

# Northern Planning Committee

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 15th August, 2012  
**Time:** 2.00 pm  
**Venue:** The Assembly Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

---

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

**Planning Updates** (Pages 1 - 16)

---

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462  
E-Mail: [sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto: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

**UPDATE TO AGENDA – NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE 15**  
**AUGUST 2012**

**APPLICATION NO: 12/1361m**

**LOCATION: FESTIVAL HALL, STAMFORD ROAD , ALDERLEY EDGE**  
**UPDATE PREPARED 13 AUGUST 2012**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

The Applicant has provided an additional streetscene elevation to demonstrate the relationship of the proposed front extension with the adjoining residential property .This is attached to this update.

It has also been confirmed that 2 telecoms masts will be removed from the site to facilitate the development. The Applicant has confirmed that the lease for these items has expired.

**FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

The neighbouring resident has asked for clarification of the separation distance between the boundary of their property and the side elevation of the proposed side extension for the medical practise. Within the report it is erroneously stated as being circa 2m closer to the boundary than the existing. The distance is circa 3.8m closer to the boundary than the existing Festival Foyer/side elevation of the Festival Hall closest to the boundary.

The assessment of the amenity implications of this extension and the suggested conditions remains as contained in the Officers report.

**ADDITIONAL POLICY CONSIDERATION**

Members need to be aware that the site is located in close proximity to the Alderley Edge Conservation Area. The boundary of the Conservation Area is located within the housing area opposite the site. The Conservation Area is mainly focused on the later Edwardian development of Alderley Edge arranged around the railway station. It is domestic in scale, in the immediate vicinity (opposite side of Stamford Road and turning the corner into Trafford Road turning away from the site) of the site , it is characterized by semi-detached and detached type villa development, which remain mainly in residential use.

Within the context of the sites proximity to the Conservation Area, consideration must be afforded to the matters of height bulk, materials, colour and design. These matters have previously been considered within the Report, with the exception of colour. The colour of the bricks/roof covering to be used are recommended to be controlled by condition.

The proposed front extension for the medical practice is a sizeable extension to the frontage of the Festival Hall which will come forward within the forecourt of the site to the back of the public highway on Talbot Road. It will therefore bring the building frontage closer to the boundary with the Conservation Area.

Policy BE3 of the Local Plan states that development will only be permitted in or adjoining a conservation area which preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area. Special attention will be paid to matters of bulk,height. Materials, colour and design.

The consideration of the proposal on the impact on the streetscene within the report is therefore relevant to the implications of the proposal to the character and appearance of the Alderley Edge Conservation Area and consideration should be given to Policy BE3 of the Plan.

As noted in the committee report, the impact of the development in the streetscene is considered to be acceptable. There will not be an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, particularly noting that views of the development from within the public realm of the Conservation Area are limited.

The proposal, it is considered, will create its own civic identity within this corner site, which is considered to be a community focused area, with land uses in the main being public uses (eg the allotments, the Scout Hut , St Pius Church). This will assist in defining the different characters of this area and the Conservation Area opposite.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval as specified on page 22 of the Committee Report.

PLANNING



PROPOSED STREET SCENE, TALBOT ROAD 1:200 @ A3

EMERSON HOUSE, HEYES LANE,  
ALDERLEY EDGE,  
CHESHIRE SK9 7LF  
Tel: (01625) 588400. Fax: (01625) 588276

**EMERSON**  
Architectural Services

location  
PROPOSED MEDICAL CENTRE  
FESTIVAL HALL ALDERLEY EDGE

title  
PROPOSED STREET SCENE,  
TALBOT ROAD

scale 1:200 @ A3	ref	checked	date 03-04-2012
---------------------	-----	---------	--------------------

drawing no. FEST-PL-2009
-----------------------------

This page is intentionally left blank

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 August 2012**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

12/1532M

**LOCATION**

Land off Trouthall Lane, Plumley

**UPDATE PREPARED**

13 August 2012

**CONSULTEES**

Further comments have been submitted by the Parish Council following the submission of additional details since their original comments. They state:

The proposal is still not acceptable in principle, although some detail changes have been made. The applicants have still not provided any proof that there is a community need for the proposed houses; the Parish Council requested information such as the names and addresses of the proposed tenants, and why they need to live in Plumley on the 31st May, but Cheshire Peaks and Plains have not provided this information as yet. The site is Green Belt, Green Field, next to a Listed Building, and far too small for eight properties. No attempt has been made to consider other sites. The design and density of the development is not in keeping with the village, or the street scene and there is no provision for additional public space of which Plumley is already lacking. We do not see any reason to revise or remove our objections to the proposal.

