

Application No: 19/5582M

Location: LAND SOUTH OF, CHELFORD ROAD, MACCLESFIELD

Proposal: Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 17/4034M for the erection of up to 232 dwellings

Applicant: Redrow homes

Expiry Date: 03-Mar-2020

SUMMARY

Macclesfield is one of the principal towns and growth areas of the Borough where national and local plan policies support sustainable development. The principle of residential development on the site has been established through the grant of outline planning permission for up to 232 dwellings and allocation of the site in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) under Policy LPS 16. The proposed development seeks to provide a residential development of 216 dwellings. This application seeks approval of the detail in terms of its appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. Details of access were determined at outline stage and approved vehicular and pedestrian access from Chelford Road with a newly dedicated roundabout. Pedestrian access would also be secured from Pexhill Road.

The proposal provides the required amount of affordable housing with a good mix and density of housing. As amended, the proposal achieves an appropriately designed residential development sympathetic to the character of the area and would not materially harm neighbouring residential amenity. Appropriate public open space including a Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) would be provided on site. The layout would provide an appropriate buffer to the south and would secure future connection into safeguarded land as required by the site allocation. The impacts on the adjoining Local Wildlife Site would be acceptable. Updated tree information has been submitted and is acceptable subject to further condition. Tree and hedgerow losses will be offset through replacement planting secured by the landscape scheme.

Mitigation for the impact of the proposal on local infrastructure including education, healthcare provision and outdoor and indoor sports and recreation was secured at outline stage as part of the s106 legal agreement. With respect to highways, consideration of the outline consent determined that the development will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network subject to a scheme of works at Broken Cross, which is currently being implemented by another developer. Similarly, the impact on local air quality (including cumulative impacts) has been determined to be acceptable also.

A comprehensive scheme of surface water attenuation is proposed ensuring there will be no increase in surface water runoff. The Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection in principle to the drainage strategy, but final details will need to be agreed under the conditions attached to the outline consent.

On this basis, the proposal is for sustainable development which would bring environmental, economic, and social benefits and is therefore considered to be acceptable in the context of the relevant policies of the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, the saved policies of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, the relevant policies of the emerging SADPD and the NPPF.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE subject to conditions

REASON FOR DEFERRAL:

At the meeting of 12th October 2022, Members resolved to defer this application to provide further information on the drainage at Hill Top Farm and flood risk.

Drainage at Hill Top Farm and Flood Risk

At the SPB meeting of 12th October, Members raised concern regarding the impact that the development would have on the occupiers of the adjoining Hill Top Farm, with specific reference to the servicing and maintenance of their septic tank, damage caused by construction activities and water table changes to a well within their kitchen.

1. Septic Tank – there were concerns regarding access to maintain and service a septic tank serving Hill Top Farm. There is a legal easement which gives Hill Top Farm access on foot or with vehicles to the land south of the neighbouring property (No.55). This is shown as an area of landscaping on the proposed site plan just north of Plots J100/101/102/103/104. Legal easements and rights of access are civil matters and not a material planning consideration. However, the applicant has confirmed that this area of land would remain accessible should the septic tank drainage area require service and / or maintenance.
2. Damage from Construction – again the occupiers of Hill Top Farm expressed concern about damage to their property by reason of a potential increase in the water table and construction activities within the vicinity of the site. Any damage caused to property as a result of construction activities would have to be rectified by the developer. However, this is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.
3. With regard to the impact on the water table and the well within Hill Top Farm, the drainage strategy would ensure that the proposal does not exacerbate any risk of flooding as a result of the development proposed.

Members will recall that comments from United Utilities (UU) were received the day before the previous meeting and had not been available to report within the written reports. Additional comments have been received from UU. Those comments offer no objection to the proposed drainage strategy confirming that it is acceptable in principle subject to the detailed design being agreed under the separate adoptions process overseen by UU. Whilst UU did express concern regarding the upsize in sewer, UU went on to confirm that the applicant would need to submit a S185 sewer diversion application as the applicant proposes to alter an existing UU asset (i.e.

connect into the main sewer as most housing developments do). However, this is a separate process which ordinarily follows the planning approval process.

It is important to note that detailed drainage conditions are attached to the parent consent (the outline planning approval) and therefore the final detailed drainage design will be agreed under a subsequent discharge of conditions application which both UU and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) would review and comment on before discharge. UU and the LLFA are satisfied with the drainage detail in principle and accordingly, the scheme is acceptable in this regard.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site consists of 5 fields last in agricultural use and a field at the northern end of the site that is mainly covered in vegetation. The section of land adjoining Chelford Road gently increases in ground level. The fields within the site are separated by hedgerows and several mature trees are located within the site and along its boundaries. The site adjoins residential properties in places along its northern boundary and at the northeastern corner of the site. Pexhill Road forms the eastern boundary of the site and open land is located to the south and west. The site measures approximately 22.89 hectares in size. The site forms part of an allocated site for housing development under Policy LPS 16 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS).

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This application seeks approval of the reserved matters following the outline approval of planning ref; 17/4034M, which granted outline consent for residential development of up to 232 dwellings with associated works. Access was approved at the outline stage and will be taken from a new roundabout to be constructed on Chelford Road between Nos 64 and 66. The current proposal seeks approval of the remaining outstanding reserved matters which are appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale for 216 dwellings. This is a joint application between 2 housebuilders, Jones Homes and Redrow.

RELEVANT HISTORY

17/4034M - Outline Planning Permission (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of up to 232 dwellings – Approved 27-Feb-2019

POLICIES

Development Plan

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS)

MP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

PG1 Overall Development Strategy

PG2 Settlement hierarchy

PG7 Spatial Distribution of Development

SD1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East

SD2 Sustainable Development Principles

IN1 Infrastructure

IN2 Developer Contributions

SC1 Leisure and Recreation
SC2 Indoor and Outdoor Sports 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
SE7 The Historic Environment
SE9 Energy Efficient development
SE12 Pollution, land contamination and land stability
SE13 Flood risk and water management
CO1 Sustainable travel and transport
CO3 Digital connections
CO4 Travel plans and transport assessments
LPS 16 Land south of Chelford Road, Macclesfield

Macclesfield Borough Local Plan saved policies (MBLP)

NE3 Protection of Local Landscapes
NE11 Nature conservation
NE17 Nature conservation in major developments
NE18 Accessibility to nature conservation
RT5 Open space standards
H9 Occupation of affordable housing
DC3 Residential Amenity
DC6 Circulation and Access
DC8 Landscaping
DC9 Tree Protection
DC14 Noise
DC15 Provision of Facilities
DC17 Water resources
DC35 Materials and finishes
DC36 Road layouts and circulation
DC37 Landscaping
DC38 Space, light and privacy
DC40 Children's Play Provision and Amenity Space
DC41 Infill Housing Development
DC63 Contaminated land

Relevant Emerging policies for 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.

