

Application No: 13/1418C

Location: Land at THE GREEN, MIDDLEWICH

Proposal: Substitution of house types, at increase from 22 dwellings to 39 dwellings on the north west part of the site

Applicant: Lucy Hawley, Persimmon Homes North West

Expiry Date: 08-Jul-2013

## **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE**

### **MAIN ISSUES**

**Affordable Housing**  
**Amenity**  
**Ecology**  
**Landscape**  
**Trees**  
**Drainage and Flooding**  
**Design**  
**Loss of Agricultural Land**  
**Open space**  
**Highway Safety and Traffic Generation**  
**Infrastructure**  
**Ground Conditions**

## **REFERRAL**

The application has been referred to Strategic Planning Board because it is a major development and a departure from the Development Plan.

### **1. SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application relates to 0.69ha of land, which forms part of a larger development site of 2.25ha in area, situated to the south-west side of The Green. The site lies within the Open Countryside adjacent to the Middlewich Settlement Boundary and is bordered by residential properties to its northern, southern and eastern boundaries, with open fields to the west.

The site is relatively flat although it is set at a higher level than The Green. Hedgerows and fencing form the boundaries to the site and there are a number of trees along the boundaries of the site. The surrounding residential development consists of bungalows fronting onto The Green with two-storey detached and semi-detached properties to the north, east and south.

## **2. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Full planning permission was granted in 2012 for 63 homes together with associated public open space, access and highway works. The scheme included a mix of affordable and open market housing within the site, with affordable units making up 30% of the total development. The site has one vehicular access taken from The Green. The proposed open space is located on either side of the access road with properties fronting onto this public open space in a crescent shape. Work has now commenced on implementing this consent.

This application seeks consent for substitution of house types, and an increase from 22 dwellings to 39 dwellings on the north-west part of the site, bringing the total number of properties on the site to 80.

## **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

10/4065C	Outline Application for 68 Residential Dwellings over 2.25 Hectares. Access from The Green with some Matters Reserved – Refused 4 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
11/2833C	Outline planning permission is sought for up to 68 homes together with associated public open space, and highway works. – Approved 9 <sup>th</sup> January 2012
11/4545C	Residential Development Comprising 64 Dwellings (Including 30% Affordable Housing) and Associated Highways, Landscaping and Public Open Space – Approved 30 <sup>th</sup> March 2012

## **4. PLANNING POLICIES**

### **National Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework

### **Local Plan Policy**

PS8 Open Countryside  
GR21 Flood Prevention  
NR4 Non-statutory sites  
GR1 New Development  
GR2 Design  
GR3 Residential Development  
GR5 Landscaping  
GR9 Accessibility, servicing and provision of parking

GR14 Cycling Measures  
GR15 Pedestrian Measures  
GR17 Car parking  
GR18 Traffic Generation  
GR 22 Open Space Provision  
NR1 Trees and Woodland  
NR3 Habitats  
NR5 Habitats  
H2 Provision of New Housing Development  
H6 Residential Development in the Open countryside  
H13 Affordable Housing and Low Cost Housing

## **5. OBSERVATIONS OF CONSULTTEES**

### **Environment Agency**

No comments to make on the proposed development

### **United Utilities**

No objection to the proposal provided that the following conditions are met: -

- The site is drained in complete accordance with the strategy submitted, which ultimately states that all surface water flows generated by the new development will discharge to soak-away or watercourse only.

### **Highways**

- Highways have had a look at the previous transport submissions for App 11/2833C. The increase in traffic will be small and they cannot imagine any significant traffic issue. Nevertheless, given the objections citing traffic including from Middlewich Town Council, it would be wise to ask the Applicant for revised capacity assessment at the junction of The Green with Chadwick Road in order that this point can be addressed as part of the response.

