

Application No: 21/4382N

Location: HUNTERS LODGE HOTEL, 296, SYDNEY ROAD, CREWE, CW1 5LU

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a residential development (Use Class C3) alongside a care home (Use Class C2) with associated access, parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Applicant: Seddon Homes Ltd

Expiry Date: 30-Sep-2022

## SUMMARY

The application site is located largely within the Crewe settlement boundary, with part of the red edge including an agricultural field to the north and east which is located within the Open countryside and Green Gap.

Policy PG2 sets out that Crewe is a Principal Town where significant development will be encouraged to support its revitalisation, recognising its role as one of the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible by public transport. Policy PG7 sets out that Principal Towns such as Crewe are expected to accommodate in the order of 65 ha of employment land and 7,700 new homes.

The amended plans show largely the open space and ecological area located within the open space to the north and with small area of the site to the north and the east slightly protruding into the open countryside/Green Gap. It is considered that the location of the open space including a LEAP complies with Policy PG6 as outdoor recreation and therefore is acceptable in principle.

The small incursion in relation to a pathway, tree planting and a small parking allocation, and single storey element of the care home, will have some impact on the open countryside, however as noted below, have been designed to help to create a positive rural transition. Whilst there is some incursion into the Green Gap on the edges, it is considered that on balance, the development as amended, is acceptable in principle. The development as proposed is therefore considered to comply with policies PG5 and PG6, of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and RES.5 of the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with the Development Plan

unless material considerations indicate otherwise, these matters are discussed further below.

Therefore, it is considered that residential development is acceptable in principle, however this is subject to compliance with all other relevant policies within the development plan.

The layout and size of the of the scheme is now considered to be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and rural edge. The Design Officer has raised concerns over some of the house types and details in terms of landscaping and planting and surfacing materials, however the scheme is largely acceptable and subject to conditions for materials, boundary treatment, hardsurfacing, landscaping and tree planting the scheme is acceptable.

The site has raised no significant issues in relation to landscaping, forestry, amenity, highways safety, impact on protected species, flood risk or drainage, subject to appropriate conditions.

The scheme will contribute towards the normal mitigation required in relation to Education, NHS, POS, and Affordable Housing (and Biodiversity net gain – if required).

It is therefore considered that the development is on balance acceptable and recommended for approval accordingly.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**Approve subject to S106 Agreement and conditions**

## **REASON FOR REFERRAL**

The application has been referred to the Southern Planning Committee as it is a Small Scale major development of over 20 units.

## **PROPOSAL**

Full Planning Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the erection of 55 (reduced from 68 originally) dwellings and a care home.

## **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site relates to the Hunters Lodge, Sydney Road, Crewe. The application site is a former hotel. The existing buildings are accessed off a driveway and include hotel rooms and a function rooms.

The application site lies to the east of Sydney Road, towards the eastern edge of Crewe. To the east of the side is the wider rural landscape. The application site comprises a building that was formerly the Hunters Lodge Hotel, a car parking area and an area of agricultural grassland which forms part of a larger field that extends to the east, there is an area of woodland along the northern boundary.

The site is located partly within the Crewe settlement boundary (the existing built development site) with the northern and eastern boundary and field being located within the Open Countryside and Green Gap.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

12/4494N - Outline planning approval for up to 44 No. dwellings, vehicular access, associated garaging, car parking and landscaping. (All matters reserved except access) – Refused 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2013 – Dismissed at Appeal 29<sup>th</sup> July 2014

P02/0264 – Ground and First Floor Extensions, 37 Additional Bedrooms and New Leisure Facility – Approved with conditions 13<sup>th</sup> May 2002

P96/0826 – Linen store – Approved 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1996

7/19329 – Two storey and 1st floor extension to form 18 bedrooms – approved with conditions 7<sup>th</sup> February 1991

7/17331 – 18 no bedroom extension to motel – approved with condition 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1989

7/16006 – 18 no bedroom motel extension – approved with conditions 5<sup>th</sup> October 1988

7/15668 – One post mounted pictorial sign – approved with conditions 4<sup>th</sup> August 1988

7/16263 – Hotel sign – approved 7<sup>th</sup> December 1988

7/14234 – Alterations and extensions to provide additional dining area, central kitchen, staff changing rooms, lounge for motel residents – approved with conditions 6<sup>th</sup> May 1987

7/10902 – 12 additional bedrooms – Approved with conditions 30<sup>th</sup> April 1984

7/11022 – 2 no externally illuminated signwritten boards. – approved with condition 7<sup>th</sup> June 1984

7/11482 – Small conference room – approved 18<sup>th</sup> October 1984

7/05630 – Extension to form lounge, toilets, kitchen and cellars – approved with conditions 19<sup>th</sup> July 1979

7/05917 – Beer store – Approved 11<sup>th</sup> October 1979

7/04047 – Residential development – refused 11<sup>th</sup> September 1978

7/04056 – Extensions, car parking and landscaping schemes – approved with conditions 29<sup>th</sup> June 1978

## **PLANNING POLICY**

### **Development Plan**

*Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS);*

MP1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development)  
PG1 (Overall Development Strategy)  
PG2 (Settlement Hierarchy)  
PG5 (Strategic Green Gaps)  
PG6 (Open countryside)  
PG7 (Spatial Distribution of Development)  
SD1 (Sustainable Development in Cheshire East),  
SD2 (Sustainable Development Principles),  
IN1 (Infrastructure)  
IN2 (Developer Contributions)  
EG3 (Existing and Allocated Sites)  
EG4 (Tourism)  
SC1 (Leisure and Recreation)  
SC2 (Indoor and Outdoor Facilities)  
SC3 (Health and Wellbeing)  
SC4 (Residential Mix)  
SC5 (Affordable Homes)  
SE1 (Design)  
SE2 (Efficient Use of Land),  
SE3 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity)  
SE4 (The Landscape),  
SE5 (Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland),  
SE6 (Green Infrastructure)  
SE8 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy)  
SE9 (Energy Efficient Development)  
SE11 (Sustainable Management of Waste)  
SE12 (Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability)  
SE13 (Flood Risk and Water Management)  
CO1 (Sustainable Travel and Transport)  
CO4 (Travel Plans and Transport Assessments)  
Appendix C: Parking Standards