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 7 Climate Change
ENV 12 Air quality
ENV 16 Surface water management and flood risk
HOU 1 Housing mix
HOU 6 Space, Accessibility and wheelchair housing standards
HOU10 Amenity
HOU 11 Residential standards
HOU 12 Housing Density
HOU 13 Housing Delivery
INF 1 Cycleways, bridleways and footpaths
INF 3 Highways safety and access
INF 9 Utilities
REC 3 Green space implementation
PG9 Settlement Boundaries

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) 2021
National Planning Practice Guidance
Cheshire East Design Guide

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

ANSA – No objection subject to further detail on proposed play equipment

Cheshire Wildlife Trust – Object on the basis of the incursion of the southern access road into the Local Wildlife Site

Environmental Protection – No objection subject to conditions relating to noise mitigation, hours of construction and piling and dust management.

Flood Risk Manager – No objection in principle but request further detail

Head of Strategic Infrastructure (Highways) – No Objection

Housing Strategy & Needs Manager – No objection

Manchester Airport – No objection subject to a Bird Hazard Management Plan

Public Rights of Way – No objection

United Utilities (UU) – No objection to the proposed drainage strategy subject to the detailed design being agreed under the separate adoptions process. Whilst UU did express concern

regarding the upsize in sewer, UU went on to confirm that the applicant would need to submit a S185 sewer diversion application.

VIEWS OF THE TOWN / PARISH COUNCIL

Henbury Parish Council –Detailed objections have been received from the Parish Council. The main concerns are summarised below:

- Application should be considered in the context of a number of other developments considered in the area
- Flood risk and drainage information has shortcomings and does not mitigate surface water issues
- Impacts on air quality having regard to Broken Cross Air Quality Management Area
- Critical that detailed air quality modelling is undertaken to understand the net impact before any permissions can be granted, using accurate inputs and micro-simulation
- Original air quality assessments were inaccurate
- Pedestrian flow surveys were carried out when a number of year groups were on leave due to exams
- Will be very long waiting times for pedestrians which will be unsafe for school children
- Traffic flows are inaccurate (and therefore the Air Quality modelling also)
- The presence of the very busy Tesco Express store and other business accesses on the roundabout approach is also a critical factor – and this has simply not been considered
- Should wait to see how broken cross junction performs before consenting this scheme
- The developer should produce a detailed submission on sustainable access
- Local infrastructure (schools, healthcare, utility supply etc.) cannot cope
- Will impact negatively on Cock Wood Local Wildlife Site (SBI)
- The design, especially at the south-eastern corner, reduces the ‘country lane’ character of Pexhill Road
- It will have a large and negative impact on the residents of Pexhill Road including proposed pumping station

Macclesfield Town Council – Object on the grounds summarised below:

1. Sustainable transport provision to include cycleways and footpaths to access infrastructure and services in Macclesfield,
2. Provision of electric vehicle charging points in communal areas and at each of the properties,
3. Accessible waste and recycling points,
4. Sufficient off-street parking for all properties,
5. Mixed dwellings and housing types,
6. Delivery of 30% affordable housing,
7. Protection of existing boundaries,
8. Protection of existing trees,
9. That pedestrian and cycle access to the remainder/undeveloped northern portion of LPS16 is accommodated and secured for potential future development of that site as identified in the Cheshire East Local Plan,
10. That the development is served by a bus route, with upgrades to bus stops on Chelford Road and the introduction of a pedestrian crossing to facilitate safe road crossing,

11. Vehicular ingress and egress to the development is insufficiently served.

It was also noted that the excavation of peat could result in contamination of the nearby stream, effecting ancient woodland and that, as previously advised by Cheshire East Council, peat cannot be removed offsite.

MP David Rutley – Object on the grounds summarised below:

- Highlights the concerns that have already been submitted to Cheshire East Council by Save Macclesfield Green Belt Group and Henbury Parish Council
- Broken Cross has several ongoing challenges with regards to pollution and air quality, and it is within a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Given the number of homes that are proposed around Chelford Road, it is vital that there is a full assessment of the cumulative impact of these developments on local air quality, with detailed action plans setting out how these serious air quality concerns will be mitigated. Strong concerns about the robustness of the data that has informed the recommendations for the development. Essential that more robust and detailed analysis of air quality issues is undertaken at this location before planning permission can be granted.
- Site sits within a Critical Drainage Area. There is no above or below ground attenuation planned for the site, and a number of existing water bodies are to be built on or infilled. This is likely to significantly reduce the potential for surface water to successfully drain from the site. Also concerned that the cumulative effect of the various developments around Chelford Road on the public sewerage system remain unaddressed. It is vital that a more comprehensive assessment should take place before planning permission can be approved.
- Impact of development on Cocks Wood. This site of Special Biological Interest (SBI) contains important natural features such as trees, hedgerows, and ponds, as well as some protected species. The development, as currently proposed, involves the removal of priority hedgerow habitats, grasslands and wetlands.
- The developer should consider creating a continuous open space throughout the development, including the planting of native species along the western border, to help promote and protect biodiversity at this location.
- The development sits near an area of peat land, which must remain in situ.
- There are strong concerns that have been raised by local residents regarding the impact of development on local schools. This development would place additional pressure on the existing road network. It is well-documented that the Broken Cross roundabout already experiences significant volumes of traffic at peak times; even taking into account the proposed redesign of this location.
- Concerns about the scaling, massing and detailing of the proposed development. The potential scale of the buildings would dominate existing structures in their immediate vicinity, and that there would be insufficient screening to mitigate the visual impact of the development. I further understand that the development, as proposed, would raise the overall height of the land on which it sits, further emphasising the development, rather than allowing it to blend more holistically within the existing landscape.
- Given the strong level of concern across the community in Broken Cross and Henbury about these proposals, and the strong concerns voiced by Save Macclesfield Green Belt group and Henbury Parish Council, I would be most grateful if Cheshire East Council could give the points raised above the most serious consideration that they deserve, and

refuse planning permission for this application, unless revisions, as outlined above, are made.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Representations have been received from approximately 52 addresses on the following grounds:

Process

- This application should be put on hold until a thorough site visit has been made to the site and surrounding area.
- There are no scale drawings of proposed houses as required in condition 29 of the outline planning permission that was granted (17/4034M).
- This is a reserved matters application pursuant to outline approval 17/4034M. There are several issues arising from the outline permission that are not addressed in this application and a statement is necessary as to how far these have been progressed.
- As outline planning permission for land to the north and south of Chelford Road were all heard together, so cumulative effects of all sites could be taken into account, it makes perfect sense that reserved matters should be the same (19/3097M, 19/3098M and 19/3816M).

Principle

- Loss of greenfield(s) / open countryside.
- Represents overdevelopment of LPS 16 (land south of Chelford Road) in the Local Plan Strategy.
- Brownfield sites / empty shops in Macclesfield should be converted to housing instead.
- Object to loss of former greenbelt land.
- Concerns regarding whether the affordable homes will truly be 'affordable'.
- Housing targets have already been met. No need for development.
- Proposal represents urban sprawl.

Pollution / Climate Impacts

- Increased levels of air pollution, particularly on local Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) including at Broken Cross Roundabout.
- The air quality assessment is based on incomplete data where there was an under-recording of vehicle queue lengths and incomplete diffusion tube records. Air quality assessment does not consider wider developments.
- Light pollution impacts.
- Question the validity of data used in the noise impact assessment.
- Impacts on carbon sinks and natural resources for future generations.
- There is an area of peat land within the site which must remain in situ.
- There are no renewable energy sources planned for the scheme.
- Concerns regarding construction impacts including ground disturbance.

