



Southern Planning Committee

Updates

Date:	Wednesday, 4th January, 2012
Time:	2.00 pm
Venue:	Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe CW1 2BJ

The information on the following pages was received following publication of the committee agenda.

Updates (Pages 1 - 6)

Please contact	Julie Zientek on 01270 686466
E-Mail:	julie.zientek@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies, requests for further information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

Application No: 11/4228N

Location: 202, CREWE ROAD, HASLINGTON, CHESHIRE, CW1 5RT

Proposal: Erection of Three Detached Dwellings

Applicant: Cranford Estates

Expiry Date: 06-Jan-2012

UPDATE REPORT : 30th December 2011

VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL

Haslington Parish Council object to the proposed development as unwarranted development in the open countryside contrary to policy NE.2. It is not as the applicants have described "infilling a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage", the development will extend the agreed settlement boundary for Haslington into open countryside. The proposal involves building outside the settlement boundary of Haslington and encroaches into the area of open countryside between Haslington and Winterley that maintains the distinct and separate character of those two communities. Haslington Parish Council request that the application be called in to the planning committee and that they have a site visit.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Representations have been received from 225 and 194 Crewe Road objecting on the following grounds:

- **Contrary to Local Plan**

- The field clearly lies outside of the Haslington Parish boundary. (Shown on the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011). The field should be considered as being in open countryside.
- Residents were assured that the site at 202 Crewe Road was classed as greenbelt and believed that the only way a property could be erected on the site was to move an existing building (the footings are already in place), for which they have never had an objection. From reading the local plan, residents were not aware that the situation has altered. A licence was granted for the occupant to live in the temporary structure until the move of the building was completed.

- **Road Safety**

- Members should visit and view the access to the field. It is located close to a blind bend and visibility is poor to vehicles both attempting to join the road and also to those travelling from Winterley towards Haslington.
- A traffic survey was conducted prior to the introduction of traffic calming measures in the centre of Haslington Village and in Winterley,
- The fastest average speed on the whole road between Sydney and Wheelock was recorded directly outside the field.

- **Previous Planning Applications**

- A number of unsuccessful applications have been made since the 1980s.
- Some of the comments made in reference to the earlier attempts are still as valid today, some more so.
 - June 1987: "...site is in primarily open countryside..." (Source: Head of Planning, Borough Council)
 - June 1987: "Visibility from the site access is sub-standard and vehicles entering the highway would do so in a manner which would present danger to other road users." (Source: Head of Planning, Borough Council)
 - October 1995: "... the site is outside the settlement boundaries for Haslington. In such areas all land will be treated as open countryside." (Source: The Planning Inspectorate)
 - October 1995: "I consider that the proposal would represent an intensification of the existing ribbon of housing. In my view this would harm the open character and appearance of the countryside." (Source: The Planning Inspectorate)

- **Land is Open Countryside**

- refer to the Cheshire East SHLAA (Crewe (East)).
- The field is just a small part of area 2947, recorded as status "Not Currently Developable".
- If the field is granted approval, this will open the way to the rest of the (large) area being susceptible to development.
- There are several other areas within Crewe East that are flagged as either "Deliverable" or "Developable"; more than enough to meet future demand and growth.
- Additionally, (admittedly not in Crewe (East) but approximately only three miles away) a major development in Elworth was rejected just a matter of weeks ago because of the number of other recent developments in the area and the lack of demand for further new properties.
- Member should look at the SHLAA map as part of the decision making-process.

- **Contrary to Local Area**

- The developers, Cranford Estates, advertise this plot as a £2 million development on their website. For three properties, this is clearly an average price of well over half a million pounds.
- Only two houses have been sold in Haslington over the last seven years for that amount (Source: Zoopla).
- The developers claim that the proposed development is in keeping with the local area is inaccurate.

- They are of the opinion that there is a quantative need for new housing within the borough (Supporting Planning Statement, Paragraph 5.1). However, there would be very few families currently living within the area who would be able to afford the properties.
- **Misleading Statements and Inaccuracies in Planning Application**
 - Supporting Planning Statement, Paragraph 4.3: The application contends that significant development work has been undertaken to prepare the site and this implies permission has been implemented. I strongly disagree with this viewpoint. Again, the Planning Inspectorate rejected this same argument in 1995.
 - Supporting Planning Statement, Paragraph 4.6: The application itself notes that the field sits outside of the settlement boundary in open countryside.
 - Design and Access Statement (Access and Movement): The application claims the entrance offers good visibility. This is simply untrue.
 - Design and Access Statement (Refuse and Recycling): Placing up to six bins every other week at the field entrance will further reduce accessibility. Vehicles attempting to enter the site will have to wait on the highway if a vehicle is trying to exit the site, which will result in a highly dangerous queue on a blind bend.
- **Impact on trees**
 - This new proposal is much nearer the boundary which has a number of trees with preservation orders. There is some concern that the proximity of the development may affect the trees.
 - The development may affect the health and root formation of the trees, neighbours have already had to spend £3000 having a beech tree removed that became diseased as a result of its roots being disturbed by a driveway for a neighbouring property, as enforced by the council and highways.

RECOMMENDATION:

As per main report.

