies. Increased traffic is also likely to use Pepper Street, where there is no continuous footway and pedestrians are often required to share the carriageway with vehicles. The proposed passing place may facilitate additional traffic movements along this narrow rural road, increasing the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. The applicant has not demonstrated that these issues have been fully assessed or that vulnerable road users, including children, elderly residents and those with mobility difficulties, will be able to travel safely. There is also a very popular and important bridle way 'Laureens Ride' that operates through Over Peover/Snelson and Over Peover is a designated riding route.

Taken as a whole, the Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan present an optimistic assessment of the site's accessibility and transport impacts. They rely upon future infrastructure, future monitoring and aspirational behavioural change rather than the existing characteristics of the local transport network. In these circumstances, limited weight should be attached to the applicant's conclusions that the development represents a genuinely sustainable location or that it would have only a minimal impact on highway safety and the surrounding road network.

The proposed development would connect foul drainage from approximately 150 dwellings, together with commercial uses and a proposed GP surgery, into the existing public foul sewer serving Grangewood Drive. Whilst United Utilities has identified this as the preferred point of connection in principle, the submitted documents do not provide detailed evidence of the wider network's capacity to accommodate this additional demand, particularly when considered alongside other committed and proposed developments within Chelford. The Local Planning Authority should therefore be satisfied that sufficient wastewater infrastructure capacity exists before planning permission is granted. On top of this, consideration also needs to be given to the proposed development by David Wilson Homes at the other end of the village and what impact this will also have on the system and the fact there have already been failed schemes in Ollerton where there have been issues with pumps and drainage.

The proposal also raises significant concerns regarding the capacity of local education infrastructure. The development is likely to generate a substantial number of additional primary and secondary school pupils, placing further pressure on Chelford Primary School and surrounding primary and secondary schools, many of which already experience capacity pressures or increasing demand. Whilst the applicant identifies existing educational facilities,

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that adequate school places will be available to accommodate the additional pupils generated by the development.

9. Flood Risk

The applicant's own Flood Risk Assessment acknowledges the existence of localised surface water flooding within parts of the site. Whilst mitigation is proposed, the presence of existing flooding demonstrates that the site already experiences drainage constraints which will require substantial engineering intervention in order to accommodate development.

The application site is understood by local residents to experience regular flooding and has historically been known as "Stockin Moss". The proposed drainage strategy relies upon discharge into the Stockin Moss area, which the applicant acknowledges is a designated Local Wildlife Site. The report repeatedly states that further investigation and approval from the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency will be required. Accordingly, the long term effectiveness and environmental acceptability of the drainage solution has not yet been fully demonstrated.

The Flood Risk Assessment confirms that the Council's Ecologist has required a hydrological assessment to determine whether development would alter water entering the Stockin Moss Local Wildlife Site and whether discharge points would change. This demonstrates that important ecological and hydrological issues remain under consideration and have not yet been conclusively resolved.

Given the increasing frequency of severe weather events, development upon land with known drainage issues requires particularly careful scrutiny. It is important to note that this area contains peat land which is sensitive to hydrological changes.

The applicant has not yet demonstrated with sufficient certainty that the proposed drainage strategy will operate effectively without adverse impacts on Stockin Moss and the surrounding environment. The applicant must demonstrate that the proposed development will not increase flood risk either within the site or elsewhere. It is heavily reported in Over Peover that the surrounding land of the development and along Pepper Street does regularly and heavily flood already meaning there is a high risk to additional flooding in this area.

In terms of the drainage strategy, the application proposes relies heavily upon engineered SuDS infrastructure, including attenuation ponds, swales, flow control chambers, culverts and discharge structures, together with an extensive long-term maintenance regime. The effectiveness of the drainage system is therefore dependent not only upon its initial construction but also upon regular inspection, maintenance and intervention throughout the lifetime of the development. The long-term management, funding and enforceability of these maintenance obligations should be carefully scrutinised before significant weight is attached to the proposed drainage strategy.

Careful consideration needs to be given to the economic viability to deliver sufficient basic infrastructure to support new homes without negatively impacting existing properties.

10. Ecology and Agricultural Land

The nearby Holly Tree House application was refused in part because of unacceptable impacts upon protected species including bats and Great Crested Newts.

The SADPD supports the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and rural landscapes. Given the ecological concerns identified in the refusal of the nearby Holly Tree House proposal, equivalent scrutiny should be applied to this application

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

The application site also comprises open agricultural land that is currently being used and its loss would permanently reduce the extent of open countryside and agricultural land within the Green Belt. It is also believed by local residents that bats had originally be residing in this particular plot when the original barn was removed thereby destroying their habitat.

