

Application No: 18/4024M

Location: 51 & 53 HANDFORTH ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 2LX

Proposal: Demolition of existing 2 detached properties and erection of 65no. bedrooms care home with associated landscaping, car park and access

Applicant: New Care Project LLP

Expiry Date: 12-Apr-2019

REASON FOR REPORT

The application is to be presented at Northern Planning Committee because it has been 'called-in' to committee at the request of Cllr Barry Burkhill on the 28th February 2019 due to the following concerns:

"The application has created significant and extensive local concern. It will create precedence for other houses in this area on both sides of the road in an area of large, low density, detached properties, widely separated, set in their own grounds and will inappropriately alter the character of the area. There is concern about overlooking a large car parking area and the parking provided does not meet parking standards, particularly at peak times."

SUMMARY

The principle of the proposed development is acceptable subject to there being no significant adverse impacts arising from the proposal.

As the proposal is not classified as use class C3 (dwellinghouses) there is no affordable housing requirement. However, the development will provide suitable accommodation to enable an ageing population within Cheshire East to live full independent lives for as long as possible. It is considered that the proposal would make a valuable contribution towards meeting an identified housing need for elderly people within the Borough, as well as continuity in their care, which is a material consideration of significant weight.

The impact on European Protected Species and other ecological interests has been assessed by the nature conservation officer and is acceptable. The proposal accords with the relevant ecology policies in the local plan and national guidance in the Framework. There is not considered to be any reason, having regard to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, to withhold planning permission in this case.

Similarly, the proposal also raises no significant visual, highway safety, amenity, design or flooding issues, and complies with relevant local and national planning policies.

A number of economic benefits will also arise from the development including additional trade for local business and the creation of employment.

Bearing all the above points in mind, it is considered that the proposal accords with all other relevant Development Plan policies and as such it is recommended the application be approved, subject to relevant conditions and a s106 contribution to healthcare.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions and completion of a s106 agreement

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site comprises 2no. detached residential dwellings situated in large plots, fronting onto Handforth Road. The levels increase from the north-west of the site to the south-east (right to left as you look at the site from the front).

The site frontage (north-east) is to Handforth road, with mature tree screening to the north and west, separating the site from the neighbouring residential properties and the sports field to the rear.

The site is located to the south-east of Handforth and north-east of Wilmslow, within a predominantly residential area, as defined in the Macclesfield Local Plan.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of the two existing detached dwellings and the erection of a 65no. bed care home with associated landscaping, car park and access.

RELEVANT HISTORY

18/1025M Demolition of existing 2 detached properties and erection of 83-bedroom care home with associated landscaping, car parking and access.

This application is currently subject to an appeal against the non-determination of the application.

POLICIES

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – adopted 27th July 2017

MP1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

PG1 Overall Development Strategy

PG2 Settlement Boundaries

PG7 Spatial distribution of development

SD1 Sustainable development in Cheshire East

SD2 Sustainable development principles

IN1 Infrastructure

IN2 Developer Contributions

SE1 Design

SE2 Efficient Use of Land

SE3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

SE4 The Landscape

SE5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

SE8 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

SE9 Energy Efficient development

SE12 Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability

SC1 Leisure and Recreation

SC2 Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities

SC3 Health and Well Being

SC4 Residential Mix

Appendix C – Parking Standards

It should be noted that the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy was formally adopted on 27th July 2017. There are however policies within the legacy local plans that still apply and have not yet been replaced. These policies are set out below.

Saved Macclesfield Borough Local Plan Policies

DC3 (Protection of the amenities of nearby residential properties)

DC6 (Safe and convenient access for vehicles, special needs groups and pedestrians)

DC8 (Landscaping)

DC9 (Protected Trees)

DC38 (Guidelines for space, light and privacy for housing development)
NE11 (Nature conservation)
DC57 (Community Uses - Residential Institutions)

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Framework (NPPG)
Cheshire East Design Guide

The Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan has reached regulation 16 stage and has been through public consultation. On this basis some weight can be given to the relevant policies which are;

SP1: Sustainable Construction
SP3: Sustainable Transport
NE5: Biodiversity Conservation
NE6: Development in Gardens
H2: Residential Design
H3: Housing Mix
CR3: Local Green Spaces
CR4: Public Open Space
CR5: Health Centres

National Policy:

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
Of particular relevance are paragraphs 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 15.