Leisure Services - The Proposed development triggers the requirement for the provision of open space and in lieu of on site provision, as the site is unsuitable for the provision on of onsite public play and amenity facilities, a commuted sum for offsite provision will be required.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A letter of support has been received from a local resident / business owner noting that:

- Of the 200 homes in Plumley at least 120 (60%) been built post 1945
- Many upgraded to high standards
- Property prices have inflated as a result
- Local people have been priced out of market
- Increase in local community will increase trade for local businesses
- In the right place, moderate developments can only enhance the village life both now and in the future.

At the time of writing, 10 further letters have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- No attempt made to use renewable energy
- Inadequate car parking
- Appear to be no measures in place to avoid contamination of the watercourse
- Hedgerow survey undertaken by the developers took place outside the recommended time period for vegetation surveys and is inaccurate
- Wheelie bins are now likely to impede both the carriageway and sightlines
- Housing needs survey out of date
- Cascading shows there is no community need
- Not considered other sites
- Design and density out of keeping
- The proposed 6 metre sewer easement has been marked incorrectly on the plans
- Officer report to the Committee states that the setting of the listed building was not specifically mentioned in its listing. The setting does not have to be specifically noted when the building is listed the setting automatically forms part of the building.
- The housing will be at a considerably higher density than anything else in the Plumley area and will detract from the character of the locality
- Cascade Provision allows anybody who resides in East Cheshire to take residence in one of the proposed homes which is in direct conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework when related to Green Belt development.
- Insufficient need
- No letters of support on the website
- Detrimental to evidential and aesthetic value of Malt Kiln Farm (a heritage asset)
- Views to the north and north east of building disregarded in submitted statement
- Impact Assessment should be amended to assess the implications of the proposed development falling within the “curtilage” of the Grade II listed building.
- The removal of a large section of hedgerow will undermine the green network on site which currently offers a wide range of ecological benefits
- The application, considering the size of the local community, is more than a small scheme, not least because of the number of houses, but also because of its impact on the neighbouring properties, the openness of the Green Belt and the local ecology
- Although information has been requested to publically substantiate that the affordable houses are for the local community as defined in the NPPF, none has been provided
- The Cascade Conditions identify that potentially any resident in the Cheshire East borough could be eligible for affordable housing in Plumley. This contradicts the NPPF and Interim Planning Statement On Affordable Housing



- There are 27 existing affordable houses in Plumley, which do become available. What part do these properties play in satisfying the local community need before further developments are considered?
- Apart from a "drop in" session in April, 2012, there has been no consultation, as defined within the Localism Act and the NPPF, with the community to seek their views on an ongoing basis as the housing scheme was developed.

An ecological survey has been submitted on behalf of local residents. In summary this concludes:

- A full hedgerow survey should be carried out prior to the determination of planning in order to establish the importance of the hedgerows on site.
- The development and on-going use of the site has the potential to disturb any bat roost in a tree at the north west of the site (if present). Further survey work should be carried out prior to determination of planning in order to determine whether the tree is used by roosting bats.
- Further survey work should be carried out in order to establish the level of use of the hedgerows by commuting and foraging bats. The development has the potential to disturb bats using the hedgerows.
- Emergence and return to roost surveys of the timber shelter / structure on site should be carried out prior to the determination of planning. As the structure has been identified as a bat roost the surveys should determine the level of use of the roost, the type of roost and the species present.
- Prior to determination of planning further survey work is necessary in order to determine the presence or absence of GCN in proximate ponds.
- Further survey works are necessary prior to determination of planning in order to establish presence or absence of water voles.
- The shed in the northeast corner of the site has two nests in the roof structure; breeding birds will need to be considered prior to any planned demolition of the structure or works within close proximity of the nesting sites.

## **KEY ISSUES**

### **Principle of Affordable Housing in this location**

Representations suggest that this is not a small scheme, and therefore does not qualify as a rural exception site. The NPPF does not define what qualifies as a "small site". This is a proposal for 8 dwellings on a site area of just over 0.2 hectares. This is considered to be a small site in the context of Plumley village.

The development seeks to meet the local community need identified in the original committee report. The cascade provision is required to ensure that the homes do not stand empty in the future and meet the needs of the local community first.

