

Application No: **10/3339N**

Location: **Reaseheath College, Main Road, Worleston, CW5 6DF**

Proposal: **Proposed Extension and Alterations to Provide Extended Catering Facilities, including an Enlarged Kitchen and additional Dining for Students and Staff**

Applicant: **Reaseheath College- Mr M Embrey**

Expiry Date: **24-Nov-2010**

Ward **Cholmondeley**

Date Report Prepared: 31 December 2010

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Subject to Conditions and Subject to Section 106 Agreement

MAIN ISSUES

Impact of the Development on:-

- **Principle of Development**
- **Impact of the Development on the Campus and the Conservation Area**
- **Highways**
- **Ecology**
- **Archaeology**
- **Trees/ Landscape**
- **Other Matters**

REASON FOR REFERRAL

This application is to be determined by the Southern Area Planning Committee as the application would need to be accompanied by a legal agreement to secure a commuted sum payment as a contribution to the cost of delivery of the Crewe-Nantwich Cycle route known as the Connect 2 scheme.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

Reaseheath College is located in the open countryside just north of Nantwich. The principal vehicular access is from B 5074 Nantwich – Winsford Road (on the east side of the college). Secondary vehicular accesses are obtained from the A51 to the south of the college and Poole Lane.

Part of the campus is sited within the Reaseheath Conservation Area. Reaseheath Conservation Area extends from the group of dwellings and buildings on the A51 into the college grounds. The site the subject of this application is within the Conservation Area boundary however the majority of the built form of the college lies outside of the Conservation Area.

There is a scheduled monument (earthwork) which lies within open land to the east of the college and a listed building (Reaseheath Old Hall) sited to the west of the complex. These would be unaffected by the proposals.

The application site comprises the access track from Winsford Road and the existing hall catering services within Reaseheath Hall and linking with the Lord Woolley Sports Hall, Jodrell (residential) Hall and the Jim Humphreys Building.

The application site is surrounded by other college buildings to the north and east however to the south and west lies a large lake and the core of the Conservation Area which remains largely undeveloped.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Reaseheath Redevelopment Proposals

Reaseheath College has been undertaking a campus redevelopment. In 2007 the second phase of the development was completed and comprised a new Learning Resource Centre/ Welcome Building (Centrepont) and an Engineering Academy. In 2008 the 3rd phase of the development achieved planning consent.

This related to:

- New student hub with dining, retail and student amenity facilities, (HUB) P08/1126;
- New horticulture department, P08/ 1142;
- A new animal management centre P08/1136;
- New food processing department, P08/1134;
- Minor alterations to form a new farm interpretation centre, P08/1140;
- New horticulture and animal management training and education resource, (HAMSTER) P08/1129; and
- New facilities for arboriculture, construction and engineering (ACE) P09/0025

Many aspects of the Phase 3 proposals are on hold due to lack of Learning Skills Council (LSC) support. As such, Phase 4 will involve the completion of the Food Centre of Excellence (due for completion in spring 2011) and Phase 5 relates to the refurbishment and extension of existing facilities rather than the provision of replacement and new buildings.

Site Specific Proposals

In respect of the application site the student HUB building proposed under P08/1126 was dependent on LSC funding which the college was unable to secure. As such a scaled down version of the scheme relating to the extension and refurbishment of the existing facilities is proposed under this application as part of Phase 5.

The proposals under P08/1126 included the demolition of the Cross College Foundation Block, the Harvester Coffee Shop, single storey dining hall, and associated circulation space. Internal alterations would also have taken place and recladding of the Lord Woolley Building. The replacement building would have linked to the Jim Humphreys building but all other alterations of that building would have been internal works. New development included an entrance hall

with circulation space, coffee shop, double height dining room and refectory, new kitchen and upper holding kitchen and related facilities.

