

**APPLICATION NO:** 22/0670C

**LOCATION:** Land East of VIKING WAY, CONGLETON, CW12 1TT

**PROPOSAL:** Reserved matters application proposing details for the appearance, scale, layout and landscaping for a residential development at Viking Way, Congleton. An Environmental Impact Assessment was submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of the outline

### CONSULTATIONS

**ANSA** – No formal comments received, but from discussions it is understood some further design changes will be needed. These it is considered can be readily achieved but the condition (no.9) is required.

**Environmental Protection** – They have confirmed the revised Noise Assessment that reflects the amended layout is acceptable and recommend the mitigation measures outlined are approved by condition.

**Nature Conservation** - Revised comments have been received to reflect additional ecological information and revised phasing plan submitted in support of the application. No objections are now raised subject to confirming that the northern footpath is either unlit, or lighting is minimised.

### KEY ISSUES

**Ecology** – It is recommended that a condition be added requiring details of any proposed lighting on the northern footpath to be agreed.

**Public Open Space** – At the time of writing this report no revised formal ANSA comments have been received, however as stated above these matters can be addressed by condition.

**Urban Design** – Further updated plans have been submitted and are assessed below:

24-10-22											
Integrating into the Neighbourhood				Distinctive Places				Streets for All			
1 Natural Connections	2 Walking, cycling public transport	3 Facilities and services	4 Homes for everyone	5 Making the most of what's there	6 A Memorable character	7 Well defined streets/spaces	8 Easy to find your way around	9 Healthy streets	10 Cycle and car parking	11 Green and blue infrastructure	12 Back of pavement, front of home

The main issue with the scheme throughout has been the design not fully embracing and strengthening the approved spatial design code to deliver a place of true distinctiveness. The latest amendments have led to some further enhancement, but the scheme could still do more to fully embrace the design opportunity presented by the spatial design code to create a more distinctive development. This would have further enhanced the quality and sense of distinctiveness of the development as well as its liveability.

However, it should also be recognised that these latest changes and earlier amendments, will help invoke a much stronger sense of place than was originally proposed and will therefore lead to a better performing development.

There are still certain specific changes listed below to be addressed to further improve the scheme:

- Enhancement of the detailing of buildings in the Home Farm interface character area
- Improvement to the street scene to the main gateway frontage into the scheme off Viking Way, by re-considering building scale and roofscape, particularly north of the Avenue
- Improvement to the siting of plots 35/6 to better contain the street edge
- The use of chimneys more extensively across the site to punctuate the roofscape
- Ensuring that, where possible, meter housings are not sited prominently on houses

In addition, as advocated by the Landscape officer, it is recommended that there are conditions relating to:

- submission of a landscaping scheme. This should include final working details of all SuDS within the scheme.
- submission of boundaries information
- submission of a landscape management plan.

Further conditions are recommended in relation to:

- approval of facing and roofing materials including treatment of key focal and landmark buildings within the scheme
- submission of details of wayfinding, interpretation and public art including the detail of the various installations and their location.

**Landscape** – Following the submission of revised proposals no objections are raised subject to 4 recommended conditions:

- Submission of Landscape Details
- Landscaping Conditions (Implementation)
- Boundary Treatments
- Submission of Landscape Management Plan.

Whilst there has been a detailed landscaping scheme and boundary treatment plan submitted, the Landscape Architect still feels some further amendments are required hence the need for those two conditions.

**Trees** – Revised Forestry Officer comments have now been received as expected with the main details as below.

The application has now been supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Method Statement by Tyler Grange. The survey has identified 3 individual high quality A Category trees, 7 individual, 5 groups and 3 woodlands of moderate quality B Category trees, 5 individual and 8 groups of

low-quality C Category trees and 2 Hedgerows. Of these a small section of low-quality groups G12 and 2 trees within G3 and 4 within G4 will be removed to accommodate the proposal and there are no objections to the removals proposed.

The canopy spread of individual boundary trees in woodland W1 will be reduced to provide clearance from the northern boundary greenway alignment and associated cut and fill works. The reductions of mature high canopy trees in particular within the area of W1 extending north to south towards the greenway alignment is considered excessive and unjustified.

No levels changes are indicated in this location on the latest submitted levels plans, and the proposed footpath is not close to the tree line, yet the plan is annotated 'cutting back of canopies as shown to provide clearance from northern boundary greenway alignment and associated cut and fill works.

The proposed line of tree protection indicated fails to respect the RPA's of trees along this section and has been removed back to the fence line. This cutting back description also applies to the section of woodland overhanging the footpath to the west of plots 61 and 62 and given that ground clearance of trees in W1 is reportedly 4.5 metres which is ordinarily considered adequate for a pedestrian pathway, it's unclear why such an extreme reduction (which does not accord with current best practice) is required.

A minor incursion into the RPA of veteran tree T1 is noted and calculated to equate to approximately 6% of the extended RPA and plotted in recognition of the tree's veteran status. Having regard to the trees condition and retrenchment visible within the upper crown of the tree, it is accepted rooting could be restricted to the northwest and therefore the extent of incursion indicated is unlikely to have a significant detrimental impact.

The relationship of the retained tree cover with residential property across the site is considered acceptable. Notwithstanding this, the proposed management of some of the sections of priority habitat woodland which overhangs the site boundary is questionable and the proposals should be amended to allow for crown raising where necessary, but not overall canopy reduction as suggested. The tree protection fencing should also be realigned to respect RPAs of trees in W1 which extend north to south towards the greenway alignment.

The above comments have led to a further revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment to be submitted which reduces the canopy loss for trees in W1.

**Flood Risk** – Detailed layouts have been submitted albeit these are to discharge the condition on the outline approval and not for this reserved matters scheme.

## **CONCLUSION:**

There are no suggested changes to the recommendation, but additional conditions should be added to the main report as detailed below:

12. Submission of Landscape Details
13. Landscaping Conditions (Implementation)
14. Boundary Treatments
15. Submission of Landscape Management Plan
16. Details of lighting to be submitted / in accordance with plans
17. Approval of facing and roofing materials (including treatment of key focal and landmark buildings)
18. Submission of details of wayfinding, interpretation and public art (including the detail of the various installations and their location)