



Southern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 25th January, 2012
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe
CW1 2BJ

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

Updates (Pages 1 - 10)

Please contact Julie Zientek on 01270 686466
E-Mail: 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

APPLICATION NO: 11/4222N

PROPOSAL: Proposed extension of existing Industrial Building and enlargement of rear parking and vehicle turning area.

ADDRESS: PRG Engineering, Lightwood Green Avenue, Audlem

REPRESENTATIONS

Additional comments received from the Strategic Highways Manager. The salient points being:

- This is an existing operation so the precedent of heavy traffic to and from the premises is set
- The application seeks to provide access and turning into and within the site for the existing commercial buildings. Currently they can cause congestion on the public highway and there is merit in highways terms over the current arrangements.
- The proposals make good sense and would provide betterment in highways terms
- Widening of the access can be carried out under section 184 license
- An additional plan showing access detail and turning movements would be useful.
- No highways objections

KEY ISSUES

No additional highways issues raised.

An additional plan of turning movements has been requested from the applicant's agent and details of which will be made available at Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation

APPLICATION NO: 11/4466C

PROPOSAL: Installation of 21m High Monopole Telecommunication Tower Incorporating 6No. 3G Antennas and Associated Headframe. 1No. Equipment Cabinet, 1No. Meter Cabinet and all Ancillary Development

ADDRESS: Little Moss Farm, Priory Close, Congleton

REPRESENTATIONS

A further 17 letters of objection have been received since the date of the main report was written, the main issues raised in these objections are,

- Proximity to local school, and residential properties,
- Health risks
- Impact on Congleton Edge/Green Belt, Visual amenity
- Inaccuracies on the plans and site specific supporting information,
- 11/3788C for holiday lets the two applications are not compatible with each other,
- Mast will appear 6m higher than adjacent tree coverage,
- Outside the designated search area,
- Is there an essential need for the development in this area, only a small catchment area will have improved 3G signal,
- Town Council have raised no objections subject to the tower being disguised, questions raised how this is possible given it will be over 6m higher than tree coverage and further tree growth would affect the operational viability of the site,
- Devaluing house prices,
- Insufficient consultation carried out,
- Nearby application at Biddulph Road and Boundary Lane was refused due to visual amenity,
- Warrington Council refused an application on appearing as an 'alien feature' and health impact on local primary school within proximity 200m,

A letter of objection has been received from Fiona Bruce MP the main issues raised on the grounds that the proposal is clearly of concern to the neighbourhood.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The issues raised with regards to the health risk of the mast have been dealt with in the main officer report and therefore will not be re-addressed in this update report. With regards to the application noted from Warrington Council this application (reference number 2011/17847) was refused for the proposed demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the local area by reason of its height, size and prominence in the streetscene. The reason for decision makes no reference to

health implication to the local school. This application went to appeal where it was dismissed, however the Inspector who made the decision noted that many residents had raised issues in relation to impact on health and safety, the Inspector stated that the mast met ICNIRP guidelines in line with Planning Policy Guidance 8 – Telecommunications, and therefore was acceptable in planning terms. Notwithstanding this appeal decision, each application must be dealt with on its own merits and as noted previously this application meets the ICNIRP guidelines and is therefore acceptable and in line with both Local and National Government policies on health and safety.

The proposed mast will be sited 160m away from the Mossley Church of England Primary School. There are no distance requirements for masts to be sited a certain distance from schools or residential properties. The mast meets the ICNIRP guidelines. As noted in the main report this application site has been chosen from several others as the most suitable in operational and suitability terms. The siting of this mast is removed from the large population of the designated search area and is therefore considered to be suitable in this instance.

For clarification the mast will be sited to the south west of the site behind the tree coverage but still within an area of hardstanding to the farm. The mast will be viewed in the context of the urban area when viewed from the Green Belt area and with suitable camouflage the mast will not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area. It is suggested that different colours are used to disguise the mast to lessen the impact on the views. Details of possible colour considerations are still awaited from the applicant, and may be conditioned if not received prior to the determination of the application at the committee meeting. It is therefore considered that the proposed mast will not have a significant impact on the Green Belt.

Planning application 11/3788C which seeks to convert the existing redundant farm buildings into Holiday Cottages at Little Moss Farm is a separate planning consideration. As noted above there are no limitations on the distance from residential properties for which masts can be constructed and therefore it is not considered that the decision made on application 11/3788C (when made) will have any impact on the siting of the mast.

As noted within the main report a detailed consideration of alternative sites has been carried out by the applicant. The coverage plots submitted with the application highlight a need for improved 3G signal in the area for both O2 and Vodafone. Given the Government guidance which aims to facilitate new telecommunications development it is accepted that there is a need for the mast within close proximity to the designated Search Area.