Highways, sustainable travel and access

- Traffic congestion.
- Safety concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist access, including from Pexhill Road.
- Concern over road safety / speeds along proposed internal road network.

- No reference in the application to the feasibility study regarding highways safety / speed limit review which was secured at outline stage.
- Access via Pexhill Road will require a change to the speed limit.
- Roads are in poor condition.
- Concern over access for emergency vehicles & farmers.
- Change to the availability of public transport, the 88-bus service runs every 2 hours Monday to Saturday. Bus service 130 has been cancelled.
- The main spine road should be constructed to an appropriate standard to allow public transport access.
- The traffic modelling does not include recently completed local development(s).
- Miscalculation of traffic on Chelford Road. Impacts on Chelford Road have not been appropriately considered.
- The building of the South-West Macclesfield Link Road should not be led by such schemes and should not be delivered in a piecemeal fashion.
- Plan to replace Broken Cross roundabout with traffic lights will not improve traffic flow.
- CEC should defer decision on this application until a new review of the road network around Macclesfield has been undertaken.
- A condition requiring the construction of the internal link road up to the legal southern boundary of the application site should be included, it must also include its construction and adoption by a certain timeframe. This is needed to ensure that the delivery of the South West Macclesfield Link Road is not prejudiced by this development (reference to site specific principle of development b for LPS 16 and condition 32 of the outline planning permission).

Flooding / drainage

- Building on this land will cause flooding issues.
- Concerns over drainage facilities and impacts on adjacent properties, inadequate drainage (with tarmac drives) and surface water flooding impacts.
- When outline planning permission was granted, there were two pumping stations shown. This application currently only shows one. Is one pumping station sufficient for this site?
- The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area as identified by Cheshire East in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of 2013. Appropriate mitigation measures have not been addressed in this planning application.
- There is no ground or below ground attenuation planned for the site. This will have implications for water drainage. Drainage assessment has not considered impact of additional discharge from neighbouring developments on the site. Increased hard standing (40%) with no addition of attenuation ponds to maintain current flow rates
- The hydrology and hydrochemistry of Cock Wood Ancient Woodland Site of Biological Importance will significantly be affected by this development's drainage.
- Increasing the height of the land in the northwest of the site will increase the flow rates to existing housing
- Important that condition 4 of outline planning permission with regards surface water drainage is appropriately addressed and discharged before planning permission is granted (17/4034M).
- Concerns regarding changes to the water table and water contamination
- Impact on water table and a well located in the adjoining Hill Top Farm
- Impact on drainage site for nearby septic tank.
- Loss of legal easement and right of access to service said septic tank

Wildlife / Trees

- Impacts on wildlife and habitats.
- Impacts on protected species including bats, newts.
- Impacts on trees, hedgerows, flora and fauna.
- Biodiversity impacts.
- Lack of detail regarding Cock Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The LWS seems to have been reduced in the drawings, the pumping station 15 metre boundary encroaches into the LWS.
- Negative impact on the Cock Wood LWS and removal of priority habitats. In the current layout it will be directly affected by the recreational impacts of the new residents, as well as the air pollution, hydrology and hydrochemistry changes associated with human activity of the new residents and the drainage.
- 3 metre buffer around Cock Wood LWS has not been incorporated
- The plan however also shows an access road passing through the LWS site to provide speculative access to further development on adjacent land outside of the application/allocation. The creation of this access road would have an adverse impact upon the LWS site and not be in accordance with the Local Plan Policy for site LPS 16 and condition 13 of the outline planning permission.
- A method statement detailing how the LWS site and associated buffer will be safeguarded throughout the construction phase should be included.
- Concern over the loss of trees suffering from Ash dieback.

Character

- Impact on the character and appearance of the area. Impact on its rural characteristics.
- Already a high concentration of houses in this area
- Access from Pexhill Road will change the character of the area from a rural location to a housing estate
- Landscape and visual impacts
- Impact on the character of Chelford Road

Infrastructure

- Large development with no services to support it
- Lack of suitable infrastructure
- Schools are overly subscribed
- Impact on NHS, including doctors, dentists etc.
- Proposed contributions to infrastructure are well below that required to accommodate the extra dwellings.

Housing Mix

- Some support for the mix of housing types and tenures throughout the development
- Proposed housing stock is different to current housing stock along Pexhill Road and Pexhill Drive
- No bungalows are planned for the site
- Disproportionate amount of 4 bed properties
- There is a need to ensure development is tenure blind in respect of affordable homes

Design

- An increased number of dwellings on a smaller footprint has led to perception of 'cramming' of development.
- Number of dwellings excessive for site constraints
- Welcome a greater proportion of low shrubbery along the spine road frontages to provide for particulate capture bringing air quality benefits. The landscaping to the west, south and east boundaries is important for the longer-term integration of the scheme into the local landscape
- Site layout involves the building of properties close to existing dwellings without sufficient space and planting to screen and buffer the visual impact of the development.
- The intrusive nature of the development is exacerbated by the addition of a pumping station adjacent to Pexhill Road at the corner of the southeastern boundary and into Cock Wood LWS.
- The proposed regrading of the land significantly increases the height of land to the northwest of the site. This increases rather than mitigates the oppressive visual impact of the new housing development on the existing residents of Pexhill Road and Pexhill Drive
- There is some creation of open space around one property on Pexhill Road, Hill Side, however this is not evident for the rest of Pexhill Road. Continuation of this depth of open space and naturalistic planting would be beneficial
- There needs to be a significant reduction in the housing allocation to allow creation of drainage buffers to the north and west of the existing properties on the site, retention of the waterbodies within the development site, retention of the ponds and streams in Cock Wood LWS, the development of additional open surface water attenuation features such as ponds or basins.
- Design of homes proposed not in keeping with local area
- High density scheme with insufficient green / public space
- Scheme is not compliant with the Cheshire East Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
- Object to 3 storey homes, not in keeping with local area
- Lack of a southwest green route as described in the Local Plan Site Specific Principles of Development D.
- Concerns regarding boundary treatment from scheme
- Development should be set back from adjacent properties, as should the pump station (and exclusion zone)
- Proposed homes are close to existing dwellings on Pexhill Road, Hillside and Hill Top Farm
- Concerns regarding lack of local detailing and standardisation of design response
- Concerns over location of pumping station

Amenity

- Height (due to regrading) and the impacts on adjacent developments (including amenity impacts) need to be considered.
- Height of properties proposed has an overbearing impact on adjacent properties including Bungalows etc.
- Development should be scaled back to something more sympathetic to reduce impacts on adjacent homes.

- Privacy / amenity impacts on adjacent homes.
- Concerns over loss of daylight.
- Construction impact on adjacent homes.
- Larger buffer needed to adjacent homes.
- Location of park / play area is a concern on amenity of adjacent properties.
- Objections to the type of fencing used.
- Play area is inadequately screened.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

Macclesfield is identified as one of the principal towns in Cheshire East where CELPS Policy PG 2 seeks to direct 'significant development' to the towns in order to 'support their revitalisation', recognising their roles as 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.