The dining facilities would have been a two storey space curving out from the rear of the existing dining hall area in an arc around retained trees to look over the grounds towards the lake. At the rear, this development would have been single storey. It would have linked to the single and two storey buildings which were to be retained. The curved dining area would have been constructed in glass with timber posts and cladding. The remaining areas would have been constructed in white render to match other new buildings recently constructed.

The proposals under this application have been significantly reduced in scale; the demolition of the Cross College Foundation Block, the Harvester Coffee Shop, single storey dining hall, and associated circulation space are no longer required as the two storey dining facilities have been removed from the proposals.

Instead, it is proposed to renovate and extend the existing facilities rather than completely rebuild them. The refurbishment would relate to the existing catering department, Greenways Dining Room and Harvester Coffee Shop to provide a kitchen and servery, internal and external seating areas, café and shop. Single storey extensions would be added and the footprints of these would be sited on some existing areas of landscaping. One area would be in-between the Greenways Dining Room and the kitchen to provide extended kitchen facilities. A further extension is proposed within the existing courtyard between Jodrell Hall and Greenways Dining Room to provide internal and external seating areas. A further external seating area and a paved entrance point would be provided to the south-east elevation in-between the Main Hall and the Lecture Hall. The proposals would continue to be linked to the Lord Woolley Sports Hall, Jodrell (residential) Hall and the Jim Humphreys Building.

The above would result in some changes to the external appearance of the buildings. The Harvester Coffee Shop footprint would remain the same however the existing walls would be increased in height and a new flat roof with a canopy would be provided. This would replace the existing hipped roof. The existing doors and windows would also be removed and larger glazed openings provided. On the north-western elevation a new kiosk and shop entrance would be provided, and there would be a mono pitch roof and glazed atrium to the indoor seating area to the south-east and north-east elevations.

RELEVANT HISTORY

There have been well over 30 applications submitted on the site since 2006. In addition to those noted above the following are relevant to the proposals:

P09/0025 Removal of Gas Cylinder And Erection of New Shed for Teaching Accommodation and Storage Extensions for Teaching Office and Storage Space (resubmission of P08/1130) Approved 11/03/2009

09/1155N Demolition of the Cross College Building including Student Union Office Approved 5/6/2009

09/2160N Refurbishment and Extension of the Existing Food Processing Department to Accommodate New Student Training Facility Approved 22/9/2009

09/2675N Demolition of Single Storey Teaching/ Amenity Block and Erection of a New Two Storey Food Centre of Excellence to Facilitate Business Innovation and Research Areas Approved 15/12/2009

10/0279N Demolition of Single Storey Teaching/Amenity Block and Erection of New Two Storey Food Centre of Excellence for Business and Research Use Approved 16/4/2010 (this increased the approved floor area by 200 sq. m)

POLICIES

The development plan includes the North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy 2021 (RSS) and the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

The relevant development plan policies are:

Regional Spatial Strategy

DP1 – Spatial Principles
DP2 – Promote Sustainable Communities
DP3 – Promote Sustainable Economic Growth
DP4 – Make the Best Use of Existing Resources and Infrastructure
DP5 – Managing Travel Demand
DP6 – Promote Environmental Quality
DP7 – Promote Environmental Quality
DP8 – Mainstreaming Rural Issues
DP9 – Reduce Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change
RDF2 – Rural Areas
W1– Strengthening the Regional Economy
L1 – Health, Sport, Recreation, Cultural and Education Services Provision
RT2 – Managing Travel Demand
RT9 – Walking and Cycling
EM16 – Energy Conservation and Efficiency
EM1B – Natural Environment
EM1 D – Trees Woodlands and Forest
EM3 – Green Infrastructure
MCR4 – South Cheshire

Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan

Policy 11A Development and Waste Recycling.