As noted within the main report the devaluation of house prices is not material planning considerations.

As noted in the main report the consultation for this application was carried out in accordance with the Councils Publicity and Neighbour Notification procedure, this included consultation of all neighbours within 100m radius of the site, site notice at the site and an advertisement in the local newspaper.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval subject to condition remains

Condition 2 – amended to require details of colour to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

APPLICATION NO: 11/4371N

PROPOSAL: Two Detached Properties

ADDRESS: Land off, Monks Lane, Hankelow

AMENDED PLAN

The applicant has submitted an amended plan showing the proposed visibility splays. Colleagues from Highways have inspected the plans and confirm that they have no objection to the proposal.

REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of objection received from the occupiers of Abbots Lodge and Oak Cottage. The salient points raised in the letters of objection are as follows:

- The proposal is outside the settlement boundary and the application site due to its site does not comprise an infill gap. The proposal due to the size of the plots will appear out of place;
- The road access to the site is not satisfactory and the proposal will have a detrimental impact on highway safety;
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, resulting in a loss of privacy and over shadowing;
- The application states that the site has limited use as a small paddock. The only reason it is the size is, because the applicant has altered the boundaries;
- The applicant had planning permission refused for a similar application approximately 18 years ago;
- There is no tradition of infill on Monks Lane. The last property to be built was Abbots Lodge built in 1990 to replace a mobile home which was an agricultural workers dwelling since the early 1970's.
- The proposal does not respect the building line.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

- It is noted that due to the size of the gap the proposal does not constitute an infill gap;
- The Highways Engineers have commented on the application and state that they have no objections to the proposal. Therefore, there is insufficient justification to warrant a refusal and sustain it at any future appeal;
- It is considered given the separation distances, orientation and boundary treatment are sufficient to mitigate any negative externalities caused by the proposal. Furthermore, the application is in outline format with all matters reserved apart from access and layout. The design of the proposed dwellings including the location of the windows would be considered at the reserved matters stage.

Addendum to the Design and Access Statement

The applicant has submitted an amended Design and Access Statement which states:

- The applicant has a pre-application meeting with officers from the Highways Department and they had no objection to the proposal;
- Furthermore, the Parish Council has received additional funding to reduce the speed limit through the village from 60mph to 40mph;
- The proposal seems a logical extension of the building line and sits comfortably within the existing built form;
- The proposal is completely different to 11/4228N (202 Crewe Road, Haslington) which was recently refused by Members. This application was for three properties and was more of a garden land. The proposal will have similar plot sizes to the neighbouring properties and is only for two properties;
- Another site in Hatherton sited that the Inspector gave weight to the relatively wide spacing of the other existing dwellings in the frontage and the fact that the properties shared a building line. The gap between the neighbouring dwellings at the Hatherton site was 60m and the Inspector considered that this site did form a small gap and the application was subsequently approved.

RECOMMENDATION: The recommendation for refusal stills stands. All the matters highlighted above have been considered as part of the officer's report.

APPLICATION NO: 11/4598C

PROPOSAL: Double Storey Side extension

ADDRESS: 3 Shorthorn Close Middlewich

FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Since the initial report, further neighbour objections have been received and the issues are summarised below:

- Parking – Existing parking problems with the owner parking vehicles in the turning circle which creates difficulty when entering/exiting the close. The proposal will increase the number of vehicles at the property and the road isn't big enough to accommodate more vehicles.
- A caravan is permanently parked on the driveway
- Concern that the parking situation would adversely affect the garden of number 15 White Park Close with vehicles parking on the lawn.
- Reduction of light to 8 Longhorn Close and change of outlook from the house. The proposal would make their property less desirable should they wish to sell.
- Loss of privacy to number 15 White Park Close – a window is proposed to the side directly opposite number 15. With the proposal so close to the boundary this will severely compromise privacy with a direct and close view into the bedrooms and gardens if this window is opened. The front elevation would see directly into the garden, again compromising privacy.
- Loss of daylight to number 15 White Park Close – the proposed build is close to the boundary and will affect the outlook and daylight of the lower level rooms and garden.
- Loss of privacy and outlook to number 6 Longhorn Close due to size and closeness to the property.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking to garden and property of number 11 White Park Close due to the layout of the extension and proposed side window. Extension in extremely close proximity to the boundary fence.
- The proposal is out of character with the Kinderton Manor estate – whilst the estate does contain a number of different types of property there is a consistency in the aesthetic which the proposal would break.
- The development will add a claustrophobic feel to Shorthorn Close.
- Falsification and not providing the full facts in the application form i.e. (i) section 5 – the existing highway will have to be altered due to the introduction of a further 2 parking spaces (ii) section 7
- Design – oversized , disproportionate to surrounding properties and lack of detail to side elevation which would be a mass of brickwork
- The property already has a large conservatory and the gain on square footage would be excessive from the original footprint.

