



Strategic Planning Board Update

Date: Wednesday, 9th December, 2020

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Virtual

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

Planning Update (Pages 3 - 6)

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

APPLICATION NO: 19/1068M

**LOCATION: KINGS SCHOOL, CUMBERLAND STREET,
MACCLESFIELD, CHESHIRE, SK10 1DA**

PROPOSAL: The demolition of existing buildings and the residential redevelopment of The King's School Cumberland Street site to provide a mixture of conversion and new build dwellings and 'Later Living' apartments, with associated access, car parking, open space, landscaping and infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS

Since preparation of the report, further representations have been received from 13 addresses (in addition to those addresses that had already lodged representations), objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Housing density
- House types and styles unsympathetic to the local area
- Lack of affordable / social housing
- Type E properties too tall and close to eastern boundary
- Insufficient parking – increase in spaces offset by loss of on street parking
- Essential that provision for charging points for electric cars is made
- Land value has been overestimated if it cannot afford to provide affordable housing
- Loss of cricket war memorial and listed building with no justification – s106 money should be used to retain including war memorial gates
- Effect on protected trees including incursion into root protection areas
- There are no benefits to the scheme that would outweigh the impact on trees nor any other impacts
- Substandard separation with neighbouring windows resulting in loss of privacy
- Concern regarding vibrations from demolition and construction
- Inaccuracies contained with officers original committee report and officer's advice is incorrect and misleading
- Applicant's air quality assessment is inadequate using defective traffic model data and lack of appropriate receptors
- Viability assessments are now out of date existing use value, alternative use value, construction costs and residual land value)
- The benchmark land value should be reduced so that the purchase price is lower and the scheme can be made more viable to increase affordable housing provision
- Other land uses should have been considered to establish the value of the site
- Site needs to be marketed in current climate
- The Kings school and the applicant did not put the site forward for inclusion as a site allocation for housing under the SADPD
- Housing targets have already been met

- Loss of cricket pitch and loss of uninterrupted view
- Macclesfield Borough Plan Saved Policies RT1 (page 44) , BE17 and BE19 (page 28) not referenced
- Increase in traffic congestion on surrounding streets
- Properties in the vicinity have been subject to subsidence and developer must pay for structural surveys
- No timetable for construction hours provided
- Listed building consent should be considered at the same committee
- Applicant's heritage assessment should be rejected
- Lack of adequate provision for cycling and walking infrastructure

OFFICER ASSESSMENT

The Council's Principal Forestry and Arboricultural Officer and the Principal Design and Conservation Officer have further commented on the revised proposals as outlined below.

Trees

The proposed revisions have resulted in a slight realignment of the Type E properties found to the east of the site. The Council's Principal Forestry and Arboricultural Officer has confirmed that this is not significant when compared to the previous layout. However, issues of shading / reduced daylight/ sunlight which could result in future requests to prune/fell remain. It has been recognised that any improvements to this relationship would likely impact upon other constraints including an encroachment onto the area of open space and this should be considered when weighing up the planning balance. This particular matter is already reported on page 40 of the agenda reports pack where officers consider that "scope for improving separation distances further conflicts with other constraints on the site, namely ensuring that the cricket pitch maintains an open aspect and therefore in this case, it is considered that this need and the general benefits of the scheme outweigh this conflict". An objector has stated that these benefits have not been made clear.

The benefits referred to are the general benefits of the scheme which include; ensuring a sustainable future use is secured for such an important and prominent site within Macclesfield; the provision of a pedestrian / cycle link increasing connectivity through the site; the high quality design credentials; and the general environmental, economic and social benefits attributed to bringing forward housing on this now vacant site within a highly sustainable location close to the town centre.

The Principal Forestry and Arboricultural Officer recommends the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a revised tree protection plan and an arboricultural method statement / impact assessment. This information would be secured by conditions 7, 8 and 9 as recommended on page 52 of the Agenda Reports Pack.

Design and Conservation

The Council's Principal Design and Conservation Officer has confirmed that the revisions have not addressed the issues previously raised in relation to the Later Living Block and its scale and mass within the setting of the principal listed building on the site (the original school building/Head Master's house). However, as reported on pages 35 and 37 of the Agenda Reports Pack:

"Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be an intrusion of the 'later living' block, this has been reduced in size and it is considered that this is balanced against the improvements that would be seen from the Sainsbury's roundabout and the overall design credentials of the scheme. There are also benefits derived from ensuring a sustainable future use is secured for such an important and prominent site within Macclesfield from a heritage perspective. Thus, the proposals represent a high quality scheme, with many positive attributes. There would be harm derived from the later living block, by interrupting one of the viewpoints. However, it is considered that this harm would be outweighed by the wider benefits of the scheme and the fact that the magnitude (i.e. importance) of the said viewpoint is not considered significant."....."it may not be any taller than the Art block that it would replace, or the ridge line of the old school building, its footprint is larger than that of the building to be demolished and it will enclose much of the western side of the site as seen in the view from the site entrance off Cumberland Street. This has been improved by widening the gap between the northern end of the Later Living block and the school building and this would allow greater views of the heritage asset from the Sainsbury's roundabout. It is considered that this aspect of openness will be restricted to a limited view and the benefits of the scheme as a whole are considered to outweigh this harm as discussed previously in this report."

On this basis, officers conclude that the impact on the designated heritage assets would be acceptable in this case in accordance with Policy SE 7 of the CELPS and saved policies BE17, BE18 and BE19 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.

Viability

An objector has stated that the previous viability assessments undertaken in 2019 are now out of date and need to be redone. The applicant has submitted an update to the viability position with a Viability Note. As confirmed on page 27 of the agenda reports pack, the circumstances have not changed to an extent that would lead to different conclusions being drawn. The scheme remains unviable if it were to meet the full package of s106 obligations.

Other Matters

Saved policies BE17, BE18, BE19 and RT1 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP) are relevant and are not referenced in the policy section on page 20 of the agenda reports pack. Policies BE17, BE18, BE19 deal with proposals affecting listed buildings. For the reasons referenced in the main agenda report

pack on pages 30-38 inclusive, the scheme is found to be acceptable in regard to these policies. Reference has also been made or the need for the associated listed building consent to be referred to Strategic Planning Board. However, the council's constitution / terms of reference do not require referral of the listed building consent to SPB.

Turning to saved MBLP Policy RT1, this deals with areas of recreational land and open space and says that such areas will be protected from development. However, Policy SC 1 of the CELPS is more up to date and states that such areas will be protected 'unless alternative provision, of equivalent or better quality, is to be made'. The loss of the existing cricket pitch as a sports facility would be replaced at the new school in Prestbury, permission for which has been approved under planning ref; 19/1270M. Sport England and the ANSA do not object to the loss of the cricket pitch on this basis subject to a condition that the replacement facility is to be provided and made available for use prior to its loss at this site. As such, a refusal on the basis of non-compliance with policy rt1 would not be sustainable.

Objectors have referenced the threat of subsidence, damage caused by vibrations from demolition and construction and that the developer must pay for structural surveys to be undertaken at adjoining properties. Damage caused to neighbouring property would be a civil matter as would subsidence and therefore the Local planning authority could not require the developer to undertake structural surveys in this regard.

With respect to the other matters raised in the additional representations received, these have already been considered and are reported within the main agenda reports pack. These include issues relating to car parking, traffic generation, air quality, design, affordable housing, loss of the cricket pavilion, loss of cricket pitch and impact on residential amenity.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve as per the recommendation on pages 51 and 52 of the Agenda Reports Pack.