

STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 5 JANUARY 2011

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 10/0346M

LOCATION Woodside Poultry Farm, Stocks Lane, Over Peover

UPDATE PREPARED 4 January 2011

APPLICANTS SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Following the preparation of the report on 17 December 2010, a further meeting has taken place with the applicants to discuss a number of design changes to the proposal. This has resulted in the submission of amended plans which will be presented to Members at Committee.

REPRESENTATIONS

Following the preparation of the report on 17 December 2010, a number of further representations have been received either directly from or on behalf of one of the occupiers of the properties on Stocks Lane that adjoin the site. The main points raised are summarised below:

- Continue to question whether sufficient need exists to justify the proposal, particularly given the recent approval of two housing schemes in Chelford
- Concern that it does not appear that any changes have been made to the layout of the proposal
- Concern that the parallel application for the office development on the site is not being considered on this agenda given the previous request of Committee
- Continue to question the sustainability of the sites location
- Continued concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the amenity of nearby residents
- Continued concern regarding the design and layout of the scheme
- Request that the application be deferred to allow it to be considered at the same time as the office proposal, for the issue of need to be addressed in more detail and to allow further discussions to take place regarding the layout of the proposal
- Consider that the wording of the Heads of Terms should be revised to address concerns regarding the ability of employees of Radbroke Hall to be favoured over local people with a historical or familial connection to the village
- Request that if the Council are minded to approve the application, that this is subject to a unilateral undertaking that the rest of the site should stay undeveloped/green belt for 99 years

OFFICER APPRAISAL

As stated in the report prepared on 17 December 2010, on 8 December 2010 the Board deferred the application to enable the parallel application for the conversion of the retained building to offices (10/3506M) to be considered by the Board at the same time and to allow further discussions to take place with the applicants regarding the overall design and appearance of the proposal.

With regard to the first point, Members will note that unfortunately the parallel application for the office scheme is not on the agenda for the meeting. Whilst officers did attempt to ensure that both reports were ready for the meeting on 5 January 2011, due to some concerns regarding the relationship between the proposed offices and the affordable housing proposed by this application, amended plans are currently being prepared for the office scheme. Rather than delay both applications until such time that amended plans have been received and necessary consultations have taken place, it was decided to bring a report back on the amended housing scheme to the meeting on 5 January 2011 as any further delay to a decision being made on the housing scheme could result in a loss of funding for the scheme. Additionally whilst it would have been preferable for both applications to be considered at the same time, this is not considered essential given that each application needs to be considered independently on their own merits. Consequently it is not considered necessary to defer a decision on this application because the office proposal is not on the same agenda.

In terms of design changes that have been made to the scheme, as previously stated, amended plans have now been received following discussions with officers including the Council's design officer with the changes made to the scheme considered on 8 December 2010 being outlined below:

- Rear elevations of the two storey mews properties have been revised with the number of first floor windows being reduced by half
- Single storey dwelling roof amended from a hip to a gable to match the rest of the houses
- Front doors have been separated from each other for added privacy and improved appearance
- Porches have been revised to single gables
- Alternative construction details have been incorporated to produce more variety and external finishing materials
- Inclusion of hedge defined front boundaries, paths and gates
- Confirmation received that all windows are to be constructed from timber with front doors to be vertically boarded and rear patio doors to be white upvc
- Walls to be constructed in a red multi coloured and textured brick contrasted with two blocks of white painted smooth brick to reflect the varied character of Over Peover. The forms of construction will be different to each other in their detailing
- Engineering brick plinths removed from the design

- Discussions regarding specific brick and roof materials are ongoing but it is likely that a red multi facing brick and a varied colour roof tile or replica slate would be used subject to the receipt of acceptable samples

These changes will be presented to Members at the meeting.

It is considered that the further amendments made have resulted in improvements to the scheme. Whilst some concerns continue to be expressed by an objector to the proposal, it is not considered that these concerns are justified or that these could be sustained. There have been no further changes made to the site layout over and above those previously considered (2m shift of the semis away from the rear boundaries of properties on Stocks Lane). Again, whilst some concern has been expressed regarding the fact that the layout is unchanged, officers consider that the present layout is acceptable and consider that the further amendments that have been made to the design result in an overall improvement to the design and appearance of the scheme.

With regard to other issues raised in representations, each of these will be addressed in turn. In terms of evidence of need, as previously stated in the earlier reports and at previous meetings, officers are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of need to justify the number of dwellings proposed by this application. Whilst the findings of the SHMA have been questioned by third parties, as previously stated, this forms only one part of the evidence base relied upon. Additionally it is not considered that the recent granting of consent for housing in Chelford negates the need for housing in Over Peover. If implemented the two schemes at Chelford would provide 40 affordable dwellings which under the terms of a S106 agreement would in the first instance be made available for those with a connection with Chelford and would then subsequently be cascaded out to nearby parishes. As the Housing Needs Survey for Chelford identified a demand for 56 dwellings (35 hidden households and 21 wishing to return), there is no guarantee that any of these dwellings would become available for those with a connection to Over Peover. Additionally both of these consents were outline consents meaning that it is unlikely that either of these schemes will come forward in the immediate future whereas there is a strong expectation that if approved, the Over Peover scheme will be commenced in the next few months. With regard to ongoing concerns regarding sustainability and impact on amenity, again these issues have previously been addressed in some detail with the removal of some first floor windows in the rear elevation of properties facing towards properties on Stocks Lane improving the amenity situation further. It is not considered that the application should be deferred again as it is not considered that any of the issues raised by third parties would warrant this. In terms of the wording of the Heads of Terms, this is a summary of what issues are to be covered by the S106, the exact wording of which is being prepared in consultation with the applicants, the Housing Department, the Legal Department and the Parish Council. It is not considered that the unilateral undertaking suggested by the objector is either reasonable or necessary as any future applications on the site would need to be considered on their own merits in light of prevailing policy.

