

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 27 MARCH 2013

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 12/3786M

**LOCATION Macclesfield District Hospital, Victoria Road,
Macclesfield**

UPDATE PREPARED 25 February 2013

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Within the amenity section of the report, reference is made to 2 Nixon Street, this should read 21 Nixon Street.

With regard to parking numbers, the committee report incorrectly states that 2 spaces are proposed per dwelling with 6 additional spaces for visitors. In actual fact, there are 2 additional spaces for visitors once 2 spaces have been allocated to each property.

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

Further comments have been received on behalf of the applicants in response to the committee report and are summarised below:

- Clarification regarding the number of visitor spaces proposed (as outlined above).
- The applicants take issue with the comments made by the Housing Officer stating that the Clocktower development was grant funded meaning that it was not subsidised by the developer. The affordable housing units at the Clocktower were sold to the Registered Social Landlord at a discounted price in line with standard practice and whilst there was some grant funding assistance, this was due to higher than normal conversion costs due to the listed status of the clocktower and did not subsidise the entire costs of the affordable housing provision. For the housing officer to suggest that the applicant did not subsidise the affordable housing in Phase I is entirely misleading and inaccurate.
- The Ingersley and Henbury buildings are curtilage listed buildings.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

With regard to the correction on parking numbers, the total number of visitor spaces proposed for the housing element of this application is 2. These are to be located along the access road that leads to the junction with Nixon Street. Whilst this is lower than the number quoted in the committee report, given the fact that all of the proposed dwellings would have 2 parking spaces and given

that space is available for additional visitor parking on the access road whilst still allowing access for emergency vehicles, no highways objections are raised to the number of spaces proposed.

With regard to the comments made in the committee report in relation to developer subsidy for the Clocktower development, the comments made on behalf of the applicant are noted. For clarification, the full comments received from the Housing department in relation to this point are detailed below:

*“However it appears that although 36 dwellings of affordable housing were provided at the Clock Tower, the delivery was not as a requirement of a planning obligation from the outline planning for the Blue Zone, approved under application 09/1300M and the redevelopment of the Clock Tower, approved under application 09/1296M was for all 36 properties to be provided as affordable housing. In addition to this the Housing Association which provided the affordable homes at the Clock Tower received a significant amount of grant funding from the Homes and Communities Agency to facilitate the development of affordable homes as part of the National Affordable Housing Programme 2008 – 2011, for the NAHP 2008/11 the HCA’s prospectus stated at 181 – **Our aim is to provide grant where this is purchasing additional affordable housing outcomes, and where the level of developer contribution represents an appropriate response to the site economics. We will not fund the simple purchase by a housing association of affordable housing delivered with developer contributions through a planning obligation.***

Although affordable housing was provided at the Blue Zone due to it not being required as part of a planning obligation, grant funding being utilised and as the new applications are outside the Blue Zone boundary there is no reason why there should not be a requirement for affordable housing to be provided for these 2 applications as per the requirements of the Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing.”

Notwithstanding the comments made and received in relation to this issue, for the reasons stated in the committee report, in this case subject to the provision of 5 affordable units, it is considered that there are other material considerations weighing in favour of the proposal.

Other Matters

The Environment Agency commented on the application and recommended the imposition of a number of conditions should the application be approved. Unfortunately these were not included on the original recommendation. The conditions cover the following matters and replicate suggested conditions 20 to 22 of 12/3779M:

- Survey of existing culvert
- Scheme to limit surface water run off
- Scheme to manage the risk of flooding from overland flow of surface water

The recommendation as included within the committee report needs to be amended to include these conditions.

CONCLUSION

The original recommendation of APPROVAL remains subject to the addition of 3 further conditions as follows:

- Survey of existing culvert
- Scheme to limit surface water run off
- Scheme to manage the risk of flooding from overland flow of surface water