

Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 16th August, 2017
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: The Capesthorpe Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

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

Planning Updates (Pages 3 - 16)

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462
E-Mail: sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies, requests for further information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16th August 2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

15/5637M

LOCATION

LAND OFF SCHOOL LANE, MARTON

UPDATE PREPARED

14/08/2017

Since publication of the committee report, a consultation response has been received from the Council's Education Department.

CONSULTEE RESPONSE

Education comments:

A development of 23 dwellings is forecast to generate 4 primary school children and 3 secondary school children and 0 Special Educational Needs (SEN) children.

The proposal has been assessed against primary school capacity within 2 miles of the site (Marton & District) and secondary school capacity within 3 miles (Eaton Bank). The Education Officer has advised that additional children expected from the proposed development can be accommodated within existing provision, and therefore no contribution is being sought.

Recommendation

No change to initial recommendation. Refuse as per pages 31 and 32 of the agenda reports pack.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16th August 2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

17/1052m

LOCATION

Mere Hall Farm, Bucklow Hill Lane, Mere, Cheshire, WA16 6LE

UPDATE PREPARED

11th August 2017

POLICY

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2010-2030)

It is worth noting that the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy has now been adopted and can be given full weight in decision making. The following policies are relevant to this application:

PG3 (Green Belt)

EG2 (Rural Economy)

SD1 (Sustainable Development in Cheshire East)

SD2 (Sustainable Development Principles)

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

- Revised site plans
- Revised elevations
- Vehicle tracking diagram
- Fisher German Property Search
- Photographs
- Details of Black Magic Design, their circumstances and requirements
- Google map visuals

KEY ISSUES

Green Belt

Since the application was deferred, the following changes have been made to the proposed building:

- A reduction in the floorspace of the building (-28m²), reduction in the eaves height (-0.4m) and reduction in volume (-259m³).
- A revised siting to the SE of the existing warehouse (which will be demolished and replaced with hardstanding)

The reductions in the size of the building are noted, but the building does still remain 'materially larger'. Clear conflict is therefore identified with paragraph 89 of the NPPF and the proposal remains an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development must be given substantial weight in decision making and should only be approved in *very special circumstances*. The agent acknowledges the inappropriateness and further arguments have been put forward in an attempt to demonstrate very special circumstances.

The following matters are put forward by the applicant's as very special circumstances:

- Retains Black Magic on site
- No other suitable sites
- Costly to relocate
- Supports the farm through rental income from the tenants
- Building could be re-used for agriculture
- Minimal impact on openness
- Local socio-economic benefits
- Need for a larger replacement building

The proposed building will be a permanent feature which will meet the specific needs of a business (Black Magic), and the applicant is putting forward these specific requirements as very special circumstances. It is therefore considered that if the Council is being asked to accept an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt, which is harmful by definition, and which attracts substantial weight against the proposal, then it is considered that there should be some assurance that Black Magic are committed to the site and the Borough in order to secure the jobs and any other economic benefits for the Borough. Unfortunately this does not appear to be the case with this application. The application is made by the owners of the site, and not Black Magic, and it is understood that the building is being financed by the owners of the site and not Black Magic. There appears to be no financial commitment to the site by the expected occupiers of the building. In addition, Black Magic themselves have indicated in the supporting information that has been provided that this building, based on current forecasts, would only suit them for the next 2-3 years which is clearly short-term. This does not give any confidence that Black Magic is to remain on-site in the medium-long term. If they do, then it can only be expected that applications for further buildings will be made and these again will be inappropriate forms of development in the Green Belt which will result in further harm. Large warehouse / office buildings cannot continue to be provided in the Green Belt to accommodate their growth indefinitely.

This site is in the Green Belt and Mere Hall Business Farm is suited for small-scale offices. It appears simply to be that they have outgrown this small rural site. This is exemplified by the considerable increase in employees since 2008 (from 4 to 60, a 1400% increase) and how they now occupy three office units, a warehouse and 6x temporary porta-cabins. It can also be noted that many of these employees are from Warrington, and Manchester, and the business itself is not a local business serving local needs. The question is

therefore raised whether Black Magic Design are an international company that have outgrown the relatively small rural business centre at Mere Hall Farm.