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

United Utilities: no objection subject to conditions relating to drainage

Housing: no objection

Manchester Airport: no objection

Highways: no objection subject to a construction management plan condition

Flood Risk: no objections subject to conditions

Environmental Protection: No objections subject to conditions relating to a construction phase environmental management plan, lighting, a travel plan, piling and contaminated land.

NHS Eastern Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group: Request financial contribution of £31,324 to support the development of Handforth Health Centre.

VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL

Wilmslow Town Council: The initial comments relating to the originally submitted plans were as follows:

“Wilmslow Town Council’s Planning Committee recommend refusal of this application on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and being out-of-keeping with the area. Parking provision is also inadequate and the proposed development will be overbearing on neighbouring properties resulting in loss of privacy. In addition, the transport statement is no longer accurate.”

Following the amended plans the following comments were submitted:

“Wilmslow Town Council’s Planning Committee remains of the view that this application is overdevelopment of the site out-of-keeping with the area. The proposed parking provision is still inadequate and the proposed development will be overbearing on neighbouring properties resulting in loss of privacy. “

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Representations from 50 properties were received prior to the submission of the revised plans, below is a summary of the relevant comments:

- Lack of car parking with the scheme – the proposed provision is less than is required in the Council’s parking standards.
- Highway safety issues due to the increase in traffic.
- Doctors surgeries in the area will be overwhelmed.
- There is not a need in the area for additional care homes; there is a derelict one in the centre of Handforth.
- Loss of light and overlooking to surrounding adjacent neighbours.
- The building will be out of character with the surrounding area - the surrounding area contains mainly two storey detached dwellings.
- There is no substantiated need for this development which will probably be for residents outside the area.
- Construction traffic to the proposed site will pose a significant risk to pedestrians.
- The mass of the building would be overbearing to neighbouring properties.
- The applicant has not submitted a manoeuvrability diagram demonstrating that emergency vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward gear.

- Construction traffic to the proposed site will pose a significant risk to pedestrians.
- In order to construct the development a number of mature trees would have to be destroyed altering the local landscape and wildlife of this area.
- Another unjustified incursion into the Green Belt.
- The pedestrian footpaths in both directions are very hilly and unsuitable for residents walking around.
- This development would also bring out-of-hours noise from Lorries and vehicles, manoeuvring and loading which will impact local residents, particularly at times of the day/night when ambient noise levels are low.
- The visual impact to the frontage of the plot will create a street scene dominated by vehicles having a detrimental effect on the character surrounding this residential area contrary to policy guidance.
- Over development of the site.
- A roundabout was recently installed near to the site which increases highway safety issues.

A further 34 no. properties commented again following the reconsultation after the amended plans were submitted. The comments raise the same concerns as the initial round of objections raised.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Key Issues

- Design and impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the street-scene.
- Impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- Highways safety
- Landscaping, trees & nature conservation

Principle of Development

The site lies within a Predominantly Residential Area of the adopted Macclesfield Borough Local Plan where residential uses are acceptable in principle.

The site is considered to be in a sustainable location. It is a previously developed site, within an area surrounded by housing, which is within walking distance of public transport links and to services. No policy objections are raised to the proposal.

Sec.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications and appeals must be determined “in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.

As per para 11 of the Framework and CELPS Policy MP 1, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development taking into account the three dimensions of sustainable development (social, economic and environmental) and compliance with the Development Plan in accordance with Sec.38 (6). The ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ at paragraph 11 of the NPPF means: “approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay”

The Council can now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply but it is important to note that this site will deliver up to 46 properties for older persons within a key service centre. Proposals like this that bring forward development of such sites make a valuable contribution to maintaining a 5 year housing land supply and preventing inappropriate development elsewhere.

Policy SC4 of the Cheshire East Local Plan states the following: *“Development proposals for accommodation designed specifically for the elderly and people who require specialist accommodation will be supported where there is a proven need; they are located within settlements; accessible by public transport; and within a reasonable walking distance of community facilities such as shops, medical services and public open space.”*

The purposes are broadly repeated in the saved Macclesfield Borough Local Plan policy DC57, which lists a number of relevant criteria for assessing new residential institutions.

