Application No: 12/1627M

Location: LAND ADJACENT TO COPPICE WAY, HANDFORTH

- Proposal: Outline Application for New Vehicular Access with Means of Access, Layout and Associated Engineering Works for Consideration (with Landscaping Reserved for Subsequent Approval)
- Applicant: Mr Pasquale Nicosia, GREYSTONE (UK) LTD
- Expiry Date: 29-Jun-2012

# STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 14 November 2012

# UPDATE TO AGENDA

## **APPLICATION NO.**

12/1578M and 12/1627M

## LOCATION

Land adjacent to Coppice Way, Handforth

## **UPDATE PREPARED**

5 November 2012

## **REASON FOR REPORT**

This applications were deferred from the last Strategic Planning Board meeting to seek further information:

- 1) From Adult Services regarding the scheme's impact on local health services;
- 1) On the proposed boundary treatment for the site;
- 2) On the need for this type of close care (more detail regarding the needs assessment and sequential site search submitted)
- 3) On the Inspector's appeal decision

## **KEY ISSUES**

### Adult services

Further comments are awaited and will be reported to Members as an update. However, paragraph 18 of the Inspector's decision states clearly that:

"With regard to concerns about the strain on local resources, particularly medical facilities, there is no substantive evidence from the providers of health care which confirms these fears."

### **Boundary treatment**

As in the original report a condition is recommended for the boundary treatments to be submitted for subsequent approval.

### Need for the accommodation

Paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Inspector's decision highlights the lack of analysis of available sites within the south Manchester area as a defining factor for the lack of need being demonstrated previously. The sequential site search now assesses all potential sites within a catchment area extending to a radius of 10km from the application site. The 10km catchment includes areas covered by Cheshire East, Stockport, Trafford and Manchester Councils.

Sites were initially identified based on their size given that the Care Village concept has very specific spatial requirements and functions, which in this case includes: a care home, close care cottages and community facilities. Disaggregation of the different elements of a care village would not enable the development to perform its intended function as a place where residents can remain in the same community through varying stages of later life. Sites were initially identified using the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for each of the local authorities, then Employment Land Reviews where available, then local authority proposals maps, and finally any documents being progressed as part of the Local Plan process.

A report published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2006 entitled *'Continuing Care Retirement Communities'* sets out a number of points that charcterise a suitable site for such a development. These include:

- More than 1 in 5 people over retirement age living in the locality;
- A site suitable for traditional sheltered housing, for example a level site, served by public transport, near shops, churches and other facilities;
- A secure environment;
- A larger site than a traditional sheltered housing scheme;
- A locality with a high expected demand and indicators of demand but low level of provision;
- Not more than 5 miles from a major centre of population;
- Site specific attractive features, for example a pleasant outlook.

These indicators were also factored into the applicant's assessment of site suitability.

Many of the sites identified were discounted on their lack of availability, whether they are already occupied, have specific land use allocations within the Local Plan, which would make it difficult for them to come forward for a care village use, or are already committed to another use. In relation to suitability many sites had noise and or amenity issues and were not well

located in relation to local services / facilities and public transport. The issues identified in terms of viability generally related to site contamination and areas of flood risk.

By considering the suitability, availability and viability of each site, the results found that there were no sequentially preferable sites to the application site within the 10km catchment area.

### Inspector's decision

The Inspector's decision is attached.

### CONCLUSIONS

As in the original report a recommendation of approval is made.

The following reports from the previous committee are provided for information.

# **UPDATE REPORT**

STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 24 October 2012

# UPDATE TO AGENDA

## **APPLICATION NO.**

12/1627M

## LOCATION

Land adjacent to Coppice Way, Handforth

## **UPDATE PREPARED**

22 October 2012

#### **KEY ISSUES**

As a point of clarification, with further regard to the appeal in 2010 the Inspector accepted, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that:

- The traffic generated by the scheme could be accommodated the local road network.
- Sight lines and the configuration of the access meet normal Council and road safety standards.
- The traffic generated would have a negligible impact upon the trunk road network (A34).