*Saved policies of the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan 2011 (CNLP)*

NE.4 - Green Gaps  
NE.5 - Nature Conservation and Habitats  
NE.9 – Protected Species  
BE.1 – Amenity,  
BE.3 - Access and Parking,  
BE.4 - Drainage, Utilities and Resources,  
BE.6 - Development on Potentially Contaminated Land  
RES.2 - Unallocated Housing Sites,  
RES.5 – Housing in the Open Countryside

RT.2 – Equipped Children’s Playgrounds

RT.3 - Provision of Recreational Open Space and Children’s Playspace in new housing developments,

RT.5 – Allotments

CF.3 – Retention of community Facilities

### **Cheshire East Draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD)**

The Site allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) is at an advanced stage of preparation. The Plan was submitted for examination in April 2021, hearings took place in October and November 2021. Draft Main Modifications were consulted on during April and May 2022. Noting the relatively advanced stage of the SADPD it is considered that at least moderate weight should be applied to relevant policies, including the proposed modifications.

PG9 Settlement Boundaries

PG13 Strategic Green Gaps

GEN 1 Design principles

ENV 1 Ecological network

ENV 2 Ecological implementation

ENV 3 Landscape Character

ENV 5 Landscaping

ENV 6 Trees, hedgerows and woodland implementation

ENV 15 New Development and existing uses

ENV 16 Surface water management and floodrisk

HER 8 Archaeology

RUR 6 Outdoor sport, leisure and recreation outside of settlement boundaries

HOU 1 Housing Mix

HOU 2 Specialist housing provision

HOU 10 Amenity

HOU 12 Housing Density

HOU 13 Housing delivery

INF 3 Highway Safety and access

REC 2 Indoor sport and recreation implementation

REC 3 Open space implementation

### **National Planning Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance

### **Other Considerations**

The EC Habitats Directive 1992

Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010

Circular 6/2005 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact within the Planning System

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**CEC Head of Strategic Infrastructure (Highways)** – No objections, subject to a condition for a zebra crossing and secure cycle storage for the development.

**CEC Environmental Protection** – No objections to the proposal subject to conditions regarding electric vehicle charging points, ultra-low emission boilers, travel plan, Phase II contaminated land report, remediation scheme implementation, verification report, soil importation materials, unexpected contaminated land.

**CEC Flood Risk** – No objection in principle. Conditions suggested for surface water management plan and drainage scheme, and levels details

**CEC Housing** – No Objections

**CEC Open Space (ANSA)** – No objections in principle to revised scheme. Outdoor Sport contribution required for family dwellings at £1,000 or £500 per 2 + bed apartment in line with the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. If approved full hard and soft landscape details required with LEAP Play facility and community orchard included.

**United Utilities** – No objections subject to conditions regarding implementation of drainage scheme, surface water drainage, and sustainable surface water drainage scheme

**NHS Primary Care** – Request a contribution of £60,264 to offset the impact from extra demand for housing. Triggers to be 50% upon commencement of development and 50% upon completion of 90% of the dwellings

**CEC Education** – No objection subject to developer contribution of £121,424.0. £75,924.03 for Primary Education, and £45,500 for SEN. There is no Secondary Education contribution required.

**Natural England** – No objections

**Cadent Gas** – No objection subject to informative in relation to applicant responsibility's

**Brine Board** – No objections, subject to informative regarding the need for specific foundations and services.

**Archaeology** – No archaeological recommendations for this proposed development.

**Crewe Town Council** – Most recent consultation response (12/9/2022)

Crewe Town Council has expressed its opposition to the proposal and remains in opposition to the proposal on open greenfield land, which is not identified within the Cheshire East Local Plan for development.

*Comments from 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022*

The committee confirmed its previous objection to the principle of development and proposals, including concerns relating to accessibility for active travel due to dangers crossing a busy main road, the concerns raised by residents in response to the consultation and the loss of green space and open countryside.

*Original comments dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021*

The committee recognises and supports residents' concerns relating to this application and therefore objects to the application on the following points:

- i. The proposals represent over development of the site
- i. The development does not demonstrate net biodiversity gain as per Planning Authority Policy
- ii. Boundary treatments do not provide wildlife permeability
- iii. Lack of parking for the residential home – does not provide adequate parking for staff and visitors will lead to on street parking and impact amenity of the development
- iv. Inadequate provision for deliveries to the car home element causing safety risk during maneuvers as well as potential impact on residential amenity
- v. The development does not provide community compensation (CIL or Section 106)
- vi. The peninsula design of the proposals does not provide permeability for active travel, which does not support the active travel policies of Cheshire East or reflect the Climate Crisis as recognised by Cheshire East Council
- vii. Previous applications on the site have been declined
- viii. The development will result in the destruction of greenfield land not identified for development within the Cheshire East Local Plan

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of representation have been received from 25no households and Cllr Brookfield and Cllr Bratherton. The main issues raised are;

- Objection to development within the Green Gap
- Objection to development in the open countryside
- Objections to the loss of the existing building which could be converted for other uses, such as, a nursing home/care facility
- Overly dense development
- Lack of infrastructure in the area to cope with any further development, eg no doctors, schools,
- Unsustainable location
- Too much housing development in this area
- Highways safety concerns in an area which is saturated by cars, air pollutions and noise from additional vehicle movements in the area
- Impact on wildlife and protected species
- Impact on neighbouring amenity by means of overlooking, over bearing and visual impact
- Site was refused previously for housing and was not allocated within the plan – should not be approved
- Does not accord with planning policy
- Loss of green spaces
- Concerns over potential flooding in the area caused by new development
- Lack of parking provision shown within the site
- Properties are located directly onto Sydney Road
- Lack of greenspace for children to play
- No safe crossing for children to access park on the Lansdowne Estate

- The council has a 5 year housing land supply so no new dwellings are needed
- Applicants felled a number of mature trees before the application was submitted and lack any respect for the environment
- Site was rejected by neighbours when consulted in 2012/13 on the LPS
- Play area is within the Green Gap and therefore should be rejected
- It is an over development of the site, and out of character with the surrounding area
- Concerns raised over the stability of the land due to the land being at high risk of subsidence
- Revisions have not taken into account neighbours objections and concerns
- Loss of agricultural land
- Sydney road is a main route for emergency vehicles and traffic is already an issue

## **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of Development**

The majority of the application site is located within the Crewe settlement boundary. Policy PG2 sets out that Crewe is a Principal Town where significant development will be encouraged to support its revitalisation, recognising its role as one of the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible by public transport. Policy PG7 sets out that Principal Towns such as Crewe are expected to accommodate in the order of 65 ha of employment land and 7,700 new homes.