The site falls in a sustainable location, close to the town centre, shops and facilities. Bus routes run past the site.

Policy DC57 states that the development must comprise a reasonable sized private garden in the order of 10 sq metres per resident. Accommodation would be provided for up to 65no. residents. This would require a private garden in excess of 650 sq metres for the use of the residents. The garden area on the eastern side of the care home would be in excess of 700 sq metres of useable garden area, which would have a pleasant aspect and due to the mature landscaping, it would not be overlooked, or overshadowed.

The Strategic Highways Engineer raised no objections to the application.

Need for the development

Cheshire East Housing Strategy 2018-2023 *Growth and quality of place Health, wellbeing and quality of life*

One of the challenges identified within the strategy is for improving the housing offer for an ageing population. *“Provision of smaller homes for older people to meet changes in household types; help those with special needs; dementia friendly; making existing homes*

suitable for independent living and provide a mix of housing on larger developments, including single storey accommodation as a choice."

Vulnerable and Older People's Housing Strategy (2014)

This strategy identifies that the proportion of older people in Cheshire East is already above national average, along with this there will be a shortfall of what is defined as Extra Care of 1,063 places by 2030. The strategy does not identify any forthcoming sites for this type of accommodation.

The oversupply of residential and nursing care places is noted within this strategy. Page 5 states:

"For those with escalating needs, the Council will encourage wherever appropriate the transition of older people into specialist supported accommodation, and especially housing that enables them to live independently for as long as possible." Outcome 2 of the strategy states:

"People can receive the support they need in a wide range of specialist, supported accommodation within the Borough".

Cheshire East Extra Care SHMA - Peter Fletcher and ARC4 (2010)

This document states that:

"the key question to be asked in defining extra care is 'can the proposed development provide care equivalent to that found in a residential care home if needed?' If the proposed development is able to achieve that 'Home for life' threshold then it could be argued it is extra care in terms of Cheshire strategic objectives".

Cheshire East SHMA 2010

The SHMA identified the statistics for an ageing population of Cheshire East and concluded the following:

"Between 2010 and 2030, the number of households:

- Pensionable age to 74 is forecast to increase by 13,300;*
- 75-84 is forecast to increase by 14,000; and*
- 85 and over is forecast to increase by 11,200."*

Paragraph 4.42 indicates that there is:

"a degree of interest in new forms of older persons' accommodation, for instance older persons' apartments and properties in a retirement/care village. Providing a wider range of older persons' accommodation has the potential to free-up larger family accommodation (although price could still remain a barrier to entry)."

Cheshire East SHMA Update 2013

The SHMA was updated in 2013 and paragraph 6.27 acknowledges that:

"the range of housing options available to older people needs to be diversified, for instance through the development of open market housing marketed at older people, the development of Extra Care accommodation and co-housing."

It restates the issue of an oversupply of care home beds. It notes that the population is ageing and over the period 2011 to 2030, the number of pensionable age people and above is forecast to increase from 85,500 in 2011 (23.1% of the population) to 124,000 in 2030 (30.2% of the population).

With this in mind, there is considered to be an identified need for the proposed development, and this is a material consideration of significant weight in support of the proposal.

Healthcare

The NHS Eastern Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has commented on the application noting that there is a nearby GP practice within Handforth - Handforth Health Centre. The Handforth Health Centre GP practice is a 1970's single storey building in need of some improvements and a predicted patient growth rate of 32% over the next 10 years. Space utilisation analysis has demonstrated that the Handforth Health Centre currently has a 44% shortfall in required space in order to adequately provide primary care services to the existing patient population.

For the planning application in question the CCG requests a contribution to health infrastructure via Section 106 of £31,324. This is based on the NHS funding model for general practice (the Carr-Hill formula), which applies a workload factor to patients in nursing and residential homes of 1.43 leading to a calculation consisting of number of beds x 1.43 x £337, where £337 is the build cost per head of additional population.

Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policies SE1 and SD2 seek to ensure that new development respects the character of the area and is of an appropriate design. This is consistent with the provisions of the NPPF and is supported through the Cheshire East Design Guide.