Whilst the success of the business is acknowledged and welcomed, its growth must be accommodated in an appropriate location. The Council has recently allocated 380 hectares of employment land in its new local plan, and therefore there is a very strong potential for alternative sites to exist.

In terms of alternative sites, only very limited information has been provided regarding the exact operational and accommodation requirements of Black Magic. At present the requirements are summarised as office and warehouse space, within 5 miles of Mere Hall Farm.

Without understanding the specific requirements in more detail officers have been unable to suggest other potential sites for the business and its accommodation needs. Given the extent of employment land that is available in the Borough, the likelihood of identifying alternative sites, once Black Magic's requirements are fully explained, is very high. The lack of progress in discussions on alternative sites is a result of the applicant's wish for the application to return to the August Committee.

The 5 mile radius of Mere Hall Farm is to ensure the site remains accessible for existing employees. However, it is understood that if the current proposal is not granted planning permission then Black Magic may relocate elsewhere in Europe, which would have a much greater impact upon their workforce. Therefore this undermines the primary issue dictating the preferred location of the business that new premises must be conveniently located for the workforce. The 5 miles should therefore be negotiable.

Whilst there is a bus service that runs between Northwich and Altrincham, the site is not in a truly sustainable location. Other sites may exist in more sustainable locations with wider travel choices that may increase accessibility for the workforce.

In addition, whilst a search of sites has been undertaken by Fisher German on behalf of the applicant, this was instructed by the applicant (the landlord and owner of Mere Hall Farm), and not Black Magic. With the prospect of potentially losing a relatively longstanding tenant, it would in no way be in the interests of the applicant for alternative sites to be identified.

Despite the supporting statements clarifying that this building is necessary and Black Magic urgently require this space, the converted poultry building is not being used to its full potential. As witnessed on-site, and shown in the submitted photographs, there are still large spaces available within the building.

The present arrangement is for shipping containers to arrive on-site and whilst the proposed building would facilitate this arrangement, should Black Magic

remain at Mere Hall Farm, this arrangement is likely to continue irrespective of the larger building.

The proposed warehouse includes space such as a kitchenette, WC, restroom/administration area, and large goods in and goods out areas. It is queried whether all these are absolutely necessary. Specifically are the large goods-in and goods-out areas required due to the large storage behind? Due to the conflict with policies PG3 (CELPS) and paragraph 89 (NPPF), the harm to the Green Belt weighs heavily against the development. Black Magic currently occupies 8000sqft of land within Mere Hall Business Centre. Their continued growth cannot be supported within the Green Belt. This presents clear conflict with the purpose of including land within this designation.

There is also significant conflict with policy EG2 which states that development that supports the rural economy will only be supported where there is no conflict with policy PG3 (which the development is significantly contrary to) and could not be reasonably located within a designated centre which it arguably should be. This development proposed is not deemed environmentally sustainable and the socio-economic benefits are small, and short-term.

This application would only benefit Black Magic Design for the short-term. This is not a very special circumstance which would outweigh the substantial, long-term and ultimately irreversible harm to the Green Belt. The supporting information repeatedly refers to "growth", which itself cannot be sustained on this site. It is now that Black Magic Design should be looking at alternative sites, instead of harming the Green Belt through inappropriate development.

CONCLUSION

As in the original report the application is recommended for refusal.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16th August 2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

17/1359M

LOCATION

24, LOSTOCK HALL ROAD, POYNTON, STOCKPORT, CHESHIRE, SK12
1DP

UPDATE PREPARED

14/08/2017

KEY ISSUES

Since publication of the committee report, further representations have been received as well as an amended plan.

Representations:

21 objections have been received. The objections in full can be located on file. A summary of the objections are summarised as follows:

- Over development of the site
- Plot sizes not in keeping
- Proposed dwelling located too close to the road with breach of building line
- Amenity issues : loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing, too close to existing adjoining property, overlooking
- Highways concerns Inc. access issues
- Loss of trees/vegetation and natural habitat
- Concerns over nearby development as well as proposed development
- Belief the houses are not needed
- Height of proposed building on plots 3 and 4 higher than adjacent bungalows
- Concerns over public right of way
- Concerns over deliveries
- Design of dwellings are not in keeping
- Garden space is not in keeping with the area
- Ecology concerns
- Noise pollution
- Drainage issues
- Concerns over legal issues and covenants

Poynton Town Council raised the following

Recommendation: Refusal RO3RD. That the proposal would by reason of scale, form and design result in a cramped and intrusive form of development out of keeping with the character of the existing properties in the immediate vicinity of the site. RO7RD that the proposed development is unneighbourly.