The majority of the site is considered to be a brownfield site with an existing Hotel and Bar located down a long driveway with landscaping to either side. Whilst the floorspace created by the new development will exceed the floor space of the existing building, given the site is located within the settlement boundary this is not a requirement, as development is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with all other relevant policies of the development plan.

### *Green Gap*

The red edge of the site, to the north and east, includes areas of the Crewe / Haslington Strategic Green Gap as identified in LPS policy PG5 'Strategic Green Gaps' and Figure 8.3 of the Local Plan Strategy. LPS policy PG5 'Strategic Green Gaps' identifies that planning permission will not be granted for the construction of buildings that would:-

- i. Result in erosion of a physical gap between any of the settlements; or*
- ii. Adversely affect the visual character of the landscape; or*
- iii. Significantly affect the undeveloped character of the Green Gap, or lead to the coalescence between existing settlements*

Exceptions to this policy are only considered where it can be demonstrated that no suitable location is available.

Amended plans have been received which have removed the majority of the build development outside of the Green Gap, with largely only the Open Space and Ecological areas proposed within the green gap. There is a small area on the edge which has some development including, a pathway, landscaping and a small 3 bay car parking area, and the single storey part of the care home projects into the Green Gap. Therefore, there is some protrusion into the Green Gap, but the scheme is much reduced from the original proposal.



## *Open countryside*

The same area of land is also noted as being outside of any defined settlement boundary<sup>1</sup> in policy PG 6 'open countryside' of the LPS. In the open countryside, only development that is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation, public infrastructure, essential works undertaken by public service authorities or statutory undertakers, or for other uses appropriate to a rural area will be permitted.

Policy RES.5 of the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan sets out where residential development may be acceptable within the open countryside. This includes infill plots and agricultural workers dwelling.

The amended plans show largely the open space and ecological area located within the open space to the north and with small area of the site to the north and the east slightly protruding into the open countryside. It is considered that the location of the open space including a LEAP complies with Policy PG6 as outdoor recreation and therefore is acceptable in principle.

The small incursion in relation to a pathway, tree planting and a small parking allocation, and single storey element of the care home, will have some impact on the open countryside, however as noted below, have been designed to help to create a positive rural transition.

Whilst there is some incursion into the Green Gap on the edges, it is considered that on balance, the development as amended, is acceptable in principle. The development as proposed is therefore considered to comply with policies PG5 and PG6, of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and RES.5 of the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, these matters are discussed further below.

## **Housing Land Supply**

The Council has a supply of deliverable housing land in excess of the minimum of 5 years required under national planning policy. As a consequence of the decision by the Environment and Communities Committee on 1 July 2022, to carry out an update of the Local Plan Strategy (LPS), from 27 July (the fifth anniversary of its adoption), the borough's deliverable housing land supply is now calculated using the Council's Local Housing Need figure of 1,070 homes/year, instead of the LPS annual housing requirement of 1,800 homes.

The 2020 Housing Delivery Test Result was published by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities on the 14 January 2022 and this confirmed a Housing Delivery Test Result of 300% for Cheshire East.

Under-performance against either of these can result in relevant policies concerning the supply of housing being considered out-of-date with the consequence that the 'tilted balance' at paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged. However, because of the Council's housing supply and delivery performance, the 'tilted balance' is not engaged by reference to either of these matters.

---

<sup>1</sup> as listed in table 8.3 'settlements with a defined settlement boundary' in the LPS

## Locational Sustainability

Both policies SD1 and SD2 of the CELPS refer to supporting development in sustainable locations. Within the justification text of Policy SD2 is a sustainable development location checklist.

The site is within the Crewe Town settlement which is categorised as a Principle Town within Policy PG 2 of the CELPS. The site is considered to be locationally sustainable, and within walking distance of a number of services on within Sydney, and the Town Centre. Within the town centre is a Bus Service Station which links the town to the wider area.

## Housing Mix

Paragraph 62 of the Framework states that 'the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes'.

Policy SC4 of the Local Plan requires that developments provide an appropriate mix of housing (however this does not specify a mix).

The site as amended is split between the 12 x 1 bedroom apartments, 6 x 2 bed room dwellings/apartments, 30 x 3 bed roomed houses and 7 x 4 bed roomed houses. There is also a 6-bed specialist care home on the site. All 12 of the 1 bed apartments are to be affordable homes (rented), 2 of 2-bedroom dwellings are proposed as affordable houses (not defined) and 2 of the 2 bed apartments are proposed to be affordable shared ownership units. The development has been amended significantly from the original proposal and there is good mix of apartments, semi-detached, and detached dwellings with a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties amongst the scheme.

In terms of dwelling sizes, it is noted that HOU6 of the SADPD requires that new housing developments comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). As part of the SADPD Inspectors post hearing comments he accepts this requirement but states that;

*'as advised in the PPG, a transitional period should be allowed following the adoption of the SADPD, to enable developers to factor the additional cost of space standards into future land acquisitions. Given that the intention to include the NDSS in the SADPD has been known since the Revised Publication Draft was published in September 2020, a 6-month transitional period for the introduction of NDSS, following the adoption of the SADPD, should be adequate. This should be included as an MM to criterion 3 of Policy HOU 6'*

The case officer has requested a table to show the dwelling sizes and whether they comply with the NDSS. This will be provided as an update report.

### *Provision of C2 and older persons accommodation*

Criteria 3 of LPS policy SC4 'Residential Mix' states that development proposals 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.