There are 27 affordable homes (managed by Peaks & Plains) in Plumley, Toft and Bexton and there are 314 homes in this area. It is understood that since Cheshire Homechoice formed in April 2010 there have been 4 affordable homes that have become available. However 2 of these are homes that have a further restricted occupancy (for over 55's). The Strategic Housing Market Assessment, although not providing details down to a Parish level, gives the net affordable housing need for the Knutsford rural sub area and takes into account the expected turnover of existing stock. Therefore, whilst the availability and turnover of existing homes in the parishes assists it does not meet the need requirement.

### **Character and design**

One of the letters of representation states that the housing will be at a considerably higher density than anything else in the Plumley area and will detract from the character of the locality, contrary to what is noted in the Committee report. This density concern is acknowledged, however, it is dependent on how the density of existing properties is measured. Whilst the specific reference to density might have been misleading in the original report, the key point to make is that there are other terraced properties close by, and such a form of housing is not out of keeping with the local area.

### **Setting of listed building**

Having regard to the information submitted, the Conservation Officer is satisfied that significance and setting of the neighbouring Grade II Listed building would not be significantly affected by the proposal.

As noted in the original report, the materials will contribute greatly to the visual success of the scheme. The applicants have raised initial concern that timber windows may well affect their secure by design scores and code strategy rating. No further details have been received at this time, but a revision to condition 10 is recommended to now require window materials to be submitted and approved in order to allow for alternatives to be considered if necessary.

### **Ecology**

At the time of writing the author of the ecological assessment was unknown. The name of the fieldworker/author of the report is required to ensure that they are suitably qualified to carry out surveys of this nature. This information has been requested.

The ecological assessment submitted on behalf of local residents is at odds with the assessment submitted by the applicant in terms of the number of native woody species present in the hedgerow to be removed. Subsequently, the assessments differ in whether the hedgerow is classified as "important" under the hedgerow regulations. This matter will be the subject to further investigation and will be reported to members as a verbal update.

The nature conservation officer advises that from a superficial inspection the building on site appeared to have only limited potential to support roosting bats. The ecological assessment submitted by the local residents however

states that there is evidence of roosting brown long eared bats being present. Despite the nature of building not being obviously suited to roosting bats, bats do turn up in unlikely places from time to time so a detailed bat survey and mitigation/compensation measures for the loss of this roost may be required if the report of a roost is reliable.

However, as with the hedgerows assessment the results of the survey submitted by the local residents cannot be given any weight until the details of the person who undertook this assessment are provided. Without this information it is impossible for the Council to determine the validity of the bat survey results.

The likelihood of great crested newts occurring within the two ponds that have habitat links with the proposed development site has been considered by the nature conservation officer, as well as the likelihood of great crested newts being present on the proposed development site. His view is that great crested newts are not reasonably likely to be present on the site or affected by the proposed development. No further survey for this species is required.

He also advises that water voles are not reasonably likely to occur at the stream to the north of the site. However as per his previous comments the stream should be protected by an 8m buffer.

### **Leisure Provision**

Leisure Services have confirmed that the required commuted sum of £24,000 would be used towards works of addition, improvement and enhancement at the existing open space and play facilities at Moorcroft. However, should there be a new and appropriate open space / play facility within Plumley at the time of receipt, the council may choose to direct some or all of the commuted sum for the purpose of additions, improvements and enhancements at this new facility subject to the long term security and maintenance of the new facility.

### **Other considerations**

It is acknowledged that pre-application consultation with the local community is good practice for developers. Whilst there are no prescribed consultation requirements for a development of this scale within the Localism Act or the NPPF in this case a community drop in event was carried out in April 2012.

Comments relating to the accuracy of the sewer easement on the plans are noted, however, United Utilities have raised no objections to the proposal. For the avoidance of any doubt it is suggested that this detail could be added to the requirements for the submission of drainage details under condition 9.

### **Correction**

In the first line of the second paragraph on page 32 of the agenda "Ollerton" is mentioned. This should read "Plumley".

Similarly, in the conclusion on page 38 (first line) where it refers to "Ollerton with Marthall", this should read "Plumley with Toft & Bexton".

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The ecological assessment raises some issues not identified in the applicant's assessment. However, as noted above, until the author is known, the amount of weight to attach to it cannot be determined. If the report of a bat roost is reliable, then further information may be required prior to a decision being made. Officers have requested this matter to be clarified and Members will be updated at the committee meeting.