### **Education**

- This application will generate 7 primary and 5 secondary aged pupils.
- Based on the pupil forecasts and already approved development then there will be sufficient capacity in the local primary schools to accommodate the pupils generated of this age range. Secondary however is different and the service is seeking contributions.
- $5 \times £17,959 \times 0.91 = \textbf{£81,713}$

## **Environmental Health**

Recommend the following conditions:

- The hours of demolition / construction works taking place during the development (and associated deliveries to the site) shall be restricted to: Monday – Friday 08:00 to 18:00 hrs Saturday 09:00 to 14:00 hrs Sundays and Public Holidays Nil
- All Piling operations shall be undertaken using best practicable means to reduce the impact of noise and vibration on neighbouring sensitive properties. All piling operations shall be restricted to: Monday – Friday 09:00 – 17:30 hrs Saturday 09:00 – 13:00 hrs Sunday and Public Holidays Nil
- In addition to the above, prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall submit a method statement, to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The piling work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved method statement. The method statement shall include the following details:
  1. Details of the method of piling
  2. Days / hours of work
  3. Duration of the pile driving operations (expected starting date and completion date)
  4. Prior notification to the occupiers of potentially affected properties
  5. Details of the responsible person (e.g. site manager / office) who could be contacted in the event of complaint
- Prior to its installation details of the location, height, design, and luminance of any proposed lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall ensure the lighting is designed to minimise the potential loss of amenity caused by light spillage onto adjoining properties. The lighting shall thereafter be installed and operated in accordance with the approved details.
- The Contaminated Land team has no objection to the above application subject to the following comments with regard to contaminated land:
  - The application is for new residential properties which are a sensitive end use and could be affected by any contamination present.
  - The applicant has previously submitted reports for contaminated land under previous planning applications for the site
- As such, and in accordance with the NPPF, this section recommends conditions, stating that should any adverse ground conditions be encountered during excavation works, all work in that area should cease and this section be contacted for advice.

## **6. VIEWS OF MIDDLEWICH TOWN COUNCIL**

Middlewich Town Council objects to this application on the grounds that an increase in dwellings will exacerbate the traffic problems in the area, which the Town Council highlighted in its comments on the original planning application.

## **7. OTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

2 representations have been received making the following points:

- Following a rejection for the first planning submitted for The Green, the application was withdrawn.
- This was replaced with a further application with very little amendment, virtually immediately. Neighbours feel this second application was extremely underhanded, with no notification or consultation period offered to the neighbours, indeed exactly like the first application.
- Notification for a planning application from the council, does not constitute any consideration for the surrounding residents. Despite all the concerns and complaints, neighbours, were totally over ruled and planning was granted.
- Now, they wish to increase the number of dwellings from 22 to 39 on the north west part of the site.
- Residents strongly object to this application as this will be adding yet more traffic to a totally unsuitable access route to the estate and an already heavily congested and dangerous road, namely, Chadwick Road.
- 63 properties should not have been granted permission initially, but to increase that by 17 up to a staggering 80 properties overall, is nothing short of sheer greed by the house builder to squeeze every last single penny out of every square inch of the beautiful 'Green Belt' site residents once overlooked.
- The application is submitted because the large 3 to 4 bedroom houses are not selling so they want to build 17 smaller houses instead.
- This is totally wrong as it will mean at least another 30 cars travelling down a narrow road and at least another 30 people in a small area.
- The schools in the area are already overcrowded.
- They strongly object to this application

## **8. APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION:**

- Design and Access Statement

## **9. OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Main Issues**

The site lies in the Open Countryside as designated in the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review, where policies H.6 and PS.8 state that only development which is essential for the purposes of, agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation, essential works undertaken by public service authorities or statutory undertakers, or for other uses appropriate to a rural area will be permitted.

However, the granting of the previous planning permission established the acceptability in principle of residential development on this site and given that the previous permission is being, and can continue to be, implemented, this application does not present an opportunity to re-examine those issues.

This proposal, is a full planning application for 39 dwellings on the north-west part of the site, which will increase the total number of properties on the site to 80. Although a greater

number of dwellings is now proposed, the site boundaries remain the same. Therefore, it will not result in any greater loss of open countryside, than that which has already been accepted and by increasing the density, it will make better use of the land which will increase the contribution that the site makes to housing land supply, and will ease the pressure to develop other greenfield sites elsewhere in the Borough.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle and the main issues in the consideration of this application are the acceptability of the revised scheme in terms of affordable housing, amenity, ecology, landscape and tree matters, drainage and flooding, infrastructure, highway safety and traffic generation.