In this instance the use proposed under C2 is for adults with disabilities, and although the site is reasonably accessible in terms of walking distancing to some facilities, local Doctors and Schools are some distance away, as are local supermarkets, convenience stores etc. The applicant states that this site has been selected due to its location on the edge of the town with good links with the town and semi-rural location. The majority of the building is located within the settlement boundary although the single storey element protrudes into the Green Gap/open countryside. The proposal is in general compliance with policy SC4 and therefore is considered on balance to be acceptable in this instance. Furthermore, the affordable 1 bed units are linked to the C2 use in that they are to be used as a step-down provision for adults who require less care but still an element of help is needed and the carers from the Care home will also be managing elements of care for the occupants of the apartments.

### **Affordable Housing**

Policy SC 5 (Affordable Homes) in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) sets out the thresholds for affordable housing in the borough. In residential developments, affordable housing will be provided as follows: -

- i. In developments of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.4 hectares) in the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres at least 30% of all units are to be affordable;*
- ii. In developments of 11 or more dwellings (or have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000 sqm) in Local Service Centres and all other locations at least 30% of all units are to be affordable;*
- iii. In future, where Cheshire East Council evidence, such as housing needs studies or housing market assessments, indicate a change in the borough's housing need the above thresholds and percentage requirements may be varied;*

The National Planning Policy Framework states that the provision of affordable homes should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments. Major developments are defined as housing sites of 10 or more homes, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more.

The CELP states in the justification text of Policy SC5 (paragraph 12.44) that the Housing Development Study shows that there is the objectively-assessed need for affordable housing for a minimum of 7,100 dwellings over the plan period, which equates to an average of 355 dwellings per year across the borough.

The applicant has come back with a revised proposal. The new amount on site has been reduced to 55 units in total, with 16 affordable units and 6 bedrooms within the care home. The C2 element is included as part of the overall provision and should be included in providing the 30% Affordable Housing quota. This is based on the Rectory Homes High Court Ruling.

The proposal would provide 16 affordable where 30% would amount to 16.5 units. The applicant has proposed making up the 0.5 reduction as a financial contribution for the cost of half a 2-bedroom unit. The Strategic Housing officer has agreed to this proposal and therefore it is considered that the proposal is in line with policy SC 5.

The affordable housing provision and contribution must be secured by S106 Agreement.

## **Open Space**

The Council's Green spaces officer has considered the proposal as set out and based their comments on the Landscape Strategy Plan, reference: 525C-16 Rev E.

The Council's Green Spaces Officer considers that the revised design submitted 19 August 2022 is greatly improved with a LEAP set in increased open space, including connectivity and space allocated for food growth, and is therefore supportive of this application in its current format.

However, the LEAP – Precedent Imagery inset of the Landscape Strategy Plan does not promote a fully inclusive scheme via either the equipment or surfacing. The paths should be a resin bound gravel not rolled stone to give good accessibility. The LEAP does enjoy good natural surveillance and has the required minimum buffer set out by Fields in Trust.

The Landscape Strategy Plan currently shows species rich grassland surrounding the LEAP however, the Green Spaces officer states that whilst she is happy for the periphery to be sown this way the majority is more suited to wear tolerant amenity grass. Although this flowering mix benefits pollinators including bees, hoverflies etc. it is not ideal for children playing informal games.

Further, seating and a welcome introduction of orchard tree planting has been incorporated to support community use. The applicant previously indicated raised beds could be incorporated where appropriate to support community cohesion which would also support residents who are less mobile which would be most welcome.

Therefore, the Greenspaces officer considers that should the committee deem this development acceptable in its current format, a full hard and soft landscape details should be submitted by condition along with details of the LEAP play facility and community orchard space.

Furthermore, Outdoor Sport contributions are required for family dwellings of £1,000 or £500 per 2+ bed apartment space to be spent in line with the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. This should be secured by Legal Agreement.

## **Education**

The Local Plan is expected to deliver 36,000 houses in Cheshire East, which is expected to create an additional 6,840 primary aged children and 5,400 secondary aged children. 422 children within this forecast are expected to have a special educational need.

The development of 43 family dwellings is expected to generate:

7 - Primary children (43 x 0.19) (- 1 SEN)

7 - Secondary children (43 x 0.15)

1 - SEN (43 x 0.51 x 0.023%)

The development is expected to impact on primary and secondary school places in the locality. Contributions which have been negotiated on other developments are factored into the forecasts

both in terms of the increased pupil numbers and the increased capacity at primary and secondary schools in the area because of agreed financial contributions. The analysis undertaken has identified that a shortfall of primary school places remains.

The Service acknowledges that this is an existing concern, however the 7 primary age children expected from Hunters lodge hotel scheme will exacerbate the shortfall.

Special Education provision within Cheshire East Council currently has a shortage of places available with at present over 47% of pupils educated outside of the Borough. The Service acknowledges that this is an existing concern, however the 1 child expected from the Hunters lodge hotel scheme, application will exacerbate the shortfall.

To alleviate forecast pressures, the following contributions would be required:

$7 \times £11,919 \times 0.91 = £75,924.03$  (Primary)

$1 \times £50,000 \times 0.91 = £45,500$  (SEN)

Total education contribution: £121,424.03

Without a secured contribution of £121,424.03 Children's Services raise an objection to this application.

## Health

The South Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) have sought a S106 Contribution advise that funding is required towards the health infrastructure to support the development of Grosvenor Medical Centre, Millcroft Medical Centre and Earnswood Medical Centre, Haslington Surgery and Hungerford Road Surgery.

The mitigation requested is based on the original proposal of 68 dwellings. Using the following formula the contribution amount should be amended to £49,428 to accommodate the reduced number of units of 55 and the current housing mix.

<b>Size of Unit</b>	<b>Occupancy Assumptions Based on Size of Unit</b>	<b>Health Need/Sum Requested per unit</b>
1 bed unit	1.4 persons	£504 per 1 bed unit
2 bed unit	2.0 persons	£720 per 2 bed unit
3 bed unit	2.8 persons	£1,008 per 3 bed unit
4 bed unit	3.5 persons	£1,260 per 4 bed unit
5 bed unit	4.8 persons	£1,728 per 5 bed unit

The requested contribution is therefore calculated as £49,428. It is therefore considered that the financial contribution can be secured as part of a legal agreement to mitigate the harm. Without this contribution there is an objection raised to the development.