- No evidence to suggest that the use of the access, or the crossing of Coppice Way, would be problematic for residents of the development.
- Numbers of people living on the development would be relatively few compared to the numbers using Coppice way as a whole.
- Loss of landscaping and impact on wildlife would be negligible.
- The breach in the bund to create the access is unlikely to raise sound levels significantly at properties in the Hall Road area.

# CONCLUSIONS

As in the original report a recommendation of approval is made.

## **ORIGINAL REPORT**

Date Report Prepared: 6 August 2012

## SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

#### MAIN ISSUES

- Justification for the development
- Highway safety
- Landscape impact.

#### **REASON FOR REPORT**

The application is closely linked to application 12/1578M, which also appears on the agenda.

## DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site comprises a wooded embankment adjacent to Coppice Way. The site is located within an area of Proposed Open Space as identified in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.

## DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This proposal seeks outline planning permission to provide an access from Coppice Way to the proposed Care Village. The development would involve cutting through the wooded embankment that forms the northern boundary of the proposed care village site. Approval of access, appearance, layout and scale is sought at this stage, with only landscaping reserved for subsequent approval. The relevant issues and policy relating to the overall care village development are discussed in the parallel report on the agenda for application 12/1578M. They will not be repeated here. The key site planning issues concerning the proposed access road are considered to be those of landscaping, trees and highway safety.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

09/0695M – Development of a care village (sui-generis use) comprising 58-bedroom care home, 47 close care cottages, 15 shared ownership affordable dwellings, and associated access roads, public open space, landscaping, car parking and ancillary development – Refused 19.08.2009 – Appeal dismissed 28.10.2010 (The Inspector concluded that the assessment of need was not robust enough to justify a departure from policy GC7).

09/0708M – Formation of new vehicular access from Coppice Way and engineering works – Refused 19.08.2009 – Appeal dismissed 28.10.2010 (The Inspector concluded that as there was no proven need for the care village, there was no justification for an access, which would be contrary to policy RT6).

09/3023M – Outline application with means of access, layout, scale and appearance for consideration and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval for the development of a care village comprising 55-bedroom care home, 36 close care cottages, 6 shared ownership affordable dwellings – all for the over 55s, and associated access roads, public open space, landscaping, car parking and ancillary development – Refused 20.01.2010 – Appeal dismissed 28.10.2010 (The Inspector concluded that the assessment of need was not robust enough to justify a departure from policy GC7)

09/3050M - Formation of new vehicular access from Coppice Way and engineering works – Refused 20.01.2010 – Appeal dismissed 28.10.2010 (The Inspector concluded that as there was no proven need for the care village, there was no justification for an access, which would be contrary to policy RT6).

## POLICIES

#### **Regional Spatial Strategy**

Relevant policies of the RSS include: DP1 Spatial Principles; DP2 Promote Sustainable Communities; DP3 Promote Sustainable Economic Development; DP4 make the Best Use of Existing Resources and Infrastructure; DP5 Manage Travel Demand - Reduce the Need to Travel, and Increase Accessibility; DP7 Promote Environmental Quality; DP9 Reduce Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change; RT2 Managing Travel Demand; RT9 Walking and Cycling; EM1 Integrated Enhancement and Protection of the Region's Environmental Assets.

#### Local Plan Policy

Relevant policies of the Local Plan include: BE1 Design Guidance; RT1, RT2 and RT6 Open Space; DC1 Design; DC3 Residential Amenity; DC6 Circulation and Access; DC8 Landscaping; DC9 Tree Protection; GC7 Safeguarded Land

#### **Other Material Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)

# **CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)**

Strategic Highways Manager – The access to the cottages and the care home is to be taken off a spine road that possibly could lead to further development in the future. This spine road links to an existing roundabout on Coppice Way. Therefore, as there have been no material changes in circumstances on the highway network, (since the previous appeal) no highway objections are raised.

# VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL

Handforth Parish Council - The Council have noted the marked opposition of local residents to the proposed care village and access road. The Parish Council are broadly in sympathy with the views of local residents but, at a recent council meeting, it was agreed that councillors would send their comments on the application on an individual basis.

### OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

45 letters of representation have been received, which mainly refer to general objections to the entire care village development. However specific objections relating to the proposed access road include:

- Elderly drivers would have to negotiate the hazardous A34 roundabout.
- The roundabouts and roads around the Handforth Dean shopping centre are hazardous for the elderly and infirm.
- Increased noise and fumes, headlight beams will penetrate from Wilmslow Way
- The bund was deliberately built, where it runs east to west, to counteract this pollution and there can be no valid reason to penetrate it.
- The road access breaches RT6 land
- The exit from the A34 for the retail park is already busy and complex. This adds to the complexity.
- No justification for the development
- Increased congestion
- Loss of wildlife habitat
- Future development of safeguarded land will follow.

## APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The applicant has submitted a transport statement, planning statement, design and access statement and a tree survey with the application.

#### **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

#### Principle of Development

The site is designated within the Local Plan as Open Space and adjoins an area of Safeguarded Land. Policy GC7 notes that if the safeguarded land is to be developed in the future, access will be taken from Coppice Way. Therefore, subject to an acceptable development scheme on the safeguarded land to the South, the principle of an access from Coppice Way is established in Development Plan policy.

The issues in principle, regarding the loss of open space and other matters, are discussed in the associated report for the care village. If Members resolve to approve the proposed care village then there is no objection in principle to the proposed access. Indeed the access point proposed would be the most preferable to the site. However, if Members resolve to refuse the care village application then clearly there would be no justification for this development, and it would be contrary to policy RT6 as it would result in the loss of land allocated for open space.

## Highways

As noted above, there is provision within the local plan for an access to serve development on the safeguarded land. The Strategic Highways Manager has commented on the proposal and noted that on the previous application there were no highway objections raised to the development and in considering this particular application they have considered whether there have been any material changes on the road network since the previous application. Although there has some changes to the nearby retail park there have not been any large developments that would affect the traffic impact considerations of this proposal.

The Highways Agency has previously confirmed that the development will have a negligible impact on the trunk road network. The Inspector for the appeals in 2010 also did not identify any significant highway safety concerns. No significant highway safety concerns are therefore raised.

#### Landscaping

Since the previous appeals, there has been a minor change to the route of the access off Coppice Way into the site which now shows a slight curve and inclusion of an attenuation pond. These minor changes will not impact significantly on the extent of tree losses along the existing mound that abuts Coppice Way.

Some clarification would be necessary as to the extent of re-grading required for the new embankment detailing to ensure the minimum construction works necessary to achieve the access without compromising trees unnecessarily. If the application is approved a detailed landscape scheme should be submitted as a reserved matters application. The details must include proposed levels and contours, soiling and seeding, and vegetation to be removed, plus replanting.

The proposed cut-through is located towards the eastern end of the site (of the proposed care village) this is well away from the residential areas near Hall Road and as such there is not considered to be an issue in terms of impact on residential amenity resulting from a break in the existing landscape screen.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

The development of safeguarded land would require an access to be created from Coppice Way. Subject to approval of the associated care village development there is no objection in principle to this proposal. Landscaping will be dealt with as a reserved matter and will ensure the visual impact is minimised and the proposal will be acceptable in terms of highway safety. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Application for Outline Planning

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve subject to following conditions

- 1. A07OP Time limit on outline permission
- 2. A03OP Time limit for submission of reserved matters
- 3. A01OP Submission of reserved matters
- 4. A01AP Development in accord with approved plans
- 5. No development until a contract and phasing agreement in place for development of care village

