

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 31ST MAY 2017

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

17/1643N

LOCATION

22 Heathfield Road, Audlem.

UPDATE PREPARED

26th April 2017

Erratum

On Page 68 of the report in the paragraph discussing Policy H5 of the neighbourhood plan, the figures are incorrect. It should read:

Policy H5 relates to the type of new homes and specifies that residential development should have only one-third detached dwellings with the rest being bungalows, terraced or semi-detached. In response to the Parish Council the proposal has been amended to include 4 bungalows, meaning that 11 of the dwellings would be bungalows, terraces or semi-detached. Whilst this does not fully comply with the requirements of the ANP, it should be noted that the outline approval (albeit indicative) showed 18 of the proposed dwellings as detached.

Key Plans

The key plans pack wrongly includes a plan for house type 6. This is no longer part of the proposal and has been replaced on plot 19 by house type 9.

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Audlem Parish Council

We would like to thank to Mr Ellis for responding to our comments. This is the first time a developer has taken the trouble to do so. Hopefully, this bodes well for the future and means that we can work together to ensure that the development goes ahead in the best possible way for both existing residents of Audlem and the developer.

We wish to respond to Markden's comments as follows:

H4 and H5

We are pleased to see that revised plans have been put forward and that four 3-bedroomed dormer bungalows have been included in the plan to replace the 4- and 5-bedroomed houses.

H6

We are pleased to see from the comments made by CEC Housing that the percentage of properties to be built before affordable homes are built has been reduced from 80% to 50%. This alleviates our concern. Although we must point out that no such information provided by the applicant is shown on the Planning Portal.

D1

There is still no indication that the dwellings will comply with the CEC Design Guide; we will assume that this will be the case if the Planning Officer approves the design.

D3

Whilst welcoming the provision of dormer bungalows, we are concerned that three of them (plots 19 – 21) will still dominate the existing properties on Heathfield Road, albeit to a lesser extent. We suggest that planting is put in place as soon as possible to soften the impact.

D6 and D7

We are happy with the comments which alleviate our concern.

D8

We think that Mr Ellis misunderstood our concern about using Mill Lane. We have no problem with the short-term parking of cars while the main access is prepared. However, we are concerned about 'small deliveries of compound consumables' on Mill Lane. What does this mean?

Additionally, any use of the lane by heavy vehicles will damage the already poor surface of Mill Lane which is maintained by the property owners who use it for access. We ask for full reinstatement to its original condition on completion of Phase 1 and no further use of the lane, especially by delivery vehicles, once the main access has been opened.

We accept the provision of bat boxes as these are encouraged by CEC.

D9

We are happy with the comments which alleviate our concern.

D10

We note that CEC's Environmental Health are still not satisfied with the information provided. We also want to make sure that the water in the existing wells isn't contaminated by any groundworks and also that no historic rights to use of wells are infringed

D11 and D14

We are happy with the comments which alleviate our concern.

Issue A

See D8 above

Issue B

Our concern about this refers back to the original application submitted on behalf of Hockenhull Properties Ltd (13/3210N) in which there was a proposal to have an access road going across from this development to the field on the other side of Mill Lane. Following its refusal, Mr Hockenhull was heard to say that he would get the other field developed at some time in the future. Our concern is that this could still happen with the proposed road construction, which appears to be unnecessary as it now does not provide access to any properties in the latest revised Site Layout. In order to protect the integrity of Mill Lane as a bridleway, it should be made a condition in perpetuity that no future crossing of Mill Lane will be permitted.

Issue C

We would hope that very clear instructions will be given to suppliers and that any delivery out of hours will be refused as it is the responsibility of the supplier to abide by any contractual conditions.

However, we are really concerned that CEC's Environmental Health has stated that the approved working hours are from 08.00 to 18.00 on weekdays, when the applicant stated that they will be from 08.00 to 17.00. Similarly, the Saturday hours have been extended from 13.00 to 14.00 by Environmental Health. The additional hour could have a detrimental impact on the residents of this quiet and semi-rural surrounding area.

Issue D

We are happy with the comments which alleviate our concern.

United Utilities: United Utilities has reviewed the drainage proposals Ref No. ELL-612-MH-W-100, Dated Mar 17) and confirm the proposals are acceptable in principle. This is subject to a condition relating to sustainable drainage management and maintenance.

Flood Risk: The Flood Risk Manager is satisfied with the drainage plan & discharge rate provided. However, in order to discharge any surface water drainage conditions there will need to be calculations demonstrating storm period and intensity (1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+30% allowance for Climate Change)) & any temporary storage facilities included, submitted / approved by LLFA to ensure adequate drainage is implemented on site. Could the developer also confirm point of discharge, if this falls within ordinary watercourse formal consent will be needed from ourselves (see informative). If identified to be out falling directly into main river Environment Agency will need to be consulted.

The applicant is currently preparing the required information and this will be provided to Members at the meeting, with any additional conditions that may be necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. **Approved plans.**
2. **Submission and approval of external materials**
3. **The electric vehicle charging points shall be ‘overnight’ ones with dedicated off-road parking served from a 30amp independent circuit**
4. **Travel information pack for future residents**
5. **Provision of a LAP as shown on the planting plan. The LAP shall be provided prior to the occupation of 75% of the dwellings**
6. **Prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan shall include as a minimum:**
 - a) **Arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, or, management and maintenance by a resident’s management company; and**
 - b) **Arrangements for inspection and ongoing maintenance of all elements of the sustainable drainage system to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.**

In order to give proper effect to the Committee’s intentions and without changing the substance of the decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation), in consultation with the Chair (or in her absence the Vice Chair) of Southern Planning Committee, to correct any technical slip or omission in the wording of the resolution, between approval of the minutes and issue of the decision notice.