The application proposes the replacement of the existing two detached dwellings with a large care home. Amended plans were submitted during the course of the application following concerns raised by officers.

The parking has been reconsidered and landscaped with hard and soft landscaping to tie in with the street frontage to provide adequate screening of the parking. The surface materials should be permeable as detailed within the CEC design guide to promote SuDs within the curtilage.

The proposal balances the horizontal and vertical scale of the elevations with a variety of elements. The elevation facing the footpath provides natural surveillance along this elevation. The corner feature provides a distinctive corner detail for legibility. The amendments have broken down and articulated the elevations with a series of bays, giving the impression of a more domestic scale development. The front elevation and side elevation fronting on to the footpath read as a number of linked units.

There is a fairly wide variety in topography throughout the site. The proposal responds to the topography by providing a diverse roof line that steps to provide a more organic form.

A mix of materials that incorporate the local palette has been proposed. The proposal is a mix of traditional styling that relates to the architectural vernacular with modern elements that create a modern feature to the prominent corner.

The Council's Design Officer has concluded that *"Overall a far more refined design that contributes to the sense of place along Handforth Road and one that would be supported."*

Conditions regarding the specification of materials to the buildings and surface treatments would be attached to any approval.

While large it is considered that the size of the site, along with the improved front elevation of the proposed scheme ensure that the impact of the proposal on the character of the area is, on balance, acceptable and the views of the Council's Design Officer are concurred with.

Amenity

In order for the proposals to be acceptable, it is important that they do not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of existing residents. Local Plan policies DC3, DC38 and DC41 seek to ensure that new development does not significantly injure the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential property.

New residential developments should generally achieve a distance of between 21m and 25m between principal windows and 13m to 14m between a principal window and a blank elevation. This is required to maintain an adequate standard of privacy and amenity between residential properties and these are set out in Policy DC38. The policy includes provisions to increase these distances in circumstances when development exceeds two-stories in height.

To the north, there is a sufficient gap with extensive screening from protected trees to ensure that the development would have an acceptable impact on the properties to the north.

To the south the adjacent property would be number 49. Changes in the topography and orientation reduce the impact on this property in terms of loss of light or loss of privacy. The proposed building would be positioned over 40m from the closest rear habitable windows of number 49.

The proposed side facing windows at first and second floor would be positioned over 22m from the boundary with number 49, which together with the mature boundary screening would ensure that this relationship is within acceptable limits.

Further into the site the building would be over 24m from the closest point of the properties along Tarporley Walk. This is within acceptable limits.

With the above in mind it is considered that the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties is within acceptable limits in line with saved policies DC3, DC41 and DC38 of the Macclesfield Local Plan.

Highways

The comments below were submitted by the Council's Strategic Highways manager:

"To justify, the applicant has stated that during peak times 50% of staff travel by car which would leave approximately 10 spaces free for residents and visitors. Due to the nature of the proposal, car ownership levels for residents would be low.

In addition to this, car park accumulation surveys have been carried out from 7AM to 7PM for 3 other similar sites in Macclesfield, Wilmslow, and Holmes Chapel. The average peak parking demand of the sites was 0.34 and the provision for the proposal is 0.37, which is slightly higher. Based on this it is unlikely that parking would overspill onto the highway. There is also a resting area adjacent to space 9 should an ambulance require it.

For these reasons the parking provision is considered acceptable.

The proposal will generate no more than a dozen vehicle movements during either of the network peak hours the impact of which will be negligible.

The access and parking provision are acceptable and no objection is raised subject to an appropriate condition relating to a construction management plan."

Accessibility

It is a reasonably sustainable location, with public transport adjacent to the site, and also positioned approximately 0.6 mile from the local shopping complex at Summerfields Village Centre.

The topography of Handforth Road means that there is an incline when travelling north or south. No doubt this would dissuade some people from walking to the village centre depending on mobility. However, the path is used by local people including the elderly. As a consequence, it seems unlikely that the more mobile residents or those with mobility scooters would be deterred from walking/riding to the local facilities along Handforth Road. Walking to the nearest facilities is therefore an option for residents.

Accessibility is therefore considered to be in accordance with the objectives of policies DC6 and DC57 of the local plan.