## **Residential Amenity**

The application site is surrounded by residential development, the Brethrens Meeting House and open countryside. The site is bounded by two storey dwellings to the northwest and south west located off Sydney Road and Bentley Drive.

The Council's separations standards, set out in the Development on Backland and Gardens SPD suggests a separation distance of 21m between opposing principle windows and 13.5m principle windows and flank elevations or non-habitable windows. However, the adopted standards within the Cheshire East Design Guide allow for a slightly lower standard of separation of front elevations to around 18m. This area of Crewe is mixed in style with a general mix of detached, and semi-detached dwellings. Some with large gardens and others with smaller gardens.

The separation distance between all the existing dwellings on Sydney Road and Bentley Drive exceed 21m and therefore meet the required spacing standards. The only house with a lower standard is 11 Bentley Drive which is principle to a side elevation with non-principal windows which is distance of 14m which accords with the required 13.5m. Therefore the proposed development will not impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking or overbearing impact.

Internally most the dwellings meet the 21m standards however some to the lower part of the site are lower front to front of 17m. Given this is an internal arrangement this is considered to be acceptable.

The Council also has a standard of 50m<sup>2</sup> garden areas for future occupiers. The plan shows that all the dwellings achieve the required amount. The apartments have communal amenity space, and the site will provide an area of public open space to the north.

Environmental Protection have raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions regarding electric vehicle charging points, ultra-low emission boilers, travel plan, Phase II contaminated land report, remediation scheme implementation, verification report, soil importation materials, unexpected contaminated land. These conditions are considered to be reasonable.

## **Highways**

The site is on the edge of Crewe off Sydney Road where access is taken from. The proposal is to demolish the existing hotel and replace it with 55 new residential properties which includes apartments. A 6-bedroom care home is also proposed and 12 of the apartments will be linked to the care home and will provide independent living space for occupants.

The existing access off Sydney Road will be amended and upgraded to serve the development.

### *Sustainable access*

There are existing pedestrian connections to the surrounding area including to nearby bus stops, and the PROWs north and south of the site access that provide links into Haslington. There is also footway and a PROW on the opposite side of Sydney Road which leads into the urban area of Crewe and towards Hungerford Primary School.

### *Safe and suitable access*

The amended access onto Sydney Road will have a carriageway width of 5.5m with 2m footways either side which is sufficient to serve a development of this size. The access also has sufficient visibility.

Sydney Road is a busy C-class road and given the scale of the development and that the majority of the destinations are on the opposite side of Sydney Road, a zebra crossing has also been proposed, along with widening of the footway between the crossing and the site access and the PROW. The crossing will also be subject to a Road Safety Audit during the technical approval process.

### *Network Capacity*

The proposed development will generate approximately 40 vehicle trips in a peak hour but the existing hotel would also have generated trips, and the net highways impact will be minimal.

### *Layout*

The internal access is 5.5m wide and narrows further in to 4.8m with shared surfaces which is acceptable. There is also sufficient car parking and turning areas within the site.

For the care home, there will be a maximum of 12 staff on site at any given time. Given the numbers of staff and rooms the CELPS car parking requirements would be for 8 spaces. Seven spaces are proposed and with being just a single space below standards and not off a main road is considered acceptable. Car parking demand surveys of other care homes also indicate that the provision will be adequate.

It's not clear if cycle parking is proposed for the apartments or care home staff and visitors, and this should be conditioned.

### *Conclusion*

The Strategic Highways Officer therefore considers that the proposal is acceptable, subject conditions which require the proposed zebra crossing to be implemented prior to first occupation, and details of secure cycle storage to be approved.

### **Landscape**

This is an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a residential development (Use Class C3) alongside a care home (Use Class C2) with associated access, parking, landscaping and infrastructure. The application site lies to the east of Sydney Road, towards the eastern edge of Crewe. To the east of the site is the wider rural landscape. The application site comprises a building that was formerly the Hunters Lodge Hotel, a car parking area and an area of agricultural grassland which forms part of a larger field that extends to the east, there is an area of woodland along the northern boundary

As part of the submission a Landscape and Visual Impact assessment has been submitted, this indicates that it has been undertaken in accordance with the Guidance for Landscape and Visual

Impact assessment (GLVIA3), Third Edition, 2013. This identifies the landscape baseline as identified in the Cheshire East Landscape Character Assessment 2018, in this case LCT 4: Cheshire Plain East and specifically LCA 4d Wimboldsley.

The Landscape Assessment indicates that the landscape sensitivity for the site and its immediate surroundings is medium-low and for the site itself low and that the resulting effects upon completion would be minor adverse for the site and immediate surroundings and would be minor beneficial on the site itself; the assessment indicates that this would reduce to negligible for the site and immediate surroundings and moderate-minor beneficial for the site after a period of fifteen years. The Visual Assessment identifies that the visual effects on completion are negligible for five of the chosen receptors and minor adverse for two – FP3 Crewe and motorists and pedestrians using Crewe Road and that after 15 years the visual effects will be negligible for all but two receptors, users of FP38 Haslington and FP/Bridleway 43 Haslington, which would be minor beneficial. The Landscape Officer considered that that the northern part of the application site would have a medium-low rather than a low sensitivity and therefore the effects upon completion would be minor adverse rather than minor beneficial, but apart from that agreed broadly with the assessment of landscape and visual effects identified in the submitted LVIA.

The LVIA and submitted Planning statement identify that while the majority of the site lies within the settlement boundary of Crewe that the part of the northern and part of the eastern site lie outside the settlement boundary and in the area identified as Strategic Green Gap – Policy PG 5 and Open Countryside – Policy PG 6 in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy. The Landscape Officer previously confirmed that the proposals are acceptable across the majority of the site, e.g. within the settlement boundary, however considered that the proposals in the northern part of the site appeared to be contrary to Policy PG5 since they would adversely effect the visual character of the landscape.