Local Plan Policy

NE.2 (Open Countryside)
NE.5 (Nature Conservation and Habitats)
NE.9 (Protected Species)
BE.1 (Amenity)
BE.2 (Design Standards)
BE.3 (Access and Parking)
BE.4 (Drainage, Utilities and Resources)
BE.5 (Infrastructure)
BE.7 (Conservation Areas)
BE.15 (Scheduled Ancient Monuments)
BE.16 (Development and Archaeology)
TRAN.3 (Pedestrians)
TRAN.5 (Provision for Cyclists)
TRAN.6 (Cycle Routes)
TRAN.9 (Car Parking Standards)
CF.2 (Community Facilities)

Other Material Considerations

Planning Policy Statement 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development)

Planning Policy Statement 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development – Climate Change Supplement)

Planning Policy Statement 4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth)

Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning for the Historic Environment)

Planning Policy Statement 7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas)

Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation)

Planning Policy Guidance 13 (Transport)

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

Nature Conservation: No objections

Strategic Highways Manager: None received at time of writing report

VIEWS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL

None received at time of writing report

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:

None received at time of writing report

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Design and Access Statement / Heritage Statement

- Incorporates summary of the redevelopment proposals and a strategic overview
- Provides detailed analysis of principal routes, styles of building
- Analysis of site constraints, opportunities, existing context and Masterplan opportunities
- Provides justification for choice of design and relationship to other buildings and the campus
- Justification in respect of impact upon Conservation Area and Heritage Assets
- Analysis of transport, access and car parking impacts and sustainability features

Transport Assessment

- Undertaken in 2008 in respect of proposed Phase 3 works provided predictions in respect of car parking, traffic flows, traffic impacts and operational performance of the highways network

Transport Assessment Addendum

- No changes to predicted increase in student numbers, car parking and other information as a result of Phases 4 and 5

Ecological Assessments

- No evidence of bats or barn owls
- Evidence of nesting birds
- Development unlikely to affect Great Crested Newts
- Recommends precautionary measures

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

Whilst the existing college is outside the settlement boundary it is very close to Nantwich and is a long established institution. The principle of replacement buildings at the college has been accepted by the grant of the previous permissions at this specific site. Since this part of the campus already provides facilities for students there are no objections in principle for

redevelopment for similar purposes as this would be supported by policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy and policy CF2 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan.

Impact of the Development on the Campus and the Conservation Area

The landscaping and planting within the Conservation Area is a major element of its character. Whilst Reaseheath Hall and some of its associated buildings also contribute to the physical and visual qualities of the area's special interest and character, the landscaped setting of the college, particularly to the south, is an important component of the Conservation Area and integral to its intrinsic character.

The scaled down proposals under this application would involve only the loss of the existing Yew Tree within the courtyard of the Main Hall. As this tree is surrounded by built form on three sides it does not make any meaningful contribution to the Conservation Area. The existing landscaped areas which are to be built upon as part of this application are furnished with insubstantial shrub planting and do not contribute positively to the historic character of the Conservation Area. The loss of these areas would not adversely affect the Conservation Area.

Within the Conservation Area boundary the buildings comprise a number of key 19th century buildings with 20th century buildings to the north-east of the Conservation Area boundary. Immediately outside the Conservation Area are a range of buildings for different departments which relate to the function they perform. The setting of this part of the Conservation Area is one of a working college (teaching land based studies) with glass houses, storage buildings, traditional brick farm buildings, modern farm buildings and structures as well as the more modern buildings which have been added alongside the main access from Winsford Road. There is therefore considerable variety in form, design and appearance of buildings both within the Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to it.

The new development will link the Lord Woolley Sports Hall, Jodrell (residential) Hall, the Jim Humphreys Building and Reaseheath Hall. Reaseheath Hall is a two storey 19th century building, which is unlisted. It is however a focal point within the Conservation Area, and mentioned specifically within the Conservation Area Character Appraisal. The remaining buildings are two storey modern 20th century buildings of brick and render construction which lie to the north and east of the Hall. The areas to be demolished and refurbished are also 20th century brick additions however these are single storey. The replacement facilities and extensions would also remain single storey albeit marginally higher. This therefore reflects the existing form and scale of the existing catering facilities which link the two storey buildings to Reaseheath Hall.

