

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 17 April 2013**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO: 12/3779M**

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

**UPDATE PREPARED 15 April 2013**

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Strategic Highways & Transportation Manager:**

Further to the previous highway comments on this application, discussions have taken place with the applicant regarding improving the parking provision for the development.

The residential car parking provision is 200% for the proposed 2 bed apartments and 100% for the 1 bed apartments. This provision accords with the Council's new draft minimum standards.

Although this application is part of the wider hospital site that has its parking difficulties, the application needs to be dealt with on its own merits and determined in regards to its adherence to policy and standards. In regard the application does accord with standards and provides the minimum number of parking spaces.

Therefore, the proposed development does accord with standards and highways would find it extremely difficult to support a lack of car parking as a reason to refuse the application as this application does not have to solve the parking problems across the whole site.

No highway objections are raised to the application.

**OFFICER APPRAISAL**

As stated within the updated committee report, Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that decisions should take account of, amongst other things, whether *“improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. **Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe**”*.

In this case, as stated within the updated report, the proposal would result in an improvement relative to the existing situation on site, no objections are being raised by the Strategic Highways and Transportation Manager and the

applicant's have sought to make further improvements to the proposal in order to address Member concerns. On that basis, as stated in the updated report, no objections are raised to the proposal on highways grounds.

## **CONCLUSION**

The original recommendation of APPROVAL remains.