### **Affordable Housing**

The Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing requires provision of a minimum of 30% affordable housing on any sites over 15 dwellings or in excess of 0.4ha in settlements with a population of more than 3,000. It also requires a tenure split for affordable dwellings of 65% social rent and 35% intermediate tenure. This is the preferred split which was identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2010.

As this is a re-plan of part of a wider development site, it is necessary to consider the affordable housing requirements for the whole site. The SHMA 2010 shows that for Middlewich there is a requirement for 280 new affordable units between 2009/10 – 2013/14. This equates to a net requirement of 56 new affordable units per year, made up of 13 x 1bed, 8 x 2bed, 30 x 3bed and 6 x 1/2 bed older persons units.

In addition to this information taken from the SHMA 2010, information from Cheshire Homechoice, which is used as the choice based lettings method of allocating social rented accommodation across Cheshire East, indicates that there are currently 657 applicants on the waiting list who have selected Middlewich as their first choice. These applicants require 154 x 1 bed, 276 x 2 bed, 146 x 3 bed & 23 x 4 bed units. 58 applicants did not state how many bedrooms were required.

The existing planning approval on this site, under application 11/4545C for 63 dwellings has a s106 agreement in place securing 12 affordable dwellings as social rented and 7 as intermediate tenure, which is as per the requirements of the Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing.

This proposal would increase the total dwellings across the whole development site to 81 and therefore increase the affordable housing requirement to 24 dwellings with 16 provided as social rent (affordable rent would also be acceptable) and 8 provided as intermediate tenure.

Based on the increase in numbers on the site overall the applicant needs to provide 5 additional affordable dwellings as part of the re-plan in order to meet the 30% requirement across the whole site, with 4 of the additional affordable dwellings provided as social rent or affordable rent and 1 as intermediate tenure in order to ensure the tenure split of 65/35 between rent/intermediate continues.

The applicant was initially offering an additional 7 affordable dwellings which exceeded the number required by 2. However, the tenure split offered with the additional dwellings was 3 rented and 4 intermediate which across the whole site would equate to a provision of 26, of which 15 would be rented and 11 intermediate. This would represent provision of 32% affordable housing on a tenure split of 58% rented, 42% intermediate.

Given that conditions or planning obligations can only secure the minimum policy requirement of 30% affordable housing, there would be no control in respect of tenure or eligibility criteria for the 2 of the affordable units being offered on this scheme and therefore these should be disregarded and not counted towards the affordable housing provision on this site.

Taking account of this only 5 of the additional proposed affordable dwellings can be counted towards the 30% requirement, based on the tenure split offered if 3 were rented and 2 intermediate this would result in the affordable housing provision across the whole site being 15 rented and 9 intermediate which represents a tenure split of 62.5% rented and 37.5% intermediate and does not meet the requirements of the Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing.

Housing Officers, have confirmed, however, that they would have no objection if the affordable housing was 4 social or affordable rented units and 1 intermediate dwelling. In addition the properties should also meet all the requirements of the Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing. Their preference is that any additional affordable housing required at this site is secured by way of a s106 agreement, with a requirement that any affordable or social rented dwellings are transferred to a Registered Provider of affordable housing.

Discussions have taken place between the developer and Housing Officers and an offer of 5 additional affordable units as part of the re-plan on a tenure split of 3 social rented dwellings and 2 intermediate dwellings, has been agreed.

Overall this would provide a total of 24 affordable dwellings on the site, which represents provision of 30% of the dwellings as affordable. The tenure split would be 15 social rented and 9 intermediate which equates to 62.5% social rented and 37.5% intermediate dwellings. Although this does not quite meet the 65/35 split identified in Interim Planning Statement, it is satisfactory, as the provision of the 3 social rented dwellings and 2 intermediate dwellings as part of the re-plan is more practical in terms of management implications for a Registered Provider, given that the 3 social rented are in one block and the intermediate another.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal complies with the relevant policies in respect of affordable housing, and Housing Officers have no objection.