The footprint of the built form of the catering facilities would be extended by approximately 265 sq. m. The extended footprint would be sited on areas of existing landscaping and would not extend into undeveloped areas of the Conservation Area or affect prominent views of the Main Hall from the south.

The proposed development would utilise modern materials and a modern design. Its flat roof will visually minimize its presence and its impact on the traditional historic main hall and the proposed use of bricks to match the hall is appropriate.

The proposal to re-build this single storey modern hipped roofed structure will result in the introduction of a single storey flat roofed building. The walls would be extended in height and larger openings provided. A glazed atrium to the seating area would be provided with a sloped mono pitch roof. The scale and style of which will link in visually with the adjacent modern buildings on the south-east elevation. The proposal to retain its set back would serve to give

more presence to the hall by removing a building with a style which is not in keeping with either the hall or the modern buildings beyond. The use of large areas of glazing and render would introduce a light weight appearance to the proposals. Whilst the Conservation Officer has concerns that the use of render may not be in keeping with the character of the Main Hall, it is considered that the contrast in appearance with the traditional appearance of the Main Hall serves to ensure that the alterations do not represent a pastiche and remain visually distinct to those buildings which contribute to the Conservation Area. In addition, the use of modern materials would also provide greater legibility to the existing entrance point.

The kitchen extension would be relatively inconspicuous given that this is a service area in a fairly remote part of the complex and due to the scale and external appearance, which minimises the amount of openings and would be of predominantly brick construction. As the new entrance ramp would remain as proposed under P08/1126 it would remain appropriate in respect to its relationship with the existing buildings and the Conservation Area.

The external seating areas would have a limited impact upon the existing buildings and the Conservation Area as these would not involve the erection of any built form. In addition, the external seating area adjacent to the proposed shop would not be visible from outside of the building as it is enclosed by built form on all sides.

The dining facilities and the Harvester lounge area are of no special architectural merit and are proposed to be partially demolished/ refurbished. The demolition of these areas is considered acceptable as those areas to be removed have no special merit and are in the main mid to late twentieth century additions. As such, they do not make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

Under application 09/1155N the Cross College building was to be demolished. This received permission in 2009. Development had been approved under planning permission P08/1126 for redevelopment of the site. Whilst this demolition can still occur even if the scheme under P08/1126 is not implemented, the demolition of the Cross College Foundation Building was considered not to have any adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Reaseheath Conservation Area. The buildings to be demolished have no special architectural merit and are of single storey construction within this group of college buildings which includes larger and more prominent buildings. As such, it is not considered appropriate to require the college not to implement this consent.

Highways

These proposals do not involve any alterations to the existing car parking arrangements. Under the previous application, car parking within the application area would have been removed and not have been replaced. However the alterations to the college car parking facilities were approved under P07/0541 as part of Phase 2 which included fifteen new spaces to be created.

A Transport Assessment was submitted in support of P08/1126 which indicated that at the time of the survey in June 2008 only 6 of the 24 parking areas at the college were over 90% used most of the day and a further 3 of the 24 were over 90% used at some time during the survey. An addendum to that Transport Assessment has been submitted in support of this application. It indicates that for the current Phase 4 and 5 applications, the predicted number of students and staff expected to attend college in the future has not changed since the issue of the original Transport Assessment. Therefore the above predicted increase in traffic flows associated with the Phase 3 redevelopment proposals are still applicable for this planning application.

The development would not reduce the amount of car parking spaces available at the campus and in the context of the wider Phase 4 and Phase 5 proposals, the existing car parking

provision is expected to satisfy additional future demand. It is therefore not considered necessary to provide additional car parking.

