

# Southern Planning Committee

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 23rd November, 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.

6. **16/2993N Land Adjacent To 68, Close Lane, Alsager: Proposed outline residential development of 16 no. dwellings with access and layout applied for, for Pembroke Homes Ltd & Nichola Jane Beach (Pages 3 - 4)**
7. **16/4736C Land to the West of Close Lane, Alsager: Full planning application for the proposal of 26 dwellings (Phase 2) a mixed residential scheme to provide affordable and open market dwellings on land to the west of Close Lane, Alsager for Mr Ben Sutton, Stewart Milne Homes (Pages 5 - 6)**
9. **16/1402N Land North Of Parkers Road, Crewe: Outline planning application for the erection of 17 residential dwellings for Adrian Fabczak, Bloor Homes North West Ltd (Pages 7 - 8)**
11. **16/5038N 40, West Street, Crewe CW1 3HA: Proposed change of use of hairdressing salon to house of multiple occupation for Mr Paul Samuda (Pages 9 - 10)**
12. **16/3664N The White Lion, Audlem Road, Hankelow CW3 0JA: Demolition of public house and erection of 5no. four-bedrom detached dwellings for Mr Timothy Guttridge (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

---



**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

16/2993N

**LOCATION**

*Land adjacent to No.68 Close Lane, Alsager*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

21<sup>st</sup> November 2016

**POINTS OF CLARIFICATION**

Page 63 of the committee report advises that a contribution is required for primary education. This should read secondary education.

**CONSULTATIONS**

*Cllr Hough – objection*

*I oppose this application for the following reasons:*

- 1) In the report it states regarding Housing Land Supply “Looking ahead, if the inspector does find that the 5 year supply has been demonstrated through the local Plan strategy, this will be material to the determination of relevant applications. The inspector is expected to give further views in December.*
- 2) The report gives false impression regarding the quarry. In the local Plan and in the letter from persimmon (local Plan examination library RH C010) library the quarry not being used for residential must be restored (Local Plan). Also restoration is one of the conditions for the 350 houses already allocated. This development, although only small will have a seriously detrimental effect on the restoration of the quarry. Thus even though it is a small site approval could have a serious effect on the local Plan.*
- 3) The site is not surrounded by Brownfield land to the west. It has always been acknowledged that the quarry is Greenfield due to the restoration. It is not built up to the North nor South and is only built up to the East. The intrusion into the countryside is therefore all the more conspicuous. It should be turned down on the open countryside grounds within the NPPF. The site is attractive with mature trees. This development will neither protect nor enhance this site.*
- 4) It is not included in any category of land in the emerging local Plan. It has no mention in the SHLAA.*

- 5) *Approval of this site could enhance the possibility of approval of the 400 house application for the same land as the restoration. This would be against the Local Plan which allocated only the 350 houses already with approval.*

Appraisal:

The area of restoration as noted does relate to the site approved under 13/4134N and varied 15/2259N however the site is split into two sections with the housing development section being to the south of the application site and the restoration section to the north of the application site.

*Education – updated comments*

*It is noted that there are two applications on the committee agenda which are for residential development on Close Lane. There are a couple of reasons why the difference in the two requested, both are linked in with the timing of the consultation responses and realistically in both instances if a response was being provided today the service would be requesting primary and secondary from both applications.*

*The advice previously provided on the 21st July was based on October 2014 forecasts (available at the time) which showed a need for both primary and secondary, while the follow up advice provided on the 9th November was based on October 2015 forecasts and acknowledged that MMU had gained a resolution to approve.*

*The advice provided for 16/2993N on the 10th August was based on October 2015 forecasts but prior to the MMU resolution to approve. This indicated a small surplus in the secondary schools.*

Appraisal:

At present the advice provided by education is that a £32,685 contribution would be required for secondary education but no contribution for primary education sought. This is due to the timing of the response regarding another application for housing ref 16/4736N which is located to the north of the application site. The application to the north has a requirement for both primary and secondary education and is recommended for approval.

However if 16/4736N is refused, then there would be a requirement for both secondary £32,685 and primary school £32,539 contributions for the current application site.

**Recommendation**

APPROVE subject to the conditions and Heads of terms as set out in the committee report with the addition of the following additional heard of terms:

Primary Education Contribution of £32,539

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

16/4736c

**LOCATION**

*Land to the west of Close Lane, Alsager*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

*21<sup>st</sup> November 2016*

**Error Correction**

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure advise on page 69 erroneously refers to housing officer advice.