- Many other properties in the estate have converted their garage into living accommodation. Would there be any conditions to prevent this in future?
- What porous materials and/or drainage system would be implemented in the parking area?

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Design

Revised plans have been submitted following discussions with the applicant to improve the design of the dormer windows. The large single dormers to the front and rear have now been replaced with 2No smaller dormer windows which would relate well with the existing window features on the dwelling. The size of the proposed dormers are in proportion with the size of the extension which is subordinate to the host dwelling. It is noted that there have been several neighbour objections in relation to the design of the proposal and the view that it is not in-keeping with Shorthorn Close or the Kinderton Estate. The revised proposal however is considered to be acceptable in design terms and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The side elevation would have 2No windows which would add to the visual interest, however it is not considered that any further detailing would be required given the scale and reduce height of the extension to the main dwelling, and existing boundary treatments which would screen the lower part of the development.

The proposal would comply with Local Plan policy GR2 (Design) which seeks, amongst other things, that proposals are sympathetic to the character, appearance and form of the site and surroundings.

Amenity

A key consideration is the impact of the proposal on the property sited directly to the rear of the proposed development, number 6 Longhorn Close. Whilst the previous report stated that this property was around 21 metres from the proposal, the actual distance would be around **18 metres**. The proposal does fall short of the guidance contained within SPG2 which recommends a spacing of 21.3 metres between directly facing dwellings. The reduction of 3.3 metres however, would not result in an unduly detrimental impact on number 6 Longhorn Close by reason of over-looking or loss of privacy, and would not warrant refusal of the application.

An objection has been received from neighbouring property number 8 Longhorn Close with reference to the size of the proposed extension, loss of light, change of outlook and views, and reduction in the desirability of the property. The proposal would not be directly facing number 8 Longhorn Close as it is offset and also around **18 metres** in distance (The previous report stated that the separation distance was 20 metres however this was incorrect). The proposed extension would not be directly facing number 8 Longhorn Close and would be located at a sufficient distance so as not to result in any significant loss of light issues. Whilst the proposal would be visible from the rear gardens of these aforementioned properties, the proposal would not be oppressive or visually intrusive.

In terms of number 15 White Park Close, the rear elevation of this property would face the side elevation of the proposed extension. There would be a separation distance of around 16 metres which exceeds the guidance standard of 13.8 metres between main windows and a flank wall, as contained in SPG2. Whilst there are 2 windows proposed in the side elevation, these would be relatively small and would serve a bathroom. A condition would be attached for these windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening, and as such there would be no loss of privacy or overlooking issues. Given the orientation of the properties with the proposal being to the north of number 15 there would be no adverse loss of light or overshadowing impacts.

An objection has been received from number 11 White Park Close in relation to loss of privacy, overlooking and the proximity of the extension to the boundary fence. The proposed extension would not be directly facing this property and would be sited some 16 metres in distance. As such there would be no significant overlooking or loss of privacy impacts on this property, however it should be noted that the proposed window to the side elevation would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening. The extension would not be any closer to the boundary fence than the existing garage footprint.

In amenity terms the proposal would not result in any unduly detrimental impact to neighbouring properties and is therefore in accordance with Local Plan policy GR6 (Amenity and Health).

Parking

In order to ensure that sufficient parking is retained for the development, having regard to the increase in bedrooms to 5, a condition would be attached to prevent the garage from being converted without the benefit of planning permission. The proposal would comply with Local Plan policy GR9 (Accessibility, Servicing and Parking Provision).

Other Matters Raised

Application Form

It has been raised that a number of sections within the application form have been filled in incorrectly. This does not however impact on the development proposed on the submitted plans.

Excessive Increase in Footprint

There are no specific size increase limits on dwellings within the settlement boundary. Each application is judged on its own merits taking into account material planning considerations.

Business Use at the property

A number of objections have referred to an existing business being run from the property which generates a variable volume of cars. This matter has been referred to

enforcement for further investigation, but would not materially impact on this application.

Sustainable Urban Drainage

The application seeks to provide 2No parking spaces within front garden area. No details of SUDs have been provided within the application, however it should be noted the parking area would not occupy the full extent of the garden. Furthermore a condition would be attached to ensure that the hard-surfacing material used would be porous.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

The proposal would not be unduly detrimental to neighbouring residential amenity by reason of overlooking, visual intrusion or loss of light. Sufficient parking provision for 4No vehicles would be retained within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The revised proposal would be acceptable in design terms and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Recommendation: Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Time
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials to Match host Dwelling
4. Garage to be retained for parking of motor vehicles and not converted to living accommodation or business
5. Hard-surfacing material for parking area to be porous
6. Side window to be obscure glazed and non-opening