CONCLUSION

As previously stated, the reason that this application originally needed to come back before Committee was to address the need for an additional condition regarding protected species. The principle and detail of the proposal was fully considered at the meeting on 15 September 2010 when Members of the Committee were minded to approve the application. At the meeting on 8 December 2010, the application was deferred to enable the parallel application for the conversion of the retained building to offices (10/3506M) to be considered by the Board at the same time and to allow further discussions to take place with the applicants regarding the overall design and appearance of the proposal. Design improvements have been made to the scheme and it is considered that these result in an overall improvement to the design and appearance of the scheme. Unfortunately whilst it has not been possible to prepare a report on the office proposal in time for the meeting, it was decided that rather than delay both applications, the housing scheme should be reconsidered at the next meeting as it is considered acceptable on its own merits and any further delay to the determination of the application could result in a loss of funding for the scheme. The original recommendation of approval therefore remains, subject to some minor amendments to the specific wording of the originally recommended conditions to reflect the details that have been agreed at this stage e.g. timber windows, details of boundary treatment. However, these amendments can be made at the drafting stage and do not require any amendments to condition codes.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – UPDATE REPORT

Planning Reference No:	10/3955N
Application Address:	Tesco, Vernon Way, Crewe
Proposal:	Reserved Matters Application for Erection of Replacement Foodstore (A1 Retail) with Ancillary Café, Associated Parking, Highway Work and Landscaping.
Applicant:	Tesco Stores Ltd.
Application Type:	Reserved Matters
Grid Reference:	370800 355392
Ward:	Crewe East
Earliest Determination Date:	17 th November 2010
Expiry Dated:	10 th January 2010
Constraints:	Settlement Boundary

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

An additional representation has been received. The main points of which are as follows:

- Cheshire East needs to seek updated design and access statement, transport assessment and other documents and to assess them before any decision can be made on approving this proposal in order to protect Public Safety.
- Cheshire East need to seek improvement of Public Transport, in respect of this development. Guidelines in respect of how this may be achieved are given in DfT. PPG 13 Sections 83 to 86 Planning Obligations.
- Public Transport Provision is inadequate to support a store of this magnitude.
- Cheshire East need to review the Bus Services serving Mill Street/Oak Street with a view to improving access to the new store via Public Transport. In view of the possibility of there being two major retail outlets adjacent Oak Street/ Mill Street on this corridor this review is urgent and imperative both to ensure sustainability and reduce the dependence on car usage.
- Cheshire East should seek Developer Contribution to provide additional Bus Stops both inward and outward in Oak Street unless a new frequent service serving Vernon Way (Bus Stops needed) is provided.

- Cheshire East Highways need to examine both Tesco and Sainsbury's schemes together and not individually to ensure that Public Safety, in this case an enhanced Pedestrian Flow from the new Tesco Store is adequately catered for.
- Cheshire East need to ensure that access to the Heritage Centre is upgraded to standards suitable for Pedestrians including the Mobility Impaired to ensure Safe Public Access to the Heritage Centre.
- Cheshire East needs to review urgently as a matter of Public Safety the Pedestrian Access arrangements to the new Tesco Extra Store, both from the Town Centre and the East (incl. Retail Park) via Earl Street. The review should take into account the Mobility Impaired. Developer Contributions should be sought.
- Cheshire East needs to review urgently as a matter of Public Safety the Pedestrian Access arrangements to the new Tesco Extra Store in particular for the Mobility Impaired.
- Cheshire East needs to be clear as to what Pedestrian improvements are required and seek agreement for funding and implementation before the new store opens in the interest of Public Safety.
- Cheshire East need to clarify what provision is to be made for Pedestrians and Cyclists and seek Developer Contribution.
- Cheshire East need to clarify the provisions to be implemented for Pedestrians Cyclists, Mobility Impaired and users of Public Transport to access the new store and seek Developer Contribution where required.
- Cheshire East Highways and Shared Services need to be far more proactive and ensure that the needs of the Public as whole are met including Pedestrians and the Mobility Impaired, with Public Safety their No.1 priority.

OFFICER COMMENT

- Outline planning permission was granted for this development in 2009 and established the acceptability of the increase in retail floorspace on the site, and the increase in traffic that would accompany it.
- The outline application was accompanied by a full traffic impact assessment which considered the Tesco proposal as a stand-alone development as well as the cumulative impact of the Tesco and Sainsbury's scheme.
- The highways department carefully assessed all the supporting information at the time of the previous approval and determined that there would be no adverse impacts in terms of traffic generation or highway safety subject to the imposition of suitable conditions and legal

agreements which included a contribution of £55,000 towards cycling improvements within the town centre, a travel plan and various other highway works and pedestrian / cycle improvements such as signage.

- The adjacent Sainsbury's scheme is also subject to conditions to provide further improvements within the vicinity.
- The highways department have examined the detailed site layout as part of this reserved matters application and raised no objections on safety grounds.
- It is not therefore considered that a refusal on highways grounds could be sustained.