

# Southern Planning Committee

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 3rd February, 2016  
**Time:** 10.00 am  
**Venue:** Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe  
CW1 2BJ

---

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

8. **15/4413N Land Rear Of Woodlands View, 20, Bridge Street, Wybunbury CW5 7NE: Erection of 19 no. dwellings, vehicular access, associated car parking and landscaping (Reserved Matters) for Simon Clutton, Simon Clutton Homes Ltd (Pages 1 - 4)**
11. **15/3394C Oak Farm, Church Lane, Sandbach, Cheshire CW11 4ST: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 5 no. residential dwellings with associated infrastructure and ancillary facilities in Outline with Access defined-resubmission of 14/3810C for Paul Foden (Pages 5 - 6)**
12. **15/3863N Land Adjacent To The Bridge Inn, Broad Street, Crewe, Cheshire: Proposed construction of 14 no. dwellings for John Warters (Pages 7 - 8)**
14. **15/4234C Land Off Manor Lane, Holmes Chapel: Proposed demolition of existing buildings and outline planning permission for up to 65 residential dwellings to include access for Liberty Properties Developments Limited (Pages 9 - 10)**
17. **15/5280C Lawton Mere Nurseries, Cherry Lane, Rode Heath, Cheshire ST7 3QX: Demolition of an existing glasshouse building and the construction of six new dwellings for Gary Barratt, Alsager Plant Hire and Groundwork (Pages 11 - 12)**

---

Please contact Julie Zientek on 01270 686466  
E-Mail: [julie.zientek@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto: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**

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016**

**APPLICATION NO:** 15/4413N

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 19 no. dwellings, vehicular access, associated car parking and landscaping (Reserved Matters)

**ADDRESS:** Land to the rear of Woodlands View, 20 Bridge Street, Wybunbury, CW5 7NE

**APPLICANT:** Simon Clutton Homes Ltd

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

A letter has been received from the applicant's agent which raises issues in relation to flood risk/drainage and conditions. The letter also refers to the concerns raised about the over-engineered section of road serving plots 12-14 and that this should be changed to a private driveway. The applicant states that this is part of the terms of the purchase contract and that they are required to provide an adopted highway to the western boundary of the site. The land to the west is established agricultural land and remains designated as open countryside within the Local Plan and any applications on the land to the west would need to be subject of a separate planning application which would be determined by the Council.

**APPRAISAL**

**Land Levels**

Plans have now been received which show street-scene drawings and sections to show how the proposed dwellings would be sited in relation to the land levels across this site.

The street-scene drawings show that the that the floor level of plots 5 and 6 would be 54.55 AOD (above ordinance datum) and this would largely follow the existing land levels to plot 20 and 21 which would have a finished floor level of 62.55 AOD.

In terms of Willow Mead to the south of the site this property has a floor level of 53.00 AOD, an eaves height of 55.46 AOD and a ridge height of 60.86 AOD. This is in comparison to the proposed bungalows which would have a floor level of 55.15 AOD and a ridge height of 61.41 AOD. The plans show that there would be minimal land level changes from existing and that the ground floor windows to the proposed bungalow would be at a lower height than the first floor windows to Willow Mead. On this basis and the separation distance that would be provided it is considered that the proposed development would have a minimal impact upon the residential amenities of Willow Mead.

**Flood Risk and Drainage**

A verbal update will be provided in relation to this issue

### **Conditions**

A letter has been received from the applicant's agent which queries some of the suggested conditions within the committee report as follows:

Condition 4 – The materials will match the dwellings currently being constructed on plots 1 & 2 (Weinerberger Woodlands Mixture, Grey Marley Edgemere and buff-coloured re-constituted stone cills). The suggested condition wording will be amended to reflect this.

Condition 6 – Boundary Treatments have been submitted and should be conditioned to comply with the approved drawing. The case officer does not consider that there are sufficient details on this plan and that amendments are required to this plan. The condition will be retained as suggested.

Condition 7 – A tree protection plan has now been submitted with the application. This is considered to be acceptable and the condition will be amended.

Condition 9 – A construction environment management plan has now been submitted. In this case it has not been possible to obtain consultation responses from the relevant consultees and as such the condition will be retained.

Condition 11 – The compliance with mitigation measures within the submitted Acoustic Report should refer to the plots affected 18-21. This is agreed.

Condition 12 – All plots have rear garden access and this condition is not required. This is agreed and the condition will be deleted.

Condition 13 – This is repeated twice on the recommendation (2 and 13). This is agreed and condition 13 will be deleted.