## **Amenity**

The site is bounded to the south by open countryside. Existing residential development bounds the site on all other sides with residential properties fronting Eardswick Road to the north, Broxton Avenue to the east and Beeston Close and Bunbury Close to the south. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) recommends that minimum distances of 21.3m be maintained between principal elevations and 13.7m between a principal elevation

and a flank elevation. With regard to the relationship between the proposed dwellings and the existing properties in those roads listed above, the recommended minimum distances will be achieved.

To turn to the levels of residential amenity to be provided within the development, the recommended minimum distances of 21.3m and 13.7m will be achieved in all cases with the exception of the separation distance between the rear of plots 48 to 51 and plots 25 to 27, where the separation distance will fall as low as 14m. This is particularly problematic given that plots 48 to 51 are 3 storey developments. Also the separation between the rear of plots 43 to 45 and the gable of lot 28, is only 10m rather than 13.7m as advocated by the standard

The Council's SPG advocates the provision of 65sq.m of private amenity space for all new family dwellings. A number of plots will fail to achieve this standard. In particular the three storey plots, which are clearly family houses, will have approximately 40 to 45sq of amenity space, which is considered to be unsatisfactory. The proposal therefore fails to meet the requirements of the Council's SPG and Policy GR6 of the adopted Local Plan.

With regard to noise pollution, air pollution and light pollution caused by the development, the Environmental Health Department, have raised no objection to the development subject to conditions. Similar conditions were imposed on the previous consent and therefore these could be carried over to any further approval. As a result, it is not considered that these issues would warrant the refusal of this application.

## **Ecology**

Article 12 (1) of the EC Habitats Directive requires Member states to take requisite measures to establish a system of strict protection of certain animal species prohibiting the deterioration or destruction of breeding sites and resting places. Art. 16 of the Directive provides that if there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, then Member States may derogate *"in the interests of public health and public safety or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social and economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment"* among other reasons.

The Directive is then implemented in England and Wales : The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. ("The Regulations"). The Regulations set up a licensing regime dealing with the requirements for derogation under Art. 16 and this function is carried out by Natural England.

The Regulations provide that the Local Planning Authority must have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive so far as they may be affected by the exercise of their functions.

It should be noted that, since a European Protected Species has been recorded on site and is likely to be adversely affected by the proposed development, the planning authority must have regard to the requirements for derogation referred to in Article 16 and the fact that



Natural England will have a role in ensuring that the requirements for derogation set out in the Directive are met.

If it appears to the planning authority that circumstances exist which make it very likely that the requirements for derogation will not be met, then the planning authority will need to consider whether, taking the development plan and all other material considerations into account, planning permission should be refused. Conversely, if it seems from the information that the requirements are likely to be met, then there would be no impediment to planning permission in this regard. If it is unclear whether the requirements will be met or not, a balanced view taking into account the particular circumstances of the application should be taken and the guidance in the NPPF. In line with guidance in the NPPF, appropriate mitigation and enhancement should be secured if planning permission is granted.

In this case, ecological issues were given full consideration at the time of previous approval, and it was concluded that subject to the imposition of certain conditions, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on protected species within or adjoining the site. Given that the site area remains unchanged, provided that the same conditions are imposed, the proposed re-plan and increase in the numbers of dwellings will not have a materially different or greater impact than the approved scheme.

## **Landscape**

In respect of the previous application, the Council's Landscape Officer expressed the view that the proposals would not have a significant landscape or visual impact and therefore offers no objections to this application. Given that no change is proposed to the extent of the development area, or the site boundaries, it is not considered that any additional landscape impact would occur as a result of this proposal.

## **Trees**

The Council's Landscape Officer has examined the application, and commented that the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment indicates that the development would encroach into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of several trees on the northern boundary and that the crowns of the trees will encroach some distances over several plots. The applicant's arboricultural consultant appears to consider that the trees could tolerate the RPA encroachment and indicates that they could be crown reduced to reduce the impact on properties.

British Standard 5857:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations advises that the default position should be that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. The BS also makes reference to the relationship between buildings and large trees and the apprehension caused to occupiers. Consequently, there are concerns that the layout proposed is not fully sympathetic to the trees and the constraints they pose. The proposal should therefore be refused on the grounds of threat to mature trees of amenity value.

