

Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 2nd March, 2011
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: The Capesthorpe Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1DX

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

- a) **Planning Updates** (Pages 1 - 2)

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 – 2nd March 2011**UPDATE TO AGENDA****APPLICATION NO: 10/4970M****LOCATION: 41, Budworth Walk, Wilmslow****UPDATE PREPARED: 28th February 2011****OTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

An additional 2 letters of objection have been received that raise similar points to those already submitted. They are summarised as follows:

There is insufficient parking for the residents of Budworth Walk and there is no need for more vehicles in the area. The use of the car park for of parents taking and picking up their children from the nearby school already cause problems with regard to the availability of car parking.

The writer states that as a parent of young children he is concerned that the parking and traffic control in place to support this planning application are insufficient to cope with the influx of extra cars and deliveries to the proposed development. It is his understanding that last time an A1 use was granted on the site, there was significantly less traffic and less residents with cars.

There are enough existing shops around the area, for example, Summerfields, Handforth and Handforth Dean.

There is a major concern that littering and a possible application to sell alcohol would cause problems on the estate. The writer states that he has suffered youths lingering outside his property, littering, smoking cannabis and drinking alcohol and there is no need to encourage this behaviour with the proposed development. In addition, the residents, the Riverside Housing Association and the Police have worked hard over the last few years to improve the housing stock and reduce crime in the area

The property in question is far too close to residential property.

Noise pollution, and danger created by cars and patrons will be of great concern to the elderly and vulnerable living on Budworth Walk.

CONCLUSION

All of the above points have already been taken into consideration in the original report to committee. The recommendation remains as set out in the committee report: Approve subject to conditions.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2nd MARCH 2011

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 10/4702M

LOCATION: 7 Padstow Close, Macclesfield

UPDATE PREPARED 28 February 2011

REPRESENTATIONS

Following the preparation of the report on 17 February 2011, a letter of representation has been received from a neighbour that adjoins the site to the rear at 8, Tintagel Close. The main points raised are summarised below:

- The neighbour objects to the proposal on the grounds that the extension will further restrict the light to the writer's property.
- There is a tree on the boundary of the property which extends the height of the property, which when in leaf takes considerable light off the writer's property.
- An extension, along with the tree would leave the writers property with little natural light throughout the spring and summer.
- If the applicant were to consider greatly reducing the height of the tree, then the writer may reconsider their objection.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

The neighbours comments have been forwarded to the applicant's agent and any comments will be relayed at the Committee meeting.

The distance between the rear of the extension and the objector's house, at 8 Tintagel Close, is approximately 15.5m. Although this is below the guidance contained within Local Plan Policy DC38, it is considered that the proposed extension would result in little further harm, to neighbour amenity. Any further loss of light caused by the proposed extension, to the residents of no. 8 Tintagel Close, would be for a relatively short time period, which would be late on in the day.

CONCLUSION

As stated in the original report on this agenda, it is considered that the impact on neighbouring properties is acceptable. The recommendation remains for one of approval, subject to conditions.