The larger developments permitted in Phase 1 and Phase 2 at the college had conditions for the submission of a Travel Plan. A similar condition was attached to P08/1126. However the condition attached to P08/1126 included a reference to incorporating further surveys of car parks, cycle parks and motor cycle parking to allow for monitoring of the facilities and their use. In addition, a condition to ensure that new secured covered cycle parking facilities are provided for the student hub was also attached. It is proposed to replicate these conditions on this application given that the predicted traffic flows associated with Phase 3 would also be applicable for Phases 4 and 5.

Owing to the geographical location of the College in relation to its catchment areas only a small number of staff and students currently walk to and from the college. Existing walking facilities in and around the college are good and the majority of those who do walk, walk from Nantwich town centre which is a 15 minute walk along safe footpaths with sign controlled crossing facilities. Footways are provided along the A51 in the vicinity of the college grounds and on both sides of the carriageway. The main pedestrian entrances to the college are via the four vehicular access points, including that which falls within the application site boundary, the B5074 Winsford Road.

As PPG13 indicates that 2km is an acceptable walking distance and the existing pedestrian links to Nantwich town centre are good, it is not considered appropriate to require improvements to the existing pedestrian footways.

The 2008 Transport Assessment also showed that cycle parking and motor cycle parking at the college were underutilised. As stated above, the findings of this survey are applicable to the Phase 4 and 5 proposals.

The Transport Assessment, its addendum and the Travel Plan submitted note the college's commitment to providing a cycle link to the proposed Crewe-Nantwich cycle route (Connect 2) and it also states that there are good cycle links to Crewe Station. Since 48% of staff live within 5 miles of the college in theory the majority of these people could cycle to the college. The information supplied by the college also shows that 15% of the current students live in the Crewe/ Nantwich/ Sandbach areas and many of these would therefore be within a suitable distance to cycle.

The Strategic Highways Manager has indicated that they are actively pursuing monies towards the Connect 2 cycle route to assist the delivery and maintenance of the route and associated signage.

Under the Phase 3 proposals, the Highways Authority (formerly Cheshire County Council) requested a contribution towards the Connect 2 cycle route in relation to all the applications. This was justified by the increase in student numbers at the college and the college's commitment to encouraging cycling in the Travel Plan. As the alterations from Phase 3 to Phase 4 and 5 would not alter the predicted increase in student numbers, it is considered appropriate to replicate a contribution in respect of the Phase 4 and Phase 5 proposals. This would be in accordance with policy BE.5 of the Replacement Local Plan which states that the Council will negotiate with developers for adequate access infrastructure where the need arises from the development.

Under P08/1126 it was considered that in order to assist the College in delivery of this development as a whole it was recommended that the applicant be required to sign a Section 106 agreement in relation to the application for the student hub and not in relation to the grant

of the planning permissions for the individual departmental developments. This was to assist the college with the timing of the delivery of the various developments but would also have ensured that the commuted sum payment would still be made. The student hub was to be the largest of the applications submitted and would have provided facilities for all students at the college. The trigger for the payment to be made was agreed as 'before the Student Hub is first occupied'.

The additional floorspace of the scheme approved under P08/1126 was approximately 2527 sq. m whereas it would be approximately 265 sq. m proposed under this application, a significant reduction in size.

It is acknowledged that the college has been unable to secure the LSC funding for the student hub which is why scaled down proposals have been submitted as part of this application. The new facilities for arboriculture, construction and engineering (ACE), new horticulture and animal management training and education resource, (HAMSTER) and new equine facilities have been put on hold.

Nevertheless, the college still intend to provide student HUB facilities, the Food Centre for Excellence, SAC, GENUS, courtyard suites and the animal management facilities. As there is still a clear intention to expand the facilities at Reaseheath and there remains a commitment to improving cycle links to the college, it is considered appropriate to require a contribution towards the Connect 2 cycle route despite that the scale of the redevelopment proposals has been reduced, as this application supersedes the P08/1126 permission.