In the event that the application proceeds with a recommendation of approval, subject to conditions and unilateral undertaking, as noted above, a small amendment to condition 10 is proposed:

### **Conditions**

10. Window and door materials to be submitted

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 AUGUST 2012**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO: 12/0596M**

**LOCATION Mobberley Golf Club, Burleyhurst Lane**

**UPDATE PREPARED 13 August 2012**

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Strategic Highways and Transportation Manager:** no objections.

**Forestry:** the Council's forestry officer has considered the additional information submitted by the applicant in relation to the relationship between the proposed detached garage and existing boundary hedging and trees. A 'no dig' construction method is proposed and having regard to this, the forestry officer raises no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL**

**Mobberley Parish Council:** an additional response has been received from Mobberley Parish Council re-iterating that they have no objections in principle to the proposal subject to a S106 legal agreement linking the proposed house to the retained golf course and preventing implementation of this proposal together with other extant permissions.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

An additional representation has been received from the occupiers of Hollingee Farm who state that they support the building of the proposed Manor House if this will ensure that the driving range is not built. This support is subject to appropriate safeguards being put in place ensuring that previous conditions are attached, any conditions for building in the Green Belt are adhered to and that previous permissions are forfeited.

**OFFICER APPRAISAL**

None of the additional comments received raise any new issues that were not considered in the original report. The forestry officer has confirmed that there are no objections to the proposal on tree grounds and as such, the original recommendation of refusal for two reasons remains.

**CONCLUSION**

The original recommendation of REFUSAL remains as stated in the original report.

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 AUGUST 2012**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO: 12/2073M**

**LOCATION 22, 24, 26 & 36 CASTLE STREET; 25, 25B & 25C  
CASTLE STREET MALL; MACCLESFIELD**

**UPDATE PREPARED 13 August 2012**

**OFFICER REPORT**

Further to the original committee report in which reference is made under the Public Realm section to the tests in circular 5/05 these have been superseded by para 204 of The Framework however the wording of these tests remains the same.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Letter of support received from 58 Paradise Street which states that it is a sensible approach to re-use an existing empty building within the town centre, whilst keeping the attractive and characterful façade, extending the shopping centre within the town centre would re-inject some life into the town centre and seems much more in keeping with the character of the town.

Response from agent to letter of representation from Macclesfield Civic Society which states that it is difficult to impress the level of quality of detailing, and the materials to be employed, in the drawings. The intent is to use materials which complement the palette employed on the former Cheshire Building Society premises using crisp modern and sharp detailing which provides a dialogue with the rhythm of the bays in the architecture of the Grosvenor Centre. The new façade also picks up on the scale and sub division of the elements from either buildings by breaks in or changes in the materials employed. It is intended to lift the quality of the overall build onto Castle Street.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Strategic Highways Manager:

This application proposes the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a replacement building that will have retail floorspace on the ground floor and office space above.

With regard to floorspace proposed , the existing site has 1,694 Sq.m of retail and 3,995 Sq.m of office and if this is compared to the new proposal of 3,975 Sq.m retail and 1,446 Sq.m office, then there is a significant reduction in office floorspace in this application.

Whilst the retail element of the scheme has increased, this will not have a material highway impact but the reduction in office has a beneficial effect of reducing office trips on the road network. With regard to parking, there is no change in circumstances as the existing development does not provide any off-street car parking and this will not change with this application.

Therefore, this application will not increase traffic levels on the local highway network but will also have a beneficial effect in reducing the amount of trips associated with the office floorspace, as such no highway objections are raised to the application.

## **CONCLUSION**

The comments received from the Strategic Highways manager are consistent with the contents of the officer's report.

As noted in the committee report on p59 / 60, amended plans are awaited to ensure an improved active frontage to Castle Street and Churchill Way.

Amended plans were not received at the time of writing this update report, as such the recommendation is now to delegate the application to the Development Management and Building Control Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, to approve subject the receipt of amended plans and a financial contribution towards environmental improvements within Macclesfield Town Centre and subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard Time Limit 3 years
2. Submission of Materials
3. Approved Plans
4. Submission of detailed elevational and cross sectional drawings of windows
5. No further subdivision or amalgamation of the new retail units unless a further planning application has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
6. No films or transfers shall be attached to the windows internally or externally without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority
7. Details of renewable energy measures to provide for a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy requirements of the development
8. Details of finish and construction materials for rainwater goods to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
9. Prior to the commencement of any internal alterations details of a photographic record of the internal subdivisions of the building shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority



10. Drainage details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This page is intentionally left blank