Condition 14 – Do not understand the rationale for removing plots 9-13. The reason for this is that these plots have small rear gardens and plots 9-13 have the potential to overlook the dwellings at plots 3, 4 and 8. The condition is to be retained.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVE** subject to the following conditions

- 1. Approved Plans**
- 2. External Lighting to be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing**
- 3. Compliance with the submitted Environment Management Plan**
- 4. Materials to comply with approved details**
- 5. Implementation of the approved landscape scheme**

- 6. Boundary treatment to be submitted and approved**
- 7. Tree Protection compliance with the submitted details**
- 8. Arboricultural Method Statement**
- 9. Submission and Approval of a Construction Management Plan**
- 10. Affordable Housing Details**
- 11. Compliance with the mitigation measures contained within the submitted acoustic assessment prior to occupation of plots 18-21.**
- 12. Remove Permitted Development for plots 3, 4 and 9-13 for extensions and dormer windows**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Southern Planning Committee – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION No.**

**15/3394C** – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 5 no. residential dwellings with associated infrastructure and ancillary facilities in Outline with Access defined- resubmission of 14/3810C

**LOCATION**

Oak Farm, Church Lane, Sandbach, Cheshire, CW11 4ST

**UPDATE PREPARED**

1st February 2016

**APPRAISAL**

**Other Material Considerations**

**Draft Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan (SNP)**

The position of the SNP has changed since the drafting of the Committee report.

The examination of the Plan is now complete and Policies H1 and H5 amended. Policy H1 no longer details that future housing will be delivered predominantly on small scale sites of up to 30 houses. Although amended, Policy H5 still supports the re-development of brownfield land.

In response, this change in position does not alter the original conclusion in that; as advised, it is not accepted that all of the application site (with particular reference to the land on which the 2 on-site barns are located) represents brownfield development as insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate this at the time of assessment. As such, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy H5 of the Neighbourhood Plan as it would be providing housing not in a preferred location.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**No change to recommendation**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Southern Planning Committee – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION No.**

**15/3863N** – Proposed construction of 14 no. dwellings

**LOCATION**

Land Adjacent to the Bridge Inn, Broad Street, Crewe, Cheshire

**UPDATE PREPARED**

1st February 2016

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Crewe Town Council** - No objection provided that the site is not currently affected by proposals for HS2

**Other Matters**

The application site does not fall within the HS2 consultation zone

**RECOMMENDATION**

**No change to recommendation**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Southern Planning Committee – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION No.**

**15/4234C** – Proposed demolition of existing buildings and outline planning permission for up to 65 residential dwellings to include access

**LOCATION**

Land Off, Manor Lane, Holmes Chapel

**UPDATE PREPARED**

1st February 2016

**CONSULTATIONS**

Following the drafting of the committee report, Councillor Gilbert has provided the following comments and asked that these be read out at committee.

*'The application flies in the face of the principle that jobs and houses should be co-located where possible. The population of Holmes Chapel is growing from about 6,000 to about 7,500. Can it be appropriate to write off the one remaining available employment site in favour of yet more housing and thereby promote out-commuting?*

*Should we not be promoting local jobs for local people instead? Why do the neighbouring commercial sites on Manor Lane appear to be flourishing and yet it is claimed that there is no interest in this site for commercial purposes?*

*Unless Members are persuaded that a refusal would be unsustainable on appeal and that an approval with the proposed conditions and 106 requirements is therefore preferable, I would urge refusal.*

*The Planning Officer's assertion that the benefits of approval outweigh the dis-benefits appears to be an unsupported subjective opinion which is open to challenge. In my view, he understates the following dis-benefits:-*

- 1. The loss of an employment site as stated above.*
- 2. The impact on Jodrell Bank which is stated to be moderate. The importance thereof including the SKA and the major international significance of JB as well as its contribution to the Visitor Economy should not be taken lightly.*
- 3. The negative impact on the Village centre through increased demand for parking which is already inadequate. This leads to inconsiderate on-street parking, conflict between residents and motorists and difficulty in accessing shops and services. In particular, residents from surrounding villages such as Goostrey,*

*Cranage and Twemlow are dependent on the Health Centre and those of limited mobility are often unable to park near to it.'*

## **APPRAISAL**

### **Other Material Considerations**

Holmes Chapel Neighbourhood Plan (HCNP)

The Parish Council has raised the question as to how the proposal aligns with the emerging HCNP.

Following consultation with the Council's Neighbourhood Planning Manager, it has been advised that this plan is not yet currently in a position to be considered as part of planning application assessments as no draft plan is currently available.

## **CONCLUSION**

The points raised by the Councillor concern matters that have already been considered by the planning officer. The Councillor simply comes to an alternative conclusion and recommendation for the reasons detailed.

The position of the Neighbourhood Plan is that it is not in a position to be afforded any weight at this time.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**No change to recommendation**

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 3<sup>RD</sup> FEBRUARY 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

15/5280C

**LOCATION**

*Lawton Mere Nurseries, Cherry Lane, Rode Heath, ST7 3QX.*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

*1<sup>st</sup> February 2016*

**Affordable Housing**

The agent for the applicant has put forward that their client would be willing to consider a contribution for a financial contribution (off-site) towards affordable housing.

The Strategic Housing Manager has stated that on site provision is preferable. The SHMA evidences a need for affordable housing and so the only reasons that the Council would look for a commuted sum would be if there was an agreement that the site was not suitable for affordable housing, or if the developer provided the Council with proof that no registered providers were interested in taking affordable units at the site.

**Deferral**

The agent has also requested that the application be deferred until the change of use to storage and distribution has been implemented.

This is considered to be an inadequate justification to defer an application. Applications are required to be determined in a timely manner and whilst the Applicant say they intend to implement the development at the end of March, they could re-apply at that time for a fresh assessment

**RECOMMENDATION**

No change to the recommendation.

**This page is intentionally left blank**