## **Drainage and Flooding**

United Utilities and the Environment Agency have raised no objection to the proposed modifications subject to a condition requiring the site to be drained in complete accordance with the previously submitted and approved strategy which ultimately states that all surface water flows generated by the new development will discharge to soak-away or watercourse only.

## **Design**

With regard to the layout of the site, the re-planned part of the site would be arranged around a cul-de-sac with a turning head at the end, which is the same as the approved scheme. The only difference is the inclusion of a small private drive to serve 3 properties at the end of the cul-de-sac. The properties are orientated in such a way that active frontage is provided to the roads and, despite the introduction of the private driveway a sense of enclosure and overlooking is maintained at the end of the turning heads. This is similar in character to much of the surrounding development, particularly the more modern housing estate to the south. Whilst greater than that of the approved scheme, the density, of the development, and the spacing between the dwellings, will not appear out of character with that of the remaining part of the site and the adjoining development.

However, the increase in the density has resulted in the majority of plots now having frontage parking on both sides of the road. This will create the impression of a car dominated frontage which will detract from the character and appearance of the proposed street scene contrary to Policies GR1 and GR2 of the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to improve the character and quality of areas and the way in which they function.

To turn to elevational detail, the surrounding development comprises a mixture of ages and architectural styles, ranging from single-storey properties to two-storey properties. Notwithstanding this, there is consistency in terms of materials with most walls being finished in simple red brick; some properties incorporate render and cladding. The predominant roof forms are gables although some are hipped and most are finished in grey concrete tiles.

Of the 7 housetypes proposed in the re-planned area, three are incorporated within the existing approved scheme and are therefore deemed to be appropriate. Two of the other 4 housetypes, the “Moulton” and the “Hadfield” are 2 stories in height which reflects the more recent developments in the surrounding area. The “Mossley” and “Soutar” include accommodation within the roofspace, and are 9m and 9.5m in overall height respectively, which is significantly greater than the 2 storey dwellings on the remainder of the development and within the surrounding area which are all around 7.5m in overall height. This disparity will be more noticeable given that some of the three storey units are proposed on the boundary with existing development. Furthermore, the height of the 3 storey units on plots, which are already impacted by trees, as detailed above, will exacerbate the extent of overshadowing and over-domination.

The properties are traditional gabled and pitched roofed dwellings which incorporate many features such as canopy porches and window head details that add visual interest to the

elevations and are similar to other properties in the vicinity. The proposals are in keeping with those on the previously approved scheme, and the remaining part of the site. Similar designs have been employed on the neighbouring developments and it is considered that the proposed dwellings would be appropriate for the site and in keeping with the character of the surroundings.

### **Loss of Agricultural Land**

The proposal will not result in any greater loss of agricultural land than the previously approved scheme.

### **Open space**

The size, shape and location of the proposed on-site open space provision are identical to that shown on the previously approved scheme. This was also previously, considered to be adequate to serve a development of 68 homes. However, it would not be sufficient to provide for a development of 80 dwellings and it therefore follows that either additional open space should be provided within the site or a commuted sum towards off-site provision. The Greenspaces Officer was calculating the level of this contribution at the time of report preparation and a further update will be provided to Members in due course.

With regard to Children and Young Persons Provision, following an assessment of the existing provision accessible to the proposed development, carried out as part of the previous application, if permission were to be granted, there would be a deficiency in the quantity of provision, having regard to the local standards set out in the Council's Open Space Study for Children and Young Persons Provision.

To meet the needs of the development, an opportunity was identified for the upgrading of an existing facility at Moss Drive, to increase its capacity. The existing facility is a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP), located off Chadwick Road/ Moss Drive. This facility is within 800m of the entrance of the proposed development accessed via a footpath off Chadwick Road, close to the existing road called The Green.