Trees

The submitted arboricultural report supporting the application confirms there are 14 individual trees and one group of trees that are categorised as moderate (B), the remaining trees are categorised as low (C) in accordance with BS5837 :2012 Tree Quality Assessment methodology. Three moderate category Birch trees (T29, T30 and T37) will require removal to accommodate the proposed development; two of the trees (T29 and T30) are protected by the TPO. To justify these removals, the report at para 5.3.3. states that as these trees are located internally within the site, their removal will have little impact upon the amenity of the group when viewed from outside the site. Following a further assessment, it is agreed by the

Council's Forestry Officer that both trees are not significantly visible from outside the site and their loss will not present a detriment to the wider amenity of the area.

The report advises other low value (C) category trees will require removal to accommodate the development. Such trees would not normally be considered for retention unless they present a significant constraint on development.

Para 5.3.4 of the Report identifies several instances where the development will encroach within the RPA of retained trees. With regard to Silver Birch (T14) to the northern boundary, the encroachment is for a footpath. It is agreed by the Council's Forestry Officer that given the nature of construction, this can be adequately dealt with by installation of ground protection and a suitable method statement/construction specification.

Proposed parking to the northern boundary of the site will interface slightly within the RPA of a group of offsite Cypress (G9). The incursion into the RPA of these trees is considered to be relatively minor and given the tree's vitality and available soil rooting volume elsewhere, the construction of the car parking spaces can be implemented utilising a no dig construction methodology.

At 5.3.6 the report refers to two trees (G46 shown as T46 on the plan) and T47. Tree T46 are two Sycamore located offsite; T47 is an early mature Ash located within the site close to the site boundary. Parking bays are proposed within the RPA of both trees, however as the area is already compacted by the existing site access proposed by the proposed car parking any additional harm is expected to be minimal. The Report proposes a no dig construction to minimise disturbance and existing levels to be retained which is acceptable.

At 5.3.7 the report refers to the protected Horse Chestnut (T5) along the Handforth Road boundary. Area of hard standing (tarmac and stone flags already exist within the RPA of this tree to the north and west, which is proposed to be removed within the RPA. Some encroachment is proposed within a segment of the RPA to the south for the proposed access, and a small segment to the north. No dig construction is proposed for both segments. The removal of existing hard standing within the RPA and proposed no dig encroachment represents a neutral impact and is accepted by the Council's Forestry Officer on this basis.

Concern has been expressed regarding the social proximity of retained trees in relation to the proposed development, having regard to the group of protected trees to the western section of the site. Separation distance to the closest retained tree (T25 Norway Maple) has been measured on plan as 11.5 metres to a bedroom window and a separation distance of 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy spread. In this regard, it is anticipated that shading and some obstruction of afternoon sun from this tree and others within the group will occur, particularly when the trees are in full leaf. The report does state that due to the temporary nature of occupancy and the developer will have authority over management of the grounds, there will be less external pressure to remove trees.

Having regard to the nature of occupancy and management of the site, whilst separation distances are not ideal, the reasons given are acceptable.

There are proposals for retaining walls along the western section of the site (adjacent to the protected group of trees) and to the south of the site. The proposed walls appear to be

located outside the RPA of retained trees; however it will be necessary for construction to be dealt with by a method statement/construction specification.

Existing constraints and the scale of the development make this a very restricted site and the Council's Forestry Officer has reservations about the efficacy of the proposed tree protection measures and availability of working space, however with appropriately worded conditions these constraints should be overcome.

With suitably worded conditions the Council's Forestry Officer has no objections to the scheme.

Nature Conservation

Breeding Birds

Suitably worded conditions relating to breeding birds should be included in any approval.

Great Crested Newts

Following eDNA surveys of the site, Great Crested Newts are not considered likely to be present on site. No further action required.

Bats

Evidence of bat activity in the form of minor roosts of a relatively common bat species has been recorded within number 53 and number 51. The usage of the buildings by bats is likely to be limited to small-medium numbers of animals using the building for relatively short periods of time during the year and there is no evidence to suggest a significant maternity roost is present. The loss of the buildings on this site in the absence of mitigation is likely to have a medium impact on bats at the local level and a low impact upon the conservation status of the species as a whole.