A very important that needs to be considered is that the local water course in this area are already identified as being some of the most polluted in the North West and this scheme will only make the situation worse.

11. Sustainability

The applicant now presents the site as a sustainable location.

However, previous proposals promoted by the same land interests questioned the sustainability of Chelford, stating that the area lacked sufficient services which therefore is a huge contradiction.

Whilst applicants are entitled to revise proposals, the Council should carefully examine whether the current sustainability case is supported by objective evidence rather than assertion.

The proposal remains outside the settlement boundary, heavily reliant upon private car travel and remote from many everyday services which goes against the SADPD.

The applicant's sustainability case relies heavily upon residents walking to local services in Chelford. However, the SID data and existing Community Speed Watch activity demonstrate that the principal route connecting the site to those facilities is already affected by significant traffic volumes and speeding concerns, calling into question whether walking routes can realistically be regarded as safe and attractive for all users

12. Ollerton with Marthall Neighbourhood Plan

The Ollerton with Marthall Neighbourhood Plan identifies no requirement for development of this scale within the parish and recognises the importance of protecting the area's rural character and Green Belt setting. The proposal conflicts with the locally expressed vision for the parish and should therefore be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process especially as this will nearly double the population of Marthall as it is.

13. Planning Balance

The public benefits relied upon by the applicant remain uncertain and, in several cases, speculative.

Conversely, the planning harm is immediate, permanent and substantial.

The proposal would result in -

- inappropriate Green Belt development
- permanent loss of openness
- encroachment into the countryside
- erosion of separation between Marthall and Chelford
- loss of agricultural land

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

- pressure upon schools and healthcare
- highway safety concerns
- flood risk concerns
- uncertainty regarding delivery of the proposed GP surgery.

When considered collectively, these harms clearly outweigh the limited and uncertain benefits advanced by the applicant.

The proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy Policies PG2, PG3, SD2, SC4, CO1, EG2 and SE3 and the principles underpinning the Ollerton with Marthall Neighbourhood Plan.

14. Pedestrian Safety, Highway Safety and Speeding

The proposed access raises significant highway safety concerns.

The development would generate substantial additional vehicle movements onto the A537 Chelford Road, a busy strategic route which already experiences significant traffic volumes and speeding concerns.

Residents have consistently raised concerns regarding vehicle speeds, congestion and the ability of pedestrians to cross the road safely. These concerns are supported by Community Speed Watch activity and Speed Indicator Device (SID) data collected within Chelford. The monitoring data records traffic volumes exceeding 100,000 vehicles per month at locations along Knutsford Road and demonstrates that a significant proportion of vehicles are travelling above the posted speed limit. Maximum recorded speeds have reached as high as 99mph.

The submitted access plan relies upon a number of uncontrolled pedestrian crossings in close proximity to the proposed access and bus stop locations. Whilst uncontrolled crossings may be suitable in some locations, their use on a busy A-road carrying substantial traffic volumes requires particularly careful scrutiny.

Particular concern arises given the existing uncontrolled crossing opposite Chelford Farm Supplies, where residents have reported ongoing difficulties crossing safely due to traffic speed and traffic volume. The application has not demonstrated why additional uncontrolled crossings associated with a development of approximately 150 dwellings would operate safely in practice.

The proposal would inevitably increase pedestrian movements between the site and local facilities in Chelford including the railway station, school, village centre, bus stops and healthcare facilities. This is likely to include school children, elderly residents, dog walkers and users of public transport. The application has not demonstrated that these pedestrians will be able to cross the A537 safely during peak traffic periods as the current plans are still in the works.

Furthermore, the submitted access plan identifies several key highway features, including crossing points and bus stop infrastructure, as matters to be agreed at a later stage. Given that access is the principal matter being determined as part of this application, insufficient certainty has been provided that safe pedestrian connectivity can be achieved.

The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would provide a safe and suitable access for all users, particularly pedestrians, and fails to adequately address an existing highway environment where speeding and pedestrian safety concerns are already well documented.

A particular concern arises regarding children walking between the development and Chelford Primary School. The increase in pedestrian movements, combined with existing traffic speeds and

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

volumes, has the potential to create additional highway safety risks unless robust and fully deliverable mitigation measures are secured.

The proposal conflicts with the objectives of Cheshire East planning policies which seek to promote safe, attractive and accessible walking routes and reduce reliance upon private vehicles. The current application has not demonstrated that these objectives can be achieved.