The amended plans have taken the build development out of the Green Gap part of the site, with only the LEAP and minor built incursions on the edge. An update to the LVIA has been submitted with the revised plans, which outlines that the revised scheme will not result in any additional harm to landscape character, views or to the Strategic Green Gap.

It is therefore considered that the impact of the development will be acceptable and subject to detailed conditions in relation so soft and hard landscaping, levels and details of boundary treatment is considered to be acceptable.

## **Trees**

The revised layout has been supported by an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by E3P Ltd (80-481-R1-5) Dated 19/8/2022. The revised layout has resulted in a slightly improved relationship between plots and boundary trees T11-T13. The proposed position of the care home has arisen in a greater separation between the building and that formally proposed with the residential dwelling although the 14 metre high tree will now stand to the rear of the apartments with bedrooms and the ground floor quiet room and main access to the garden facing south directly towards the A Cat Oak. It is accepted that the build footprint is further away to that previously proposed with earlier layouts, although the configuration of the building and outside amenity space for residence stands to be heavily shaded and dominated by the tree.



It is noted that the AIA and MS have now made provision to identify and accommodate the areas of existing hard surfacing along the southeastern boundary which will require supervision in terms of breaking out the existing tarmac areas. The reduction in dwellings and increase in area of open space has allowed for an increase in tree planting as indicated on the updated Landscape Strategy Plan. The new tree planting would provide mitigation for losses proposed on the site and felling that took place prior to submission of the application.

Whilst the Forestry Officer remains of the view that the layout could be improved further regarding tree T16, it is accepted that no statutory protection applies to the trees on and adjacent to the site and that all construction is sited outside the RPAs, therefore the relationships indicated are considered broadly defensible.

Should the application be approved an updated Tree Protection and special construction measure scheme, levels and service/drainage layout details should be submitted by condition.

## **Design**

The application has been subject to revised plans which have reduced the scheme from 68 to 55 dwellings.

In line with LPS policy SD 2 'Sustainable Development Principles', criteria 1(ii) the scheme should be considered in how it contributes to the area's character and identify, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness.

Reference should also be made to the extent to which the scheme uses appropriate design, construction, insulation, layout and orientation to create developments that are resilient to climate change, minimise energy use and support the policy objectives set out in LPS policy SD2 'Sustainable Development Principles', Criteria 1(viii).

Residential developments are also expected to provide open space, access to public transport, key services and facilities and encourage sustainable travel in line with the requirements of LPS policy SD2 'Sustainable Development Principles', criteria 2 and reference to table 9.1 'access to services and facilities'.

Comments on urban design, with respect of the proposals compliance with the Design Guide SPD, LPS policy SE 1 'Design' including the building for life assessment will help the consideration of the suitability of the design of the scheme. This will also help to consider the site in terms of LPS policy SE2 'efficient use of land', and how the site, as a windfall development, considers impacts on landscape and townscape.

The Design Officer has considered that amended scheme has improved since the earlier 68 unit scheme and has the following comments to make. The layout has significantly improved in design terms from the original submission, creating a more cohesive design and one that better utilises the site having regard to previously developed land and land designated as green gap. The scheme is acceptable in layout terms. It is acknowledged that the applicant has responded in several fundamental areas and hopefully this will lead to a place where residents will experience a decent living environment whilst also creating a development that exists more successfully within its context.

The Design Officer considers that the area where there has been least improvement is in the general design of housetypes. Again, a little more innovation in the architecture and realising the potential of the site on the rural edge and in relation to landscape within the scheme, would have resulted in a more distinct place and would have added another layer to the liveability and enjoyment of the development for its residents. The Design Officer considers that several of the house types are a little weak, but on the whole the Case Officer considers that the design of the development is acceptable

In landscape terms the scheme has more significantly improved and will achieve greener streets and a stronger approach to landscape and play provision, better respecting the interrelationship with the rural edge and the policy considerations for the site. More meaningful play can be provided and there are opportunities for informal interaction within the layout. The Design Officer encourages a more creative design for the play, perhaps reflecting the relationship to the protected area for nature to the north of the POS. Some local growing opportunities have been created by proposed orchard planting and perhaps residents can extend and take this forward over time. A semiprivate landscaped courtyard for the specialist housing has been designed into the scheme, although this could have been more imaginatively conceived and detailed. This arrangement will provide a positive, defensible area for the specialist housing, whilst enabling occupants to feel part of the wider community.

Some informal sitting/meeting points have been included but there is further opportunity in relation to the main area of POS, both the play but also the less formal POS. This can be addressed in detailed landscape proposals by condition.

There are still locations however where more trees in front gardens could be secured and it is strongly encourage that as part of the detailed landscape design, that more trees are included. Also, the frontage landscaping of hedges, trees and other planting types should be subject to a 10 year management condition to help protect it from removal before full establishment.

It is unfortunate that the applicant has not sought to characterise the landscape of the scheme by using more innovative approaches driven by environmental considerations, such as rain gardens. This would have helped elevate the quality and distinctiveness of the place.

The Design Officer states that in regard to boundaries, within streets, rear garden boundaries should run in line with the dwelling and not step forward, enabling the space in front to be positively used to help green streets. There are a few examples where they should be set back to enable this. Boundaries adjacent to streets should be in brick (no timber infill) with positive landscaping to base, whilst adjacent to open space they should be in hit and miss fencing with a positive landscape in front, such as a meaningful native hedge, to help soften the interface. This can all be addressed as part of the detailed landscaping.

In terms of street materiality lanes should not be designed with bitmac, as this does not meet the objectives of the CEC design Guide. The primary street can be in bitmac but should include a gutter detail, therefore the approach to hardscape needs refinement to get as close as possible to that set out in the design guide. The approach to facing materials also feels a tad arbitrary and it is suggested that this be considered by condition along with refinement of the street materials.

In conclusion, the Design Officer considers that there has been substantive improvement from the original submission but there remain areas, as highlighted, where the design quality could be elevated to further improve the scheme. These elements can largely be dealt with by conditions in relation to materials, boundary treatment hard and soft landscaping, and surfacing materials.