The application site is allocated as a Strategic Site for housing under Policy LPS 16 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS). When the Council adopted the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy on 27th July 2017, the site was removed from the Green Belt.

The site received outline planning permission in early 2019 under planning ref; 17/4034M for the erection of up to 232 dwellings with details of access from Chelford Road via a new roundabout to be constructed by the developer. The access was agreed at the outline stage and the access points remain as originally proposed.

The principle of development has therefore been accepted and the purpose of this application is to agree the detail of the scheme, which will provide the site with a full detailed planning consent. It is not the purpose of this application to revisit the merits of developing this allocated site for residential purposes or its removal from the Green Belt when the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy was formally adopted.

Site LPS 16 states that the development of land south of Chelford Road will be achieved over the Local Plan Strategy period through:

1. The delivery of around 200 new dwellings;
2. Provision of new road junction to Chelford Road, and construction of an access road to the southern perimeter of the site;
3. Incorporation of green infrastructure and public open space;
4. Pedestrian and cycle links to new and existing residential areas, shops, schools and health facilities;
5. On site provision, or where appropriate, relevant contributions towards highways and transport, education, health, open space and community facilities; and
6. A master plan should be submitted so the site may be planned in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. Development must be in accordance with an agreed masterplan which must detail how a recognisable Green Belt boundary would be reinforced that will endure in the long term.

And the following Site Specific Principles of Development:

- a. The development would be expected to contribute towards off-site road infrastructure improvements in the central and western Macclesfield area.
- b. Any development that would prejudice the future comprehensive development of the adjacent safeguarded land will not be permitted (Site reference LPS 19).
- c. The access road must be designed to serve any potential future development on the adjacent safeguarded land and it must be of a standard to form part of any future South West Macclesfield Link Road.
- d. The development would be expected to provide improvements to existing and include the provision of new pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to existing and proposed residential and employment areas, shops, schools & health facilities. The provision of a south west green route would link with existing north to south routes in the form of the Macclesfield Canal and Middlewood Way.
- e. The Local Plan Strategy site is expected to provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in Policy SC 5 'Affordable Homes'.
- f. A desk based archaeological assessment is required for the site, with targeted evaluation and appropriate mitigation being carried out, if required.
- g. Any application would need to be supported by a full ecological appraisal. Mitigation would be required to address any impacts on protected species. Any woodland, orchards and other priority habitats or habitats of local wildlife site quality on the site should be retained and buffered by areas of open space/habitat creation. A 30m undeveloped buffer must be provided around the ancient woodland within and adjacent to the site at Cock Wood and deliver complimentary and/or compensatory habitats on the site as required.
- h. Any development proposals must avoid any impacts on Local Wildlife Sites. This should include indirect impacts resulting from changes in hydrology, hydrochemistry, air pollution and recreational impacts.
- i. A minimum of a Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment for contaminated land should be carried out to demonstrate that the site is, or could be made, suitable for use should it be found to be contaminated. Further work, including a site investigation, may be required at a pre-planning stage, depending on the nature of the site.

This application is for approval of the details of Appearance, Landscaping Layout and Scale (the reserved matters) and proposes 216 units. The proposed layout covers a slightly smaller area than the entire site allocated under LPS 16. However, the site is the same as consented at outline stage. The area to the northeast of the site where it sits in between Nos 46b and 50 Chelford Road is not included in the development site.

Whilst the proposed development of 216 dwellings would take the development numbers past the general number of 200 indicated in the site allocation, the outline consented up to 232 within the site. The number of dwellings proposed as part of this reserved matters application would be 16 less than was permitted at outline stage and accords with the outline consent, which was accepted as complying with LPS 16 at outline stage. The delivery of the site for residential development will contribute towards the Council's housing land supply and assist in meeting the development requirements of Macclesfield and the wider Borough. The further requirements of policy LPS 16, and other relevant policies, are considered below.

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 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.

The CELPS states in the justification text of Policy SC 5 (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. This figure should be taken as a minimum.

Point 3 of Policy SC 5 notes that “the affordable homes provided must be of a tenure, size and type to help meet identified housing needs and contribute to the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities where people can live independently longer”. Paragraph 12.48 of the supporting text of Policy SC5 (affordable homes) confirms that the Council would currently expect a ratio of 65/35 between social rented and intermediate affordable housing. On this basis, 42 units should be provided as affordable rent and 23 units as intermediate tenure.

The current number of those on the Cheshire Homechoice waiting list with Macclesfield and Sutton as their first choice is 1751. This can be broken down as below;

The current number of those on the Cheshire Homechoice waiting list with Macclesfield as their first choice is 1592. This can be broken down to 936 x 1 bedroom, 408 x 2 bedroom, 173 x 3 bedroom, 45 x 4 bedroom and 30 x 5 bedroom dwellings. The intermediate need in Macclesfield is the same as across the borough of Cheshire East. The need is for dwellings that 1st time buyers and families looking to buy but cannot afford without assistance.

The Intermediate need is the same across the borough. Small dwellings for 1st time buyers, those making a new household or families who cannot afford to buy without subsidy.

Points 4 and 5 of Policy SC 5 requires that the affordable units should be pepper potted within the development unless there are specific circumstances that would warrant a different approach. The external design, comprising elevation, detail and materials should be compatible with the open market homes and achieve the same design quality.

30% of the dwellings on site were secured as affordable housing as part of the s106 agreement attached to the outline permission, in accordance with policy SC 5 of the CELPS. This includes 65% of the affordable housing to be Social Rented Housing and the balance to be Intermediate Housing. This is a proposed development of 216 dwellings (as amended) and therefore to meet the Council’s Policy on Affordable Housing there is a requirement for 65 dwellings to be provided as affordable homes. The Council’s Housing Strategy and Needs Manager has confirmed that the scheme meets with these provisions and has confirmed that there is no objection to the proposal. As such, the scheme is compliant with Policy SC 5.

Residential Mix

Policy SC4 of the CELPS states that new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed,

balanced and inclusive communities. Reference is made to the need for development proposals to accommodate units specifically designed for the elderly and people who require specialist accommodation.

The proposed development as amended comprises of:

	number	% of total units
1 bed	10	5
2 bed	50	23
3 bed	73	34
4 bed	83	38

Overall mix of open market units:

	Number	% of open market
2 bed	16	11
3 bed	54	36
4 bed	81	53

Overall mix of affordable units:

	number	% of affordable units
1 bed	10	16
2 bed	34	52
3 bed	19	29
4 bed	2	3
5 bed	0	0

As can be seen above, a range of housing types are being proposed from small sized 1 bed units offering ground floor single storey entry to 2 bed, 3 bed and 4 bed dwellings. There are no 5 bed executive style homes proposed on this site. Several family houses are proposed albeit smaller in terms of their size (i.e. not large executive family homes), which has enabled the proposed development to provide the consented number units and offers a really good mix of housing and a number of 2 and 3 bed dwellings. This general makeup of dwellings would provide a good mix of type, size and coupled with the affordable provision. The proposal would provide a diverse community and would fit in with the existing residential development which varies in terms of its size and type. As such, the scheme is found to comply with Local Plan Policy SC 4.

Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS)

In terms of dwelling sizes, it is noted that HOU6 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (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. It is confirmed that all the proposed dwellings are NDSS compliant.

Design - Layout, Scale and Appearance

Amongst other criteria, Policy SD 2 of the CELPS expects all development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness in terms of:

- a. Height, scale, form and grouping;
- b. Choice of materials;
- c. External design features;
- d. Massing of development - the balance between built form and green/public spaces;
- e. Green infrastructure; and
- f. Relationship to neighbouring properties, street scene and the wider neighbourhood

Policy SE 1 of the CELPS expects housing developments to achieve Building for Life 12 (BfL12) standard, and that development proposals consider the wider character of a place in addition to that of the site and its immediate context, to ensure that it reinforces the area in which it is located. These principles are also reflected in the CEC Design Guide and reinforced by Policy GEN 1 of the SADPD. The relevant BfL12 headings are considered below:

Connections (Amber) - With this proposal being a part of a previously approved permission including an indicative masterplan, it would be expected that the external connections would be appropriate and in the right places. Whilst the amended layout does connect reasonably well to neighbouring development with a suitably placed entrance road to the north onto Chelford Road, officers originally expressed concern over the termination of the main spinal route as it sets up potential connections to possible future development phases to the south and to the southwest.

At present the site allocations contained in the Cheshire East Local Plan Draft Adopted Policies Map imply that these are unlikely to happen in the short term with the open countryside there (site LPS19) designated as safeguarded land and not as an allocated housing site. Whilst it is appreciated that these should be developable in the future and that there is a policy requirement to ensure that this site enables that (by providing access to it) there is no indication as to timescale, or indeed if it will happen at all and as such this proposal really must be viewed in isolation and on its own merits.

As a result, the indicated abrupt termination of these roads is a concern, how will these be handled, will they simply stop. Until the issue of how these roads will terminate i.e. until such a time as future phases of development on LPS19 come forward, then it is only possible to award an amber light here.

Facilities and Service (Green) - These matters were considered at outline stage and it can be seen that this site lies the settlement edge, 2.4 miles from the centre of Macclesfield where a full range of facilities and services can be accessed. There are shops, pubs, schools and access to local transport hubs, within easy walking distance of the site. More locally, there are shops, pubs and other facilities including a primary school in Broken Cross which is within easy walking

distance of the site. Here is also a LEAP provided on site and some usable areas of public open space. As a result of all this a green light is readily awarded.

Public Transport (Green) - These matters were considered at outline stage, and it was identified that the closest bus stops to the scheme are located on the A537 Chelford Road close the proposed site access, around the Broken Cross roundabout and on the B5392 / Gawsorth Road / Princes Way to the south. From services found there access can be gained into Macclesfield town centre and to the National Rail station with its excellent services to Manchester and London. As a result, a green light is awarded.

Meeting Local Housing Requirements (Green) – The proposal as amended would provide a good mix of housing including affordable provision. Affordable units are now no longer distinguishable from the open market units through and although there are clusters of affordable, these have been broken up, reduced in number, and spread better across the development. Further, following amendments, some 2-bedroom open market units have been incorporated into the proposed scheme.

Character (Green) – Following comments by officers, clear improvements have been made in the amended scheme. In particular to the Jones house types which have benefitted greatly from the removal of the standard (and therefore non-context specific) detailing and the application of a more locally responsive approach. Similarly, the Redrow homes, whilst not as overly busy in the first place, have also benefitted from the ‘localisation’ of their detailing. Overall, it is felt that whereas the previous scheme jarred, this is more coherent proposal.

Working with the Site and Context (Green) – The revised proposals will include measured lengths of hedgerows and that there is a commitment to ensure that they are returned to proper hedgerow boundaries. With regard to the southern boundary, the turning of houses to address this is welcomed along with the reorientated acoustic fence. Finally, the changes to the layout do create a stronger frontage to the southern end of the eastern boundary on Pexhill Road and this is considered an improvement.

Creating well defined streets and spaces (Green) - Houses generally do front the street and views are well terminated. Houses are generally positioned positively to define and enhance streets and where this is moved away from it is for good reason – such as the houses which turn to face the open countryside and/or the gateway to potential future development on the safeguarded site beyond. There is one key place where this was not successful. The ‘Harrogate’ house on plot R01 presented a side elevation to the avenue and a driveway with the side of a double garage. This also terminates the view from the cul-de-sac to the south. Following concerns at this key location at the heart of the site, a corner-turning dual aspect house addressing the avenue and providing a suitable termination of the vista has been secured.

Easy to find your way around (Green) - Overall, it is felt that this is not a concern, and the layout would be easy to navigate. This has improved as a result of the changes to the layout and the subsequent strengthening of the street hierarchy.

Streets for All (Amber) – There was some concern that the long sweeping spine road, which is designed to take more traffic than would be generated by this development alone, would not help to reduce vehicle speeds. Whilst it is appreciated that there is the need to cater for an

unknown but significant quantum of development at an unspecified time on the LPS19 site, the spine road appears to be over-engineered when viewed in isolation as a part of this application. However, this is a requirement of LPS16 points 2 and b and accordingly, the street hierarchy has been justified and is acceptable. Elsewhere there is an identifiable hierarchy of streets, with secondary branch streets/cul-de-sacs and some more home zone type shared driveways.

Car Parking (Amber) - Car parking levels are adequate and garages do not seem to be included in the figures which is good as they are not often used for parking cars. Spaces are all in-curtilage parking, predominantly to the side and front of properties is generally well handled. The development has achieved a varied mix of parking solutions across the site. The parking arrangements have been separated with green spaces and the runs of adjacent car parking spaces have been reduced through amendments. There is the possibility that informal 50:50 kerb parking will occur along the main street, which will not only detract from the environment but also make this less safe. As a result of this, an amber light is awarded here.

Public and private spaces (Amber) - Houses have reasonably sized rear gardens and some space to the front too which is well defined. There are useable pockets of accessible open space across the development and a well-appointed LEAP located adjacent to the central pedestrian street and main route. The layout has been updated to show increased quality of landscaping and front boundary treatments updated to and reinforce street hierarchy as required in CEC Design Guide. Corner turners have been provided to improve transitions at nodal points.

External storage and amenity space (Green) - Houses have reasonably sized rear gardens, large enough to house the bin/recycling stores. These rear gardens have a clear external route to the front of the property for bin collection without the need to go through homes. Garages are provided at some plots, maybe with the intention of use for bike storage. Space for other storage including that of bicycles, especially useful for the houses without garages have been illustrated on the revised layout plan.

In terms of appearance, the proposed dwellings would be acceptable within the context of the site and would offer a degree of variation within the street. It is considered that the overall design, scale, form, and appearance of the proposals would be acceptable subject to the use of high-quality materials. The proposal achieves a well-designed residential development which would accord with LPS 16 and the Cheshire East Design Guide.