The development is also likely to generate increased traffic movements along Pepper Street as residents seek alternative routes, access existing public rights of way and travel between the site and surrounding areas. Pepper Street is a narrow rural road with limited pedestrian infrastructure and, in places, no continuous footway provision. As a consequence, pedestrians, including residents, walkers, children and dog walkers, are often required to share the carriageway with vehicles. Any increase in traffic associated with the development would therefore increase the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, to the detriment of highway safety.

Particular concern arises from the proposed passing place and associated highway alterations on Pepper Street. Whilst intended to facilitate vehicle movements, the passing place may encourage increased vehicle use and higher vehicle speeds along a road that is currently constrained in width and frequently used by pedestrians. The proposal has not adequately assessed the impact of these changes on pedestrian safety, particularly given the absence of continuous footways.

The cumulative impact of increased traffic on both the A537 and Pepper Street has not been adequately assessed by the applicant. Whilst the application considers vehicular access arrangements, insufficient attention has been given to the practical reality of how pedestrians will safely move around the area once the development is occupied.

In addition to this, the location of the proposed site access nearest to Knutsford gives rise to particular concerns regarding pedestrian safety, as it is situated close to the point where the speed limit on the A537 increases from 30mph to 50mph. This transition zone is likely to result in vehicles accelerating as they approach or pass the site access, increasing vehicle speeds at a location where pedestrians will be crossing the road and entering or leaving the development. Higher vehicle speeds reduce driver reaction times and increase stopping distances, creating a greater risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. This is of particular concern given the anticipated increase in pedestrian movements associated with approximately 150 dwellings, including children, elderly residents and those accessing local facilities. The applicant has not adequately demonstrated that pedestrians can use this access safely under real-world traffic conditions

For these reasons, planning permission should be refused.

Matters Requiring Further Examination

Before this application can be properly determined, the Local Planning Authority should require robust evidence addressing -

- Whether the site genuinely meets the definition of Grey Belt.
- Compliance with NPPF Green Belt policy, particularly Paragraph 143 and the subsequent Green Belt provisions.
- Why this application should be treated differently from the previously refused Holly Tree House proposal on nearby Green Belt land.
- The actual housing needs of Marthall and Chelford, rather than borough wide figures.
- The deliverability and funding of the proposed GP surgery.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

- Capacity within local schools and healthcare services.
- Independent highway safety assessment.
- Historic flooding and drainage evidence.
- Agricultural land classification.
- Ecological impacts, particularly in light of the previous refusal on nearby land.
- The cumulative effect of successive Green Belt developments on the separation and identity of Marthall and Chelford.
- Not encouraging ribbon development.

Appendix F: Highway issues updates

1. Mud and water on footway along Knutsford Road (between Parish Hall and roundabout)
Update: Issue reviewed by landowner.
2. Street lights out along Knutsford Road between Chelford Parish Hall and roundabout
Update: "Will be fulfilled by planned works."
Update via Esther McVey MP: "We have just had confirmation they are hoping to have this lighting fixed by the end of June."
3. Pothole on Knutsford Road outside Applewood House
Update: "Will be fulfilled by planned works."
4. Damaged safety railings on railway bridge at Knutsford Road
Update: "We have made the location safe until we can return to carry out further works. Unfortunately, we are unable to provide you with a timescale of the further works."
5. Pothole on Broomfield Close near to junction with Dixon Drive
Update: "The enquiry has been assessed and does not present a risk to highway users at this time."
Update via Esther McVey MP: "Potholes are not considered with regard to the characteristics of the road users, instead it is considered for repair only when it is more than 40mm deep. That is standard for, as far as we are aware, all councils."
6. Potholes on Broomfield Close outside No. 2
Update: "The enquiry has been assessed and does not present a risk to highway users at this time."
Update via Esther McVey MP: "Potholes are not considered with regard to the characteristics of the road users, instead it is considered for repair only when it is more than 40mm deep. That is standard for, as far as we are aware, all councils."
7. Barbed wire along highway at Common Lane
Update: Referred to Peover Superior and Snelson Parish Council for attention: wire to be removed and replaced with gate.
8. Damaged chevron sign at Alderley Road
Update: "The enquiry has been assessed and is being considered for a future programme, in line with other works and locations. This means we are unlikely to do any improvement work here during the current financial year. Our programmes are reviewed on an annual basis and changes may also be necessary to stay within the available budgets."
9. Broken up area of footway along Knutsford Road (between station pathway and Parish Hall)
Update: "Request completed"