The existing facilities at the identified site are substandard in quality and consequently the applicant agreed to provide a financial contribution of £21,152.67 for capital works for the upgrade of its play area in accordance with Council standards. This equates to £335.76 per dwelling. The increase in the number of dwellings to 80 would clearly increase the demand for play facilities and the pressure on the Chadwick Road / Moss Drive site. It is therefore recommended that the contribution should be increased accordingly. A figure will be provided as part of the update report.

The applicant has also confirmed that it is their intention to set up a management company to maintain the onsite open space and in this context they would not be required to make a contribution to the Council for the on-going maintenance of the on-site amenity green space.

Therefore, subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the financial contribution and the establishment of the management company, it is considered that the revised proposal is acceptable in Open Space terms.

### **Highway Safety and Traffic Generation**

The Strategic Highways Manager has looked at the previous transport submissions for application 11/2833C. The increase in traffic will be small and he does not consider that there will be any significant traffic issue. Nevertheless, given the objections citing traffic

including from Middlewich Town Council, it is considered that it would be appropriate to ask the Applicant for revised capacity assessment at the junction of The Green with Chadwick Road. This has been requested and an update on these matters will be provided prior to the Strategic Planning Board Meeting.

### **Infrastructure**

The Councils Education Department were consulted as part of the previous application and stated that the existing schools in the area should be able to accommodate the additional pupils from this development and therefore no Section 106 Developer contributions were required in respect of that proposal.

The Education Officer has confirmed that the revised application will generate 7 primary and 5 secondary aged pupils. Based on the pupil forecasts and the already approved development there will be sufficient capacity in the local primary schools to accommodate the pupils generated of this age range. However there is a shortfall in secondary provision and therefore a contribution of £81,713 is required.

### **Ground Conditions**

A consultation response was received from the Cheshire Brine Board in respect of the previous application which raised no objection to the proposed development. Given that there is no change to the site area, no additional concerns are raised in this respect.

Matters of contaminated land were also addressed as part of the previous permission, and the conditions attached thereto, and consequently, Environmental Health have raised no objection subject to a condition being added requiring all work to cease in the event that previously unsuspected contamination is encountered.

## **9. CONCLUSIONS**

The previous planning permission granted in January 2013, established the acceptability in principle of residential development on this site and given that the previous permission can still be implemented, this application does not present an opportunity to re-examine those issues.

However, the application raises concerns in respect of the level of residential amenity provided within the site for future occupants. It is also likely to result in a threat to mature trees of amenity value, both as a result of construction and the long term impact of living in close proximity to overbearing trees. In terms of design there are concerns regarding the three storey nature of the development and car dominated frontages.

The application makes provision for an adequate level of affordable housing, which can be secured through an appropriate Section 106 Agreement. The proposal will not have any adverse effects in terms of ecology, landscape, drainage and flooding, loss of agricultural land, highway safety and traffic generation and ground conditions. Subject to additional Section 106 contributions, the proposal will be acceptable in terms of education and open

space provision. However, these are insufficient considerations to outweigh the concerns as outlined above and accordingly the proposal is recommended for refusal.

## **10. RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE** for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its size and siting would result in a threat to the continued well being of existing mature trees of amenity value, both as a direct result of construction activity and as a result of overbearing impact on the proposed properties leading to long term pressure from future residents to inappropriately prune or remove trees. The loss of these trees is considered unacceptable because of the impact upon the general amenity and character of the area in which the application site is located contrary to Policy NR1 (Trees and Woodlands) of the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity and the prevent loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including trees.**
- 2. The proposed 3 storey development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the remainder of the properties within the development site as a whole. This would be contrary to Policies GR1 and GR2 of the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to improve the character and quality of areas and the way in which they function.**
- 3. The proposed parking arrangements would lead to a car dominated frontage which would detract from the character and appearance of the proposed street scene and the development as a whole contrary to Policies GR1 and GR2 of the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to improve the character and quality of areas and the way in which they function.**
- 4. The proposed development provides insufficient separation between dwellings and levels of private amenity space and would lead to an inadequate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers contrary Policies GR1, GR2 and GR6 of the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review and the provisions of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Private Open Space in New Residential Developments, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to improve the character and quality of areas and the way in which they function.**



(c) Crown copyright and database rights 2013. Ordnance Survey  
100049045, 100049046.