The additional concerns raised have already been addressed in the main committee report.

Plans:

Four revised plans have been received on the 02/08/17. The amendments are detailed below.

- 16-188 (FPL) F200 Type F elevation. The amendments include two rear first floor windows sited on the gable instead of two. This now matches the floor plan submitted and consulted on.
- 16-188 (FPL) F100 Type F floor plan. The amendments include two rear ground floor window sited on the gable either side of the bifold doors being removed. This now matches the elevation consulted on.
- 16-188 (FPL) E200 Type E elevation. Window and door evidenced on side elevation one.
- 16-188(FPL) E100. Type E floor plan. Window to the garage has been evidenced as per elevation plan and door to garage. Window to bathroom removed

One revised plan has been received on the 14/08/17. The amendments are detailed below.

- LOS1702 _L03 rev A. Additional wording inserted to state 'NOTE: Existing brick boundary wall to be retained, except where access is required from Lostock Avenue. Elsewhere external boundaries to be close boarded timber fence or hedging as shown'

RECOMMENDATION:

No change to the recommendation. Approve as per pages 61 and 62 of agenda reports pack.

Northern Planning Committee 12/07/2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

17/1977M

LOCATION

Netherbrook, Chorley Hall Lane, Alderley Edge, SK9 7UL

UPDATE PREPARED

17/8/2017

CONSULTATIONS

Flood Risk Comments – A further revised Drainage Drawing has been received which addresses concerns regarding surface water raised by the Flood Risk Team. It has been confirmed that the surface water is stored and attenuated to an existing SW connection. This mitigates the requirement for the flood risk condition to be included on any subsequent approval.

CONCLUSIONS

The original condition as requested by The Flood Risk Team is no longer required as the concerns have been addressed on the revised submitted plan.

A revised plan indicating the correct house layout has not yet been received. As this is a technical issue, it can be addressed without prejudice to the committee outcome.

As in the original report a recommendation of approval is made.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16th August 2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

17/2263M

LOCATION

TOP CROFT, RIDGE HILL, SUTTON

UPDATE PREPARED

14/08/2017

OFFICER REPORT

Since publication of the committee report, a consultation response has been received from the Council's Arboricultural Officer and an amended plan has been secured.

CONSULTEE RESPONSE:

The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection subject to an appropriately worded condition being placed on any grant of permission that requires a Construction Method Statement to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA prior to any construction works on site. Members will note that this condition is already recommended at condition 4 on page 91 of the agenda reports pack.

Plans

Following the Committee site visit, Officers have secured an amended plan moved the proposed building slightly further back into the site so that the gates can now be set 5.5metres from the back of footpath to prevent vehicles overhanging the highway.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to the conditions outlined on page 91 of the agenda reports pack.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16th August 2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

17/2586M

LOCATION

Alderley Edge School for Girls, Wilmslow Road, Alderley Edge, Cheshire, SK9 7QE

OFFICER REPORT

14/08/2017

Since the committee report, 2 x letters of objection have been received, and one additional consultee response from the Highways department.

CONSULTEE RESPONSE (summarised)

- Cheshire East Flood Risk Team – Insufficient information submitted relating to drainage of the proposed playing fields. Further information would be required. Suggest informative regarding the hierarchy of drainage options.

This has been noted. As per the original recommendation, conditions are suggested regarding the submission of a drainage scheme (submitted prior to commencement of works for approval by the LPA), a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan (submitted prior to commencement of works for approval by the LPA) and an informative relating to drainage in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.

2x letters of objection summarised as follows:

- Request additional planting to NW boundary
- Disagree with statement that development does not comprise a change of use. Objector has not witnessed hockey being played on this pitch
- Request that hours of use are restricted to term time only
- Parking issues
- Issues relating to drainage.

The additional comments are noted and have already been addressed in the main committee report.

RECOMMENDATION

As in the original report the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out on page 104 of the agenda reports pack.

This page is intentionally left blank