The developer contribution towards the Connect 2 cycle route was calculated based on the likely increase in student numbers, and the addendum to the Transport Assessment indicates that these figures are applicable to the Phase 4 and 5 proposals. As such, it would be reasonable to require a comparable contribution.

The Council is currently negotiating a figure with Reaseheath College representatives taking into consideration the above issues. However no figure for the developer contribution to the cost of the cycle works has been agreed to date.

Ecology

Ponds are suitable habitats for Great Crested Newts which are listed as a protected species under schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the existing buildings on the site could be suitable habitats for bats, and breeding birds. Protected species are considered to be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, and therefore any impact must be considered and mitigated accordingly.

The EC Habitats Directive 1992 requires the UK to maintain a system of strict protection for protected species and their habitats. The Directive only allows disturbance, or deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or nesting places,

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment and provided that there is
- no satisfactory alternative and
- no detriment to the maintenance of the species population at favourable conservation status in their natural range

The UK implemented the Directive by introducing The Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 which contain two layers of protection

- a requirement on Local Planning Authorities (“LPAs”) to have regard to the Directive’s requirements above, and
 - a licensing system administered by Natural England.
- Local Plan Policy NE.9 (Protected Species) seeks to prevent harm to protected species and their habitats.

Circular 6/2005 advises LPAs to give due weight to the presence of protected species on a development site to reflect EC requirements. “This may potentially justify a refusal of planning permission.”

PPS9 (2005) advises LPAs to ensure that appropriate weight is attached to protected species “Where granting planning permission would result in significant harm [LPAs] will need to be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative site that would result in less or no harm. In the absence of such alternatives [LPAs] should ensure that, before planning permission is granted, adequate mitigation measures are put in place. Where significant harm cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated against, appropriate compensation measures should be sought. If that significant harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against, or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.”

PPS9 encourages the use of planning conditions or obligations where appropriate and again advises [LPAs] to “refuse permission where harm to the species or their habitats would result unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh that harm.”

The converse of this advice is that if issues of detriment to the species, satisfactory alternatives and public interest seem likely to be satisfied, no impediment to planning permission arises under the Directive and Regulations.

The surveys commissioned in 2008 concluded that the buildings have variable potential for use by bats and that there is currently no evidence to suggest that the buildings on the application site have any importance for bat and barn owl conservation. There were a number of birds nests found associated with a number of the buildings proposed for demolition. The surveys recommended precautionary measures in respect of bats and nesting birds. This was a condition of the P08/1126 permission. Whilst these surveys are over 12 months old and therefore out of date, the Council’s Ecologist has indicated that the survey results would still be applicable as the buildings have low potential to form a suitable habitat for roosting bats or barn owls and the buildings could in all likelihood still contain nesting birds during the breeding season. The 2008 survey makes reference to the fact that Great Crested Newt eggs were found in a pond on the campus 220m away from the application site. However the Surveyor in 2007 concluded that in relation to the built area of the campus, Great Crested Newts were unlikely to be found due to the inhospitable nature of the site. The 2008 assessment concurred with this conclusion and the Council’s Ecologist has indicated that these conclusions would be applicable to the proposals in respect of this application.

Archaeology

There is an Ancient Monument north of the access road and some 210m east of the application site with a number of buildings separating the Ancient Monument and the application site. In relation to application P08/1126 English Heritage recommended that steps be taken to ensure that no development or construction activities impact on the ancient monument (to the north of the access road) either through use for storage land or as a result of alterations to the access.

There is no proposal to alter the access in any way. The field is separated from the college areas by a post and rail fence and there is no proposal in any of the submitted applications to

use this land. A condition would be required to ensure that no storage would take place on the archaeological land. This would replicate the condition attached to P08/1126.