Open Space

A minimum of 65 square metres per dwelling of public open space was secured as part of the outline consent, which based on a scheme of 216 units, amounts to 14,040 square metres. An adequate amount of formal and informal public open space is provided within the site amounting to space in excess of 20,000 square metres. This would include a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) positioned within the open space towards the southeastern portion of the site. The Council's Greenspaces officer is currently reviewing the specification of the LEAP and their comments will be reported to members by update. Subject to further comment, the proposal complies with policy DC40 of the MBLP and policy SE 6 of the CELPS.

Residential Amenity

Saved policy DC38 of the MBLP states that new residential developments should generally achieve between 21m and 25m between principal windows and 14m between a principal window and a blank elevation. This is required to maintain an adequate standard of privacy and amenity between residential properties unless the design and layout of the scheme and its relationship to the site and its characteristics provide a commensurate degree of light and privacy between buildings.

However, the CE Design Guide states separation distances should be seen as guide rather than a hard and fast rule. The Design Guide does however acknowledge that the distance between rear facing habitable room windows should not drop below 21m. 18m front to front will also provide a good level of privacy, but if this applied too rigidly it will lead to uniformity and limit the potential to create strong street scenes and variety, and so this distance could go down as low as 12m in some cases. This aligns with the residential standards referenced within Policy HOU 11 of the SADPD.

To the north of the site, there are residential properties fronting Chelford Road and properties forming the end of Newlands Road, a cul-de-sac taking its access from Bromley Road and Pexhill Road. The layout shows that the nearest properties proposed as part of this application would achieve a distance of at least 23 metres with these neighbours. This would be sufficient to protect their level of amenity.

To the east, on the opposite side of Pexhill Road there are a number of existing residential properties. The nearest proposed dwellings would achieve a distance of at least 21 metres with the existing properties on the opposite side of Pexhill Road.

Elsewhere the site itself would envelop two existing properties which take their access off Pexhill Road. These are the properties referred to as 'Hill Top Farm' and 'Hillside' (no. 55). A distance of at least 23 metres would be maintained between the nearest Plots (J117 and J102/J103 respectively) whilst both being offset. Based on existing and proposed relationships, it is not considered that the proposes would result in material harm to the residential amenity afforded to neighbouring properties by reason of increased sense of enclosure, loss of light or direct overlooking.

The layout within the site ensures the relationships between the new dwellings result in acceptable standards of space, light and privacy for future occupants, having regard to the distance guidelines set out above. There will be sufficient private amenity space for each new dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policy DC3 of the MBLP.

Noise

The application is supported by a Noise Survey and Mitigation Scheme. The impact of the noise from road traffic on Chelford Road on the proposed development has been assessed in accordance with British Standard BS8233:2014 Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings. The report recommends noise mitigation measures in the form of specific glazing which are designed to achieve BS8233: 2014 and WHO guidelines; to ensure that future occupants of the properties are not adversely affected by environmental noise. Levels of noise in external garden areas are also acceptable with proposed boundary

treatments to 15 of the plots to the north of the site. The proposal complies with policy SE 12 of the CELPS and DC14 of the MBLP relating to noise and soundproofing.

Air Quality

Policy SE 12 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. This is in accordance with paragraph 181 of the NPPF and the Government's Air Quality Strategy.

Air quality impacts were comprehensively assessed and addressed at the outline stage. This included queries regarding monitoring tubes used and the methodology for assessment. The outline consent secured a package of mitigation measures which are forecast to mitigate the impact of the development through a highway improvement scheme at Broken Cross, electric vehicle infrastructure, a Travel Plan, dust control. The details of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, Travel plan and dust control included within this submission has already been permitted under discharge of conditions application 22/1308D. It is noted that works have already started to implement the highway improvement scheme at Broken Cross by Bellway Homes as part of the development consent on land to the north of Chelford Road. Subject to these, the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the air quality and the proposal will comply with Policy SE 12 of the CELPS.

Public Rights of Way and Accessibility

The proposal would not directly affect any public rights of way. With respect to the internal footways and cycle path connections, there are a number of internal footways and paths that run through the site and through the areas of open space that would facilitate both pedestrian and cycle movement. This would also increase permeability from through the site. As such, it would increase accessibility. Subject to a condition requiring the developer to provide new residents with information about local walking and cycling routes for both leisure and travel purposes, the proposal is considered to accord with the justification to Policy LPS 16 of the CELPS.

Highways

Whilst access was approved as part of the outline permission, this reserved matters submission seeks approval for the internal road layout of the site.

The CEC Design Guide promotes a Manual for Streets approach to all residential developments, and it is important that the design aims to reduce vehicle speeds.

A revised road layout was submitted to address previous comments made by the Head of Strategic Infrastructure (HSI – Highways). The submitted road layout plan is broadly in conformity with the original masterplan and is an acceptable design with suitable carriageway and footway widths being provided. The main spine roads have footways both sides of the road and the cul-de-sacs have a single footway. The applicant has also addressed the number of driveways on the northern part of the site and the proposed connection to the footway on Pexhill Road.

There are no changes to the main spline road that runs through the site. There are small infrastructure changes on east and west boundaries of the site that have realigned some of the minor roads. The proposed changes in road infrastructure are acceptable and meet design requirements and as such do not raise design concerns. There is a single point of access to the site from a new roundabout on the A537 Chelford Road. The main access road is 6.75 metres with a 3.0 metre shared pedestrian/cycle facility on the eastern side and a 2-metre footway on the western side of the road. The design of the main access is consistent with a distributor road standard and would provide adequate capacity for future connection to the safeguarded land to the south of the site.

It is important that the main road is constructed to the southern boundary of the site as is shown on the plan to ensure that future development of the safeguarded land under LPS 19 is not prejudiced, as per the requirements of criterion 2 and b of LPS 16.

A pedestrian only footway connection is provided at the northeast corner of the site and links to Pexhill Road. In providing this connection there needs to be a small amount of new footway provided on Pexhill Road to link into the existing footway.

The car parking provision across the development complies with the CEC parking standards and each unit has either internal cycle storage or provided in external sheds.

Swept paths have been submitted at the turning head locations for refuse vehicles and the tracking details show that adequate turning spaces are available.

As this is a reserved matters application, all matters relating to access/traffic impact and any off-site mitigation measures have already been dealt with in the outline application. This included a scheme of highway works to Broken Cross required by condition no. 30 of the outline consent. This is currently being implemented by another developer in relation to the delivery of housing on LPS 18 as part of a highways s278 agreement.

The internal road submission in this application is acceptable and is suitable for adoption. It is important that the spline road is constructed to the southern boundary of the site for connectivity reasons to allow for possible future development. A condition should be attached to secure this.

In summary, the submitted layout is technically acceptable in regard to highways and no objections are raised to the application.

Trees

Selected individual trees and groups within the site are afforded protection by the Cheshire East Borough Council (Macclesfield – Land to the south of Chelford Road) Tree Preservation Order 2018.

This application is for approval of reserved matters following outline approval application 17/4034M which included access. Condition 7 requires that any future reserved matters application shall be supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). Condition 9 requires a detailed levels survey and Condition 4 requires the submission of a detailed surface water drainage layout.

The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement. A Tree Protection Plan provides details of construction exclusion zones, tree protection fencing and proposed tree works. Having regard to the AIA and submitted Tree Protection Plan, the Council's Tree Officer had originally expressed concerns, which have been attended to within the revised proposal and an updated AIA. The Council's Tree Officer has reviewed the updated tree information in respect of the following.