## **Ecology**

The application includes a protected species survey, which the Councils Ecologist has considered. These comments are updated and reflect the revised plans and additional information submitted in support of this application.

### Statutory Designated Sites

The application site falls within natural England's SSSI impact risk zones for residential developments. Natural England have been consulted on this application and raised no concerns.

### Bats

No evidence of roosting bats was recorded during the surveys of the buildings on site and it is advised that roosting bats are not reasonable likely to be affected by the proposed demolition. A number of trees with bat roost potential were also recorded on site, however the trees that are reasonable likely to support bat roosts are retained as part of the proposals.

To avoid any adverse impacts on bats resulting from any lighting associated with the development it is recommend that if planning permission is granted a condition should be attached requiring any additional lighting to be agreed with the LPA.

### Water vole, Otter and Great Crested Newt

It is advised that these species are not reasonable likely to be present or affected by the proposed development.

### Reptiles

The risk of reptiles being present at this site is low. Grass snakes are the only species likely to occur in this locality, but the majority of habitats on site are unsuitable for this species. The potentially most suitable habitat is the area of scrub on the northern boundary. This area is retained as open space under the latest proposals, but the area scrub is not shown as being retained on the submitted landscape plan.

The ecologist has recommended that the landscape plans are updated to show the area as retained on the landscape plan.

### Hedgerows

Native species hedgerows are a priority habitat and hence a material consideration. Two native species hedgerows are present on site.

A second hedgerows (identified as TN8 on the Phase One Habitat plan and hedgerow H4 on the tree report) would be lost as a result of the proposed development. It is recommended that in order to avoid a loss of biodiversity this hedgerow must be retained. If the loss of the hedgerow is considered unavoidable then the submitted landscape plan includes sufficient compensatory hedgerow planting to address its loss.

### Nesting Birds

If planning consent is granted a condition is required to safeguard nesting birds.

### Biodiversity Net Gain

In accordance with Local Plan policy SE3(5) all development proposals must seek to lead to an overall enhancement for biodiversity. In order to assess the overall loss/gains of biodiversity an assessment undertaken in accordance with the Defra Biodiversity 'Metric'.

The applicant considers that the site will provide the required biodiversity, however if following its revision the metric still shows a loss of biodiversity additional habitat retention/creation proposals will be required to ensure the scheme delivers a net gain. If a net gain cannot be achieved on site a section 106 agreement will be required to secure delivery at an offsite location. This matter will be updated to the committee.

Furthermore, this planning application provides an opportunity to incorporate features to increase the biodiversity value of the final development in accordance with Local Plan Policy SE 3. It is therefore recommended that the applicant submits an ecological enhancement strategy prior to the determination of the application or if planning permission is granted a condition should be attached which requires the submission of an ecological enhancement strategy.

Natural England have also commented on the application and have raised no concerns with the proposed development.

It is therefore considered that subject to clarification on the Biodiversity net gain, an amended landscape scheme and conditions in relation to lighting, breeding birds and a biodiversity enhancement scheme the development would not have an adverse impact on protected species and is in accordance with the development plan.

### **Air Quality**

Policy SE12 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to ensure all development is located and designed so as not to result in a harmful or cumulative impact upon air quality.

The Environmental Health Officer has requested the following conditions in relation to air quality;

- Travel Information Pack
- Electric Vehicle Infrastructure
- Ultra Low Emission Gas Boilers

Subject to the imposition of these conditions the impact upon air quality from this development is considered to be acceptable.

## **Flood Risk**

The Strategic Flood Risk team have confirmed that there are no objections in principle to the revised proposals.

However, firstly, as land levels are being raised circa 300-700mm along existing boundaries, there is a potential requirement for boundary treatment to manage any adverse surface water runoff associated with these elevation changes. This should be included within the submission. The flood Risk officer has confirmed that this can be supplied by condition.

Secondly, the LLFA would expect at discharge of conditions stage for the surface water route to outfall to be clearly illustrated. The LLFA would need to be satisfied that the route is sustainable and adequate for the lifetime of the development. This submission must also include any third-party landowner agreements required for the surface water sewers routing. Please note that connection to the ordinary watercourse will also be subject to a land drainage consent application, under Land Drainage Act 1991.

The Flood Risk Team also note that the applicant has continued to propose the use of the attenuation tank. However, there is now an area of POS/open space land, and given Cheshire East is looking towards a more sustainable approach to flood management, the LLFA would strongly encourage above ground attenuation and the application of SuDs on sites where this is practicable. The LLFA suggest the applicant re-considers this as part of their discharge of conditions of the scheme.

Therefore, subject to a condition for a detailed drainage strategy to be submitted and levels details to be confirmed the proposal is considered acceptable.

United Utilities have been consulted on the application have raised no objection, subject to conditions for the implementation of the drainage scheme, and a detailed strategy for SUDs to be submitted.

## **CIL Compliance**

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 it is necessary for planning applications with planning obligations 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.

A LEAP and a contribution of £40,000 towards outdoor sports provision is required in terms of Policy. The requirement to secure the commuted sum by legal agreement is considered to be fair and reasonable to ensure the mitigation is secured and used offsite appropriately.

A contribution of £75,924.03 towards Primary and £45,500 towards SEN provision. Which is a total education contribution of £121,424.03 in terms of mitigation for the development. The requirement to secure the commuted sum by legal agreement is considered to be fair and reasonable to ensure the mitigation is secured and used offsite appropriately.

A contribution of £75,924.03 towards Primary and £45,500 towards SEN provision. Which is a total education contribution of £121,424.03 in terms of mitigation for the development. The requirement to secure the commuted sum by legal agreement is considered to be fair and reasonable to ensure the mitigation is secured and used offsite appropriately.

A contribution of £49,428 is required to mitigate the impact on the NHS. This is directly related to the development to ensure the increased use of the site and access is mitigated. This is considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

The development will provide just short of 30% affordable housing provision, 16 Dwellings. It is considered necessary to ensure this is provided. 4 dwellings intermediate tenure and 12 affordable rental. This is 0.5 lower provision than the policy requirement and therefore a contribution of half a two bedroom unit will also be required. Furthermore, the tenure mix of affordable rent and shared ownership will be secured also. This is considered to be reasonable and fair.