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

10. Overgrown footway to north of telephone exchange, Knutsford Road
Update: Work to cut hedge back complete.
11. Damaged bollard at Peover Lane (near junction with roundabout)
Update: "A job has been raised and scheduled to be carried out by Cheshire East Highways following the enquiry logged. We'll provide a further update once the work is completed. While we make every effort to keep to the programme, dates can change due to unforeseen factors, such as weather and budget availability."
(Damaged bollard has been removed and replaced with a traffic cone.)
12. Blocked gully at Knutsford Road (near to butchers)
Update: "Assessed - does not meet criteria for works at current time"
13. Width of Chelford FP4
Update: Awaiting response from Cheshire East Council.
14. Request for loading bay outside Chelford Surgery, Elmstead Road
Update: No update received from Cheshire East Council.
15. Request for 20mph speed limit outside Chelford Primary School, Oak Road
Update: No update received from Cheshire East Council.
16. Safety concerns at zebra crossing
Update: Planning application 25/1234/FUL approved with conditions by Northern Planning Committee. Parish Council to lobby for proposed improvement works to be completed at earliest opportunity. Jones Homes awaiting completion of s.106 agreement.
Update via Esther McVey MP: "We are obviously aware of this issue, and can confirm the feasibility study has shown no problems, and that a Puffin Crossing can be delivered. It will be installed prior to commencement of work on the site."
17. Review of yellow lines at junction of Oak Road and Knutsford Road
Update: "The request has been added to the list of locations for consideration during prioritisation assessments which inform future work programmes."
18. Re-instatement of worn yellow lines on Dixon Drive
Update: Awaiting outcome of parking review from Borough Councillor A. Harrison.
19. White lining along Knutsford Road
Update: Lining work commenced.
20. Review of bollards at Dixon Drive (near Galloway Grange)
Update: No update received from Cheshire East Council.
Update via Esther McVey MP: The bollards do not present a risk so no action is planned.
21. Traffic issues arising from car boot sales in Marthall
Update: Awaiting assessment.
22. Uneven and sloped footways at Elmstead Road
Update: The enquiry has been assessed and does not present a risk to highway users at this time.

CHELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Appendix G: Speed indicator device data

The following summarises data collected by speed indicator devices between 1st September 2025 and 30th June 2026.

Site A1 = Knutsford Road, near Parish Hall – incoming traffic

Site A2 = Knutsford Road, near Parish Hall – outgoing traffic

Site B1 = Knutsford Road, near Dixon Drive – incoming traffic

Site B2 = Knutsford Road, near Dixon Drive – outgoing traffic

Notes:

January 2026 data impacted by roadworks (traffic lights) near to device near Parish Hall.

	Sept. 2025	Oct. 2025	Nov. 2025	Dec. 2025	Jan. 2026	Feb. 2026	Mar. 2026	Apr. 2026	May 2026	Jun. 2026
Site A1	136,028	136,456	132,650	126,986	70,252	110,871	127,894	120,847	128,190	128,470
Site A2	136,658	139,159	131,940	131,110	99,066	118,825	135,701	129,339	137,435	135,955
Site B1	108,008	106,021	103,860	100,389	88,902	101,728	104,670	98,873	97,948	86,491
Site B2	124,355	121,891	121,125	116,020	105,221	103,822	120,556	113,636	115,520	106,200

Table 1: Total number of vehicles

	Sept. 2025	Oct. 2025	Nov. 2025	Dec. 2025	Jan. 2026	Feb. 2026	Mar. 2026	Apr. 2026	May 2026	Jun. 2026
Site A1	69.76	71.23	71.86	71.16	82.69	69.09	68.48	70.12	71.67	71.11
Site A2	53.08	52.75	55.99	56.42	70.94	52.60	51.06	53.45	51.52	51.31
Site B1	78.39	80.53	81.30	81.57	80.08	63.53	76.64	76.59	78.76	80.05
Site B2	60.77	61.35	63.49	63.56	64.66	62.24	60.37	58.62	60.69	60.96

Table 2: Percentage of vehicles travelling within speed limit

	Sept. 2025	Oct. 2025	Nov. 2025	Dec. 2025	Jan. 2026	Feb. 2026	Mar. 2026	Apr. 2026	May 2026	Jun. 2026
Site A1	71	85	68	73	68	73	72	76	72	71
Site A2	69	68	65	67	69	64	68	74	76	70
Site B1	79	83	71	73	84	75	80	84	78	72
Site B2	91	97	84	92	85	99	94	84	90	80

Table 3: Maximum recorded speed