Position of access road and Oak (T36) - There will be an encroachment of 30% into the Root Protection Area of the unprotected Oak (36T) due to the position of the access off Chelford Road and associated reprofiling work. The updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Rev G) seeks to retain the tree through amelioration of the remaining root system, to mitigate the extent of root loss using bio – char and woodchip mulch. Bio char is a soil ameliorant which can assist in reducing soil compaction, acts as a reservoir for plant nutrients, holds air and water and beneficial microbes. However, it remains to be seen as to the efficacy and reliability of such methods given the extent of root loss proposed. However, it should be noted that the direct loss of unprotected Oak 37T and potential loss of the Oak 36T as a consequence of the proposed site access was considered as part of outline proposal, which was subsequently approved.

Plot J9-J11 (trees 41T and 43T) - A 2 metre reduction of the canopy of Tree 43T is required to allow appropriate clearance of the proposed gardens to Plots J9-J11. Such pruning would not be necessary if the design allowed for adequate garden sizes to accommodate the size of mature trees. However, this would not sustain a refusal of planning permission and would not prejudice the health or wellbeing of the said trees.

44H (Ivy and Damson Hedge) and 45G (matured hedge) - There is no change from previous revisions to significantly prune back these hedges to facilitate private amenity garden space. However, the hedge would be retained, and the scheme proposes a good amount of additional hedgerow planting.

56T to 66T - The position of the access road on the rooting environment of protected Alder (T55), Oak (56T), Ash (58T; 59T) and Oak 62T has not changed. The AIA states that there will be a low moderate impact on these trees as a consequence of the road with potential loss of roots of between 5-13%. It should be noted that the percentage figure represents a loss of roots within the identified root protection area (RPA) and not the actual root loss which may be greater. BS5837 may allow up to a 20% incursion into the RPA of trees subject to specialist arboricultural and construction design advice to determine whether the construction is achievable without a significant adverse impact on trees. Whilst the incursion into the RPA of these trees may be relatively modest, neither the AIA or the Method Statement has provided details on appropriate mitigation measures in the affected areas. In light of the modest impact, the Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that this could be dealt with by condition requiring an update to the AIA.

74T Sycamore - This issue has been addressed and there is now no impact on the tree from the road.

76T Ash - An Ash tree (76T) identified previously as moderate category tree for retention is now suffering from Ash die back and will now require removal.

Northern boundary trees and 78T Ash 85T Ash - The proximity of buildings to trees range between 12-14 metres, which on a north facing aspect provides for a reasonably defensible social relationship. The pruning of tree 78T and 85T to allow clearance of the garden area to Plots R83 and R84 could be premature. Whilst Plots R74-R76 are outside the RPA of trees 86T and 85T, there will be an impact on the RPA of these trees due to restricted space for construction/ plant. The Tree Protection Plan will require updating to make provision for special measures including ground protection and method of construction in this area. The Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that this could be dealt with by condition requiring an update to the Tree Protection Plan.

With regard to drainage, a proposed drainage layout and existing and proposed levels drawing has been submitted in respect of Condition 4 and Condition 9 of the outline approval. The Tree Officer has confirmed that there are no significant impacts on retained trees with regard to the proposed drainage or proposed site levels across the application site.

Subject to further condition requiring the AIA and Method Statement to be updated, the scheme is found to be in compliance with CELPS Policy SE 5 and LPS 16.

Landscape

Following amendments, the design of the scheme has been improved so that there are discernible character areas in the overall layout. There is a clear hierarchy of streets in terms of main access streets, streets leading from main streets and then smaller streets. The Design Guide offers advice on Avenues, the main routes leading into areas of housing and the use of larger trees along such roads. This is something that has been addressed in the submitted design, with use of trees on them as well as on secondary and tertiary streets. The layout offers the potential for the introduction of high-quality tree planting across the site. It is important that high canopy street trees are secured to do the overall green infrastructure and open spaces justice. This further detail could be secured by condition.

Ecology

Several conditions relating to nature conservation matters were attached to the outline consent.

Condition 12 Strategy for the incorporation of features to enhance the biodiversity value of the proposed development - Acceptable proposals for the provision of bat and bird boxes, hedgehog gaps, brush piles, new pond and native planting have been submitted as required by this condition.

Condition 13 No built development shall take place within 3 metres of the boundary of the Local Wildlife Site unless suitable mitigation can be identified and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority - The undeveloped buffer required by this condition is shown on the submitted Biodiversity Habitat Plan.

Cheshire Wildlife Trust, who administer the local Wildlife Site system have previously objected to the application on the basis that the proposed development encroaches into the boundary of the adjacent Local Wildlife Site (LWS). Changes have been made to several proposed units as shown on the revised layout plan to reduce this incursion. Cheshire Wildlife Trust have provided revised comments based on the latest layout plan.

The access road through the site, which is presumable provided to link to further phases of development, extends into the Local Wildlife Site and the submitted drainage scheme would result in some encroachment into the boundary of the LWS as the drainage for the site discharges into the watercourse within the Local Wildlife Site. The current layout is therefore not in full compliance with this condition.

Measures detailing how the Local Wildlife Site and associated buffer will be safeguarded throughout the construction phase are also necessary. This has been provided as part of the revised CEMP submitted in respect of conditions 11 and 15 of the outline consent. The CEMP however refers to the Local Wildlife Site as a Site of Biological Importance (SBI). If planning consent is granted, the Council's Nature Conservation Officer (NCO) recommends that these additional measures be secured by condition.

Condition 20 Updated badger and bat surveys - The submitted updated bat surveys are acceptable. An active sett is present on site. It is possible to retain this sett in the long term. However, as works will take place in the close vicinity of the sett it is proposed to temporarily close the sett for the duration of disturbing works. This approach is acceptable.

Condition 25 Details of how the existing hedges are to be retained. Should any hedgerows require removal details of adequate mitigation shall be submitted -

Native hedgerows are a priority habitat and hence a material consideration. The majority of the existing hedgerows on site are retained, but approximately 92 metres of existing hedgerow would be lost as a result of the proposed development. If this loss of hedgerow is considered unavoidable it is advised that an acceptable level of compensatory hedgerow planting is proposed in relation to that lost. This could be secured by further condition.

Condition 27 Bluebell Translocation Assessment - Native Bluebells are a priority species and hence a material consideration. The proposed layout would result in the loss of Bluebells associated with hedgerows on site. Acceptable proposals for the translocation of bluebells from these locations have been submitted as required by this condition.

Condition 33 Lighting Assessment- The revised lighting strategy is acceptable.

Landscape management plan - An acceptable landscape management plan has been submitted in support of this reserved matters application as required by the section 106 agreement associated with the outline permission.

Great Crested Newts - A further great crested newt survey has been undertaken at an off-site pond. No evidence of great crested newts was recorded during this further survey. No further action is therefore required in respect of this species.