**Highways**

Strategic Infrastructure (Highways) had provided comments on the application. No objection is raised on highways grounds

**Recommendation**

No change to the recommendation.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016****APPLICATION NO:** 16/1402N**PROPOSAL:** Outline planning application for the erection of 17 residential dwellings**ADDRESS:** Land North of Parkers Road, Crewe**APPLICANT:** Bloor Homes North West Ltd.**Officer Comment**

In support of the comments from the education department which request a primary contribution and no secondary contribution the following table have been provided by the education department.

	PAN Sep 16	PAN Sep 17	NET CAP May-16	Any Known Changes	PUPIL FORECASTS based on October 2015 School Census					
					2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Proposed Net Cap Increase
<b>Primary Schools</b>										
Underwood West	60	60	432	432	445	456	464	475	486	
St Michael's	60	60	420	420	400	413	410	407	406	
Gainsborough	60	60	420	420	415	415	409	406	405	
Wistaston Academy	60	60	420	420	404	417	416	414	417	
Beechwood	45	45	315	315	349	358	362	362	369	
Brierley	30	30	210	210	207	212	210	208	208	
Edleston	30	30	210	210	207	207	205	202	200	
Leighton	60	60	420	420	484	495	504	517	534	
Mablin Lane	75	90	525	525	531	560	555	560	566	630
Monks Coppenhall	60	90	420	420	422	455	475	489	503	630
Developments with S106 funded and pupil yield included in the forecasts				155						
Developments pupil yield not included in the forecasts									52	
Pupil Yield expected from this development									3	
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>										
	540	585	3,792	3,947	3,864	3,988	4,010	4,040	4,149	
<b>OVERALL SURPLUS PLACES PROJECTIONS based on Revised NET CAP</b>					83	-41	-63	-93	-202	

	PAN Sep 16	PAN Sep 17	NET CAP May-16	any Known Changes	PUPIL FORECASTS based on October 2015 School Census						
					2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<b>Secondary Schools</b>											
Sir William Stanier	210	210	1,050	1,050	802	864	897	1,013	1,047	1,143	1,193
The Oaks Academy	156	156	780	780	496	490	502	560	559	604	623
Ruskin	140	140	666	666	516	543	558	569	581	552	557
St Thomas More	128	128	642	642	657	664	679	697	698	701	694
Please Note: All figures quoted exclude any allowance for 6th Form Pupils											
Developments with S106 funded and pupil yield included in the forecasts				54							
Developments pupil yield not included in the forecasts											34
Pupil Yield expected from this development											3
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>											
	634	634	3,138	3,192	2,471	2,561	2,636	2,839	2,885	3,000	3,104
<b>OVERALL SURPLUS PLACES PROJECTIONS</b>					721	631	556	353	307	192	88

**RECOMMENDATION:****No change to the recommendation**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

16/5038N

**LOCATION**

40, WEST STREET, CREWE, CW1 3HA

**UPDATE PREPARED**

21<sup>st</sup> November 2016

**Highways**

The Strategic Highways Manager has provided comments upon this application.

The advice is as follows:

Car ownership data for rented apartments in this location indicates that for a development of this size 2 or 3 cars will be owned by residents. The existing commercial use will have also generated vehicle trips and on-street parking demand.

There are existing Traffic Regulation Orders outside the site on West Street restricting on-street parking and the proposal will have no impact on West Street.

Vehicles would park on the adjacent residential streets but the impact of this proposal over the existing use will be minimal and in line with NPPF requirements, will not have a severe impact upon the highway.

No objection is raised.

**Recommendation**

No change to the recommendation.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

16/3664N

**LOCATION**

*The White Lion, Audlem Road, Hanklow*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

*21<sup>st</sup> November 2016*

**CONSULTATIONS**

*Environmental Protection – No objections subject to the following conditions:*

- 1) Pile foundations*
- 2) Dust control*
- 3) Noise mitigation scheme*
- 4) Contaminated land*
- 5) Working hours informative*

*Cllr Bailey reason for deferral – Loss of public amenity / meeting place*

**Recommendation**

No change to recommendation and suggested conditions can be added to the decision notice

Approve

**This page is intentionally left blank**