Trees/ Landscape

The proposals result in the loss of three areas of landscaping around the existing main hall and catering building. One Yew tree, which is presently enclosed on three sides by buildings, would need to be removed. Under the previous application (P08/1126) the removal of this tree was considered acceptable. This was because the application was supported by a tree report indicating that the tree only had a life span of 50 years and because it was surrounded by single storey buildings close to it, it had limited amenity value. These arguments are still relevant as the condition of the tree and its relationship to the wider area has not changed since 2008. A replacement tree would be able to make a more meaningful contribution to the setting of the site by adding to the other large mature trees, which would be retained, and which are more prominent in the landscape. The mature tree to be felled would need to be inspected for bats immediately prior to felling commencing.

A number of younger recently established trees within the areas of existing landscaping would need to be removed. The impact of this on the setting of the site would be limited. Mature trees adjacent to the site would be unaffected by the development but a condition would be attached to any permission to provide protective fencing around the outer limits of the crown spread of such trees to ensure no storage of materials or other related construction activities take place under the trees.

Other Matters

Drainage

Permission P08/1126 included a condition for the implementation of the drainage scheme submitted with the application. As no details of the drainage scheme have been provided it is considered necessary to condition the submission of these details.

Waste Disposal

Policy 11 of the Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan requires the submission of a waste audit. The applicant has indicated that the new proposals will incorporate a recycling station for students and staff to recycle waste prior to distribution to the existing college recycle points. These details are not included within the submission however it is considered that this issue can be addressed through the imposition of a condition that such facilities be provided. This is to ensure the development would accord with the above policy.

Amenity

There is one dwelling very close to the site of the existing facilities to be refurbished. The proposed development would result in a building that is marginally higher than the existing buildings. However the dwelling affected is occupied by a member of staff who already lives in close proximity to the student accommodation. Sufficient space is retained to protect residential amenities (in respect of overlooking and loss of light) appropriate for a dwelling located within the campus. Whilst it is acknowledged that any odour or noise generation and the impact of this on the dwelling is a pre-existing condition, the catering facilities would be extended and as such it is considered necessary to condition details in relation to ventilation and odour extraction. This would ensure that the proposals would not make this existing situation materially worse.

Retail

The proposals involve the provision of a shop and café within the catering facilities. As this is sited within heart of the campus, it is considered that this will be utilised in solely an ancillary capacity serving the students and staff at the college only. It would therefore have no impact whatsoever on the retail offer at Nantwich or Crewe Town Centres.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed student hub will provide a modern building located within the Reaseheath Conservation Area. The development will link adjacent retained college buildings and is appropriate for the role it performs within the college. The development will, subject to conditions, preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area through its position set back from the traditional building of Reaseheath Hall and the retention of trees around the development. The development will not have any adverse impact on residential amenities at the adjacent college residence and subject to further survey work immediately prior to the demolition of buildings will not adversely impact on protected species. A commuted sum payment is required as a contribution to the delivery of the proposed cycle route between Crewe and Nantwich to improve the sustainable transport links to the college.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure a commuted sum payment as a contribution to the cost of delivery of the Crewe-Nantwich Cycle route known as the Connect 2 scheme and the following conditions:

- 1. Standard time**
- 2. Plans**
- 3. Materials**
- 4. Surfacing materials**
- 5. Landscaping scheme, including specimen replacement tree for yew which is to be felled**
- 6. Implementation of landscaping/ maintenance**
- 7. Tree Protection measures**
- 8. Details of drainage scheme**
- 9. External lighting**
- 10. Emergence survey for bats or recheck all buildings to be demolished immediately prior to demolition**
- 11. Bat survey of tree to be felled immediately prior to felling**
- 12. Work to proceed in accordance with recommendations for bat and birds and advice to personnel in bat survey**
- 13. Protection to ancient monument**
- 14. Travel Plan to include surveys of access by car, motor cycle and cycle**
- 15. Covered secure cycle parking**
- 16. Recycling Facilities**
- 17. Odour Extraction and Ventilation**

Location Plan