The NCO has advised that conditions safeguarding nesting birds and accordance with the proposals for the safeguarding of the SBI and buffer zone detailed in the submitted CEMP would be required. Subject to the proposed mitigation measures and further conditions, the scheme is found to be acceptable in terms of its ecological impact and accords with MBLP Policies NE11, NE17 and CELPS Policy SE 3.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 as defined by the Environment Agency indicative flood maps and as a result the chance of flooding from rivers or sea is 0.1% (1 in 1000) or less.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has confirmed that they have no objection in principle to the reserved matters application and layout. However, the LLFA are still liaising with the applicant regarding final drainage detail. It must be noted that the outline consent controls much of the drainage detail through conditions attached to that consent. However, the applicant has submitted some of the information with this reserved matters application.

The LLFA has commented that they are aware that United Utilities (UU) have some concerns with the proposed surface water connection point within Pexhill Road. UU have been formally consulted as part of this application, but they have not commented and in any event, the surface water drainage strategy is to be dealt with under an application to discharge condition no. 4 of the outline consent of which UU would be consulted. However, the LLFA offer no objection to the strategy as the connection is referenced within the approved Flood Risk Assessment, which is also referenced within condition 4.

Various manholes now indicate above ground flooding during extreme events. Existing overland flow routing plans are unclear. The developer needs to submit a clear overland flow routing plan demonstrating where the above ground volumes sit in relation to the development footprint. Given the wider drainage issues at this location it is essential all surface water is retained within the site boundary, without causing any adverse impacts. Additionally, the LLFA suggests that the applicant submits specific chamber details for each hydrobrake, indicating top water level during each extreme event (1:1, 1:30, 1:100+cc%). The strategy also includes offline attenuation structures, which would require cross section details for each structure to review. Consequently, management plans for the offline attenuation structures will need to be supplied unless United Utilities (UU) are adopting the full network.

The drainage detail also refers to outfalls being positioned 300mm above existing bed level as no top water level could be established during a site walkover. The LLFA has no objection in principle to this approach. However, during an extreme flood event or the culvert under Pexhill Road isn't functioning at full bore, surface water has the potential to back up the proposed surface water drainage network. Therefore, the LLFA advises that the developer installs a none return valve to each outfall. Additionally, it would be advisory a Flood Risk Officer attends site prior to outfall construction to determine if a preferred higher outfall invert level can be achieved. Each outfall will also be subject to a Land Drainage Consent application under Land Drainage Act 1991, which must be in place prior to any alterations.

Finally, it is worth noting our CEC websites refer to a spring located within the site boundary. The developer should note a spring would fall under Land Drainage Act 1991 and free passage of water should be retained through the development. Any alterations to this network will also require specific consents under section 23.

In the absence of any in principle objection from the LLFA to the submitted drainage detail and given that the forum for agreeing the final drainage detail would be under the conditions pursuant to the outline consent, the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its flood risk and drainage impact and will comply with policy SE 12 of the CELPS.

Contaminated Land

Contaminated land matters were considered and appropriately conditioned at the outline stage. No further contaminated land matters are raised by the proposed reserved matters.

Peat

The Ground Conditions Assessment which accompanied the outline application and a subsequent discharge of conditions application (ref; 19/4252D) did not identify any large volumes of peat across the site. However, a small amount of peat was found near the pond in the SBI. Plots J45-48 on the southern boundary of the site are affected and will need 100m³ of peat removing from beneath them and then a piled foundation technique will be used. Any peat removed will be reused within the site by spreading it on new gardens or landscaped areas.

Other Matters Raised by Representation

Whilst concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the local highway network and local infrastructure including schools and local GP surgeries, these matters have already been considered and with mitigation, deemed acceptable under the outline approval as has the principle of developing this site.

The design principles required to be established by condition no. 29 of the outline consent were agreed and consented under discharge of planning condition ref; 19/1875D.

BALANCE OF ISSUES

Macclesfield is one of the principal towns and growth areas of the Borough where national and local plan policies support sustainable development. The principle of residential development on the site has been established through the grant of outline planning permission for up to 232 dwellings and allocation of the site in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) under Policy LPS 16. The proposed development seeks to provide a residential development of 216 dwellings. This application seeks approval of the detail in terms of its appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. Details of access were determined at outline stage and approved vehicular and pedestrian access from Chelford Road with a newly dedicated roundabout. Pedestrian access would also be secured from Pexhill Road.

The proposal provides the required amount of affordable housing with a good mix and density of housing. As amended, the proposal achieves an appropriately designed residential development sympathetic to the character of the area and would not materially harm neighbouring residential amenity. Appropriate public open space including a Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) would be provided on site. The layout would provide an appropriate buffer to the south and would secure future connection into safeguarded land as required by the site allocation. The impacts on the adjoining Local Wildlife Site would be acceptable. Updated tree information has been submitted and is acceptable subject to further condition. Tree and hedgerow losses will be offset through replacement planting secured by the landscape scheme.

Mitigation for the impact of the proposal on local infrastructure including education, healthcare provision and outdoor and indoor sports and recreation was secured at outline stage as part of

the s106 legal agreement. With respect to highways, consideration of the outline consent determined that the development will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network subject to a scheme of works at Broken Cross, which is currently being implemented by another developer. Similarly, the impact on local air quality (including cumulative impacts) has been determined to be acceptable also.

A comprehensive scheme of surface water attenuation is proposed ensuring there will be no increase in surface water runoff. The Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection in principle to the drainage strategy, but final details will need to be agreed under the conditions attached to the outline consent.

On this basis, the proposal is for sustainable development which would bring environmental, economic, and social benefits and is therefore considered to be acceptable in the context of the relevant policies of the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, the saved policies of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, the relevant policies of the emerging SADPD and advice contained within the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Accordance with Amended / Approved Plans**
- 2. Accordance with submitted Affordable Housing Scheme**
- 3. Accordance with submitted facing materials**
- 4. Accordance with specification of LEAP**
- 5. Details of levels**
- 6. Landscaping scheme to be submitted including details of hard surfacing materials and details of mitigation planting for loss of hedgerow to be to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 7. Implementation of approved landscaping scheme**
- 8. Removal of permitted development rights classes A-E for selected plots**
- 9. Obscured glazed on selected plots with no further openings to be created**
- 10. Updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment / Method Statement to be submitted and approved**
- 11. Accordance with submitted Tree Protection Plan**
- 12. Submission and implementation of a scheme of measures detailing how the Local Wildlife Site and associated buffer will be safeguarded throughout the construction phase**
- 13. Accordance with submitted Bat Survey including details of mitigation**
- 14. Accordance with submitted Badger survey including details of mitigation**
- 15. Accordance with the proposals for the safeguarding of the SBI and buffer zone detailed in the submitted CEMP**
- 16. Accordance with submitted scheme of pedestrian and cycle signage**
- 17. Submission and implementation of a Bird Hazard Management Plan**
- 18. Bird nesting survey if works carried out during nesting season**
- 19. Spine road to be constructed to the southern boundary of the site**
- 20. Accordance with submitted Noise Report including implementation of details of mitigation**

- 21. Submission and implementation of Piling Method Statement**
- 22. Hours of construction restricted**
- 23. Scheme for the relocation and management of peat within the site**
- 24. Accordance with details of open space / play space subject to further clarification**

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 Head of Planning has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Strategic Planning Board, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