Application No: 11/4222N

Location: PRG ENGINEERING, LIGHTWOOD GREEN AVENUE, AUDLEM

Proposal: Proposed Extension to Existing Industrial Building and Enlargement of Rear Parking and Vehicle Turning Area

Applicant: PRG Engineering

Expiry Date: 09-Jan-2012

REPRESENTATIONS

7 letters of objections received from 5 Lightwood Green Avenue, The Swallows, Aven House, The Holdings, Dodcott-Cum-Wilkesley Parish Council and Glenstone House (x2, one prepared by Geoff Allen Associates). The salient points being:

- Some HGV's at present cannot enter the site and wait top be unloaded outside the gates on Lightwood Green Avenue. Often waiting for yard to open or park up overnight on street.
- Some vehicles use Wood Avens Grove to turn and manoeuvre into the gateway
- PRG promised to widen the entrance in the past but never happened
- Road surface would be undermined and any further increase in activity would damage the road further
- Too many deliveries for road
- No footpath for children to walk along to catch bus or visit friends. Grass verges have been churned up
- Site operates longer working hours than previously approved, including 7 days a week from 8am to late including night shifts. Noise has increased excessively due to nature of business
- Flooding in local area, more development would worsen this
- Nature of business causing smell and breathing problems from spraying.
- Site is unsuitable – would cause development on Green Belt
- No indication given on plans about the widening of the access
- More suitable sites for business in the area
- Development would be clearly visible from Lightwood Green Avenue
- Development would be fully visible from The Holdings and adjoining field
- Proposals would lead to further loss of amenity
- Proposals contrary to Policy E.6 as Policies BE.1, BE.2, BE.3 and BE.4 would not be satisfied.
- Proposed use is incompatible with neighbouring residential uses in principle
- Proposals would bring turning movements close to the side boundary of the property and increase in noise and fumes
- Spare bedroom of Glenstone faces the site at a distance of 600mm from a conifer hedge.
- Proposals would increase the already unacceptable noise disturbance.
- Widening of access does not make use of road any more acceptable or appropriate
- Pollution of local drainage systems from vehicles
- Proposals would not make a positive contribution or enhance built environment

- Would not be of high standard design, does not respect the pattern and form of development.
- Significant incursion into open countryside
- Extended curtilage unrelated to any physical or existing boundary
- Without landscaping details it would be difficult to determine whether the visual impact could be ameliorated
- Proposals use substandard point of access and junction onto Whitchurch Road and therefore will not provide for public safety.
- Concern over impact to Great Crested Newts and loss of foraging land
- In terms of DNPPF the proposals do not re-use an existing resource but extend onto a non renewable resource
- Site not sustainably located near to existing facilities or public transport
- Increasing the usage of the site would increase number of journeys

Further Objection received from Landform Highways Planning Consultants (on behalf of Glenstone). The salient points being:

- Visibility splays onto Whitchurch Road should be 160m x 2.4m in each direction. Distances of 59m (and only 70m to centreline) can be achieved in the Whitchurch direction
- Junction radii (onto Whitchurch Road) are significantly below the 15m normally required for HGV manoeuvres
- Lightwood Green Avenue is 4.8m in length for 90m reducing to 4.2m for 35m fronting the site. A 4.2m wide carriageway is too narrow to allow a HGV and car to pass. Road therefore unsuitable.
- No footways
- Tracks submitted with application show a tighter turn than is possible for a HGV of this size to show that no access improvement is required. No outbound tracks shown
- The access will need to be widened by 6m and the vehicle crossing by 15m making a total crossing width of 23m.
- The area needed to provide the turning area is less than shown on the plans and requires only a small incursion into the Open Countryside
- Site is too small for current operation

KEY ISSUES

Principle of Development and Design Issues

The principle of development and issues relating to design have been considered in the Committee report. The application site is an established employment site located within the Open Countryside where appropriate small scale development is acceptable (providing other Policies issues are satisfied).

It should also be clarified that the site is within the Open Countryside and not within the Green Belt as suggested by numerous objectors.

There would also be opportunity to provide additional landscaping to mitigate the impact that the development could have on the Open Countryside and/or streetscene.

Amenity

There is an hours of operation condition attached to previous permission (P99/0962) which states that:

“The site shall not operate or be open to the public between the hours of 6.00pm on one day and 8.00am on following day Mondays to Saturdays inclusive and not at all on Sundays”

The site therefore has a restriction on its hours of operation. Any working outside of these hours would be a breach of this condition. No complaints have been recorded by the Local Planning Authority relating to this issue. These hours of operation are considered to be appropriate for this operation in proximity to residential dwellings.

No objections have been raised by Environmental Health with regard to the impact that the proposed development would have on adjoining properties due to the existing relationship.

Drainage/Flooding Issues

Concern has been raised with regard to the impact that the proposed development could have on Drainage and Flooding issues, the concerns of neighbours is noted. However, it is considered that any additional drainage issues which could arise from this development could be mitigated through a satisfactory drainage condition for surface water run-off. The site is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3 which are at greater risk of flooding than the application site.

Highways and Access

Concern has been raised with regard to the impact that the development would have on highway safety (through intensification) and the capacity of the highways network to accommodate such development. Comments are still outstanding from the Strategic Highways Manager and a further update will be provided on this issue.

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation, additional recommendation relating to drainage details to be submitted and approved, a scheme for landscaping and its implementation are also suggested