On this basis the S106 recommendation is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

## **PLANNING BALANCE**

The application site is located largely within the Crewe settlement boundary, with part of the red edge including an agricultural field to the north and east which is located within the Open countryside and Green Gap.

Policy PG2 sets out that Crewe is a Principal Town where significant development will be encouraged to support its revitalisation, recognising its role as one of the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible by public transport. Policy PG7 sets out that Principal Towns such as Crewe are expected to accommodate in the order of 65 ha of employment land and 7,700 new homes.

The amended plans show largely the open space and ecological area located within the open space to the north and with small area of the site to the north and the east slightly protruding into the open countryside/Green Gap. It is considered that the location of the open space including a LEAP complies with Policy PG6 as outdoor recreation and therefore is acceptable in principle.

The small incursion in relation to a pathway, tree planting and a small parking allocation, and single storey element of the care home, will have some impact on the open countryside, however as noted below, have been designed to help to create a positive rural transition.

Whilst there is a some incursion into the Green Gap on the edges, it is considered that on balance, the development as amended, is acceptable in principle. The development as proposed is therefore considered to comply with policies PG5 and PG6, of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and RES.5 of the Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, these matters are discussed further below.

Therefore, it is considered that residential development is acceptable in principle, however this is subject to compliance with all other relevant policies within the development plan.

The layout and size of the of the scheme is now considered to be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and rural edge. The Design Officer has raised concerns over some of the house types and details in terms of landscaping and planting and surfacing materials, however the scheme is largely acceptable and subject to conditions for materials, boundary treatment, hardsurfacing, landscaping and tree planting the scheme is acceptable.

The site has raised no significant issues in relation to landscaping, forestry, amenity, highways safety, impact on protected species, flood risk or drainage, subject to appropriate conditions.

The scheme will contribute towards the normal mitigation required in relation to Education, NHS, POS, and Affordable Housing (and Biodiversity net gain – if required).

It is therefore considered that the development is on balance acceptable and recommended for approval accordingly.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approve subject to S106 Agreement to secure:**

<b>S106</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Triggers</b>
<b>Affordable Housing</b>	<b>30% affordable housing provision (16 Dwellings)</b>  <b>4 dwellings intermediate dwellings</b> <b>12 affordable rental</b>  <b>Contribution of half a two bedroom unit</b>	<b>Contribution – prior to commencement</b>  <b>Affordable Housing - All development to accord with Affordable Housing Statement</b>
<b>Public Open Space</b>	<b>Contribution of £40,000 towards outdoor sports provision</b>  <b>Provision of LEAP and Management scheme</b>	<b>Contribution – Prior to occupation of the 25<sup>th</sup> unit</b>  <b>Open Space and LEAP to be provided and available for use prior to occupation of the 25<sup>th</sup> dwelling</b>

<b>Education</b>	<b>£11,919 x 0.91 = £75,924.03 (Primary)</b> <b>£50,000 x 0.91 = £45,500 (SEN)</b>  <b>Total education contribution:</b> <b>£121,424.03</b>	<b>Primary Contribution -</b> <b>Prior to commencement</b>  <b>SEN Contribution –</b> <b>Prior to occupation of</b> <b>the 25<sup>th</sup> unit</b>
<b>NHS</b>	<b>Contribution of £49,428</b>	<b>Contribution - Prior to commencement</b>

**And the following Conditions**

1. **Standard Time**
2. **Approved plans**
3. **Materials**
4. **Surfacing materials**
5. **Revised Landscape Scheme with a 10 year management plan**
6. **Landscape Implementation**
7. **Landscape plan to include details for LEAP play facility and community orchard**
8. **Boundary Treatment**
9. **Tree Protection scheme and special construction measures**
10. **Levels survey**
11. **Service/drainage layout**
12. **Biodiversity enhancement features**
13. **Safeguard Nesting Birds**
14. **Lighting strategy – prior to occupation**
15. **Details of secure and covered cycle parking – prior to occupation**
16. **Drainage Scheme**
17. **Detailed strategy/design limiting the surface water runoff generated by the proposal, and associated management /maintenance plan - required prior to commencement**
18. **Levels Details**
19. **Foul and surface water to be drained separately**
20. **Contaminated Land – Phase II report and remediation scheme**
21. **Contaminated Land – verification report to be submitted**
22. **Contaminate land – Soil Importation**
23. **Contaminate land - Unexpected Contamination**
24. **Travel Information Pack**
25. **Prior to occupation – EVI**
26. **Prior to occupation – Low emission boilers**
27. **Removal of PD**
28. **Zebra Crossing to be implemented prior to first occupation of the site**



In order to give proper effect to the Southern Committee`s intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation) in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice.

If the application is subject to an appeal approval is given to enter into a S106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms;

<b>S106</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Triggers</b>
<b>Affordable Housing</b>	<p>30% affordable housing provision (16 Dwellings)</p> <p>4 dwellings intermediate dwellings 12 affordable rental</p> <p>Contribution of half a two bedroom unit</p>	<p>Contribution – prior to commencement</p> <p>Affordable Housing - All development to accord with Affordable Housing Statement</p>
<b>Public Open Space</b>	<p>Contribution of £40,000 towards outdoor sports provision</p> <p>Provision of LEAP and Management scheme</p>	<p>Contribution – Prior to occupation of the 25<sup>th</sup> unit</p> <p>Open Space and LEAP to be provided and available for use prior to occupation of the 25<sup>th</sup> dwelling</p>
<b>Education</b>	<p>£11,919 x 0.91 = £75,924.03 (Primary) £50,000 x 0.91 = £45,500 (SEN)</p> <p>Total education contribution: £121,424.03</p>	<p>Primary Contribution - Prior to commencement</p> <p>SEN Contribution – Prior to occupation of the 25<sup>th</sup> unit</p>
<b>NHS</b>	<p>Contribution of £49,428</p>	<p>Contribution - Prior to commencement</p>