The EC Habitats Directive 1992 requires the UK to maintain a system of strict protection for protected species and their habitats. The Directive only allows disturbance, or deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places

(a) in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment, and provided that there is

(b) no satisfactory alternative and

(c) no detriment to the maintenance of the species population at favourable conservation status in their natural range

The UK has implemented the Directive in the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 2010 (as amended) which contain two layers of protection (i) a requirement on Local Planning Authorities ("LPAs") to have regard to the

Directive's requirements above, and (ii) a licensing system administered by Natural England and supported by criminal sanctions.

Saved Macclesfield Borough Local Plan Policy NE11 and policy SE3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan states that the Council will seek to conserve, enhance and interpret nature conservation interests. Development which would affect nature conservation interests will not normally be permitted.

Circular 6/2005 advises LPAs to give due weight to the presence of protected species on a development site to reflect EC requirements. "This may potentially justify a refusal of planning permission."

The NPPF advises LPAs to conserve and enhance biodiversity: if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts) or adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

Natural England's standing advice is that, if a (conditioned) development appears to fail the three tests in the Habitats Directive, then LPAs should consider whether Natural England is likely to grant a licence: if unlikely, then the LPA should refuse permission: if likely, then the LPA can conclude that no impediment to planning permission arises under the Directive and Regulations.

In this case it is considered that the proposal will result in social and economic benefits, and any alternatives are likely to involve extensions to the existing building, which would have a comparable impact upon the species.

The submitted report recommends the installation of bat boxes on the replacement building as a means of compensating for the loss of the roosts and also recommends the timing and supervision of the works to reduce the risk posed to any bats that may be present when the works are completed.

The nature conservation officer advises that if planning consent is granted the proposed mitigation/compensation is broadly acceptable.

HEADS OF TERMS

If the application is approved a Section 106 Agreement will be required, and should include:

- Healthcare contribution of £31,324.00.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 it is now necessary for planning applications with legal agreements to consider the issue of whether the requirements within the S106 satisfy the following:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The provision of a healthcare contribution is necessary, fair and reasonable to provide a sustainable form of development, to contribute towards sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities and to comply with local and national planning policy.

All elements are necessary, directly relate to the development and are fair and reasonable in relation to the scale and kind of the development

PLANNING BALANCE

While the objections are noted, the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable.

As the proposal is not classified as use class C3 (dwellinghouses) there is no affordable housing requirement. However, the development will provide suitable accommodation to enable an ageing population within Cheshire East to live full independent lives for as long as possible. It is considered that the proposal would make a valuable contribution towards meeting an identified housing need for elderly people within the Borough, as well as continuity in their care, which is a material consideration of significant weight.

The impact on European Protected Species and other ecological interests has been assessed by the nature conservation officer and is acceptable. The proposal accords with the relevant ecology policies in the local plan and national guidance in the Framework. There is not considered to be any reason, having regard to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, to withhold planning permission in this case.

Similarly, the proposal also raises no significant visual, highway safety, amenity, design or flooding issues, and complies with relevant local and national planning policies.

A number of economic benefits will also arise from the development including additional trade for local business and the creation of employment.

Bearing all the above points in mind, it is considered that the proposal accords with all other relevant Development Plan policies and as such it is recommended the application be approved, subject to relevant conditions and a s106 contribution to healthcare.

In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions / informatives / planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Planning and Enforcement Manager has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Northern Planning Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

Application for Full Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

1. Commencement of development (3 years)
2. Development in accord with approved plans
3. Submission of samples of building materials
4. Pile Driving
5. Landscaping - submission of details
6. Landscaping (implementation)
7. Landscaping to include details of boundary treatment
8. Construction specification/method statement
9. Arboricultural method statement
10. Service / drainage layout
11. Lighting details
12. All arboricultural works shall be carried out in accordance with submitted tree works and tree protection plan
13. Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement
14. Bat mitigation
15. Wildlife sensitive lighting
16. Nesting birds
17. Breeding birds
18. Major Development Construction Phase Environmental Management Plan
19. Foul water
20. Drainage strategy
21. Travel information pack
22. Electric vehicle infrastructure
23. Contaminated Land (investigation works)
24. Contaminated Land (verification report)
25. Contaminated Land (soil)
26. Contaminated Land (unexpected)
27. Construction management plan
28. Surface water drainage

