

Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday 29th April 2015

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Meeting Room, Macclesfield Library, Jordangate, Macclesfield

The information on the following pages was received following publication of the committee agenda.

Agenda Item 5 - 14/5471M: County Offices, Chapel Lane, Wilmslow (Pages 1 - 4)

Agenda Item 8 - 15/0283M: Lode Hill, Altrincham Road, Styal (Pages 5 - 6)

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 29 April 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

14/5471M

LOCATION

County Offices, Chapel Lane, Wilmslow

UPDATE PREPARED

27 April 2015

KEY ISSUES

Revised plans have now been received, as outlined in the original report, which reduce the height of the entire building to four storeys. The effect of this reduction is to reduce the number of apartments to 57, and reduce the extent of communal facilities. The communal facilities now include a dining area, swimming pool, sauna, gym, and studio.

Design / character

The proposed four-storey building now has a height of 16.3 metres, compared to the 19.7 metres as originally submitted. By way of comparison, the terraced properties on the opposite side of Bedells Lane have a height of 9 metres, and the four-storey apartment building on Chapel Lane has a height of approximately 14 metres.

The building will of course be largely surrounded by substantial trees, which have heights up to 16 metres. Views of the building will therefore be filtered by these trees, which will serve to reduce the impact the development. The proposal is now considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the area.

Trees / landscape

The method statement relating to the protection of trees during construction has now been submitted and the arboricultural officer advises that the details do demonstrate that the trees will be appropriately protected during the construction process. A condition is recommended requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the arboricultural information.

Ecology

The required additional bat surveys are scheduled for three separate dates in May. In the event that Members are satisfied with the rest of the proposal, and are minded to approve, it is recommended that the application is delegated back to the Planning & Enforcement Manager to allow the surveys to be carried

out. A full assessment against the Habitats Regulations will also take place at that time.

Highways

Parking

57 apartments are now proposed, and 59 parking spaces are being provided to serve the development.

The parking standards for the proposed use set out within the emerging local plan are:

Residents – 0.5 per unit and 1 per 3 units (for visitors)

Staff – 1 per resident staff and 1 per 2 non-resident staff

Facilities (open to non residents) 1 per 4sqm of floorspace used for this purpose

Residents and visitors would require 50 spaces, which leaves 9 spaces for staff, none of which would be resident staff. This level would accommodate up to 18 non resident staff, whereas it is anticipated that the number of staff would be 12. The communal facilities will not be open to non residents. This could be controlled by condition to ensure adequate parking is provided to serve the development. Similarly the provision of car parking should be conditioned to be provided prior to occupation.

The application site currently provides free public parking, which will be lost as a result of the development. The neighbouring Health Centre has their own pay and display parking monitored by their own enforcement company. The parking within the application site originally served the Council offices. When the offices closed, for a short period (between 2011 and 2014) the parking then changed to a Cheshire East pay and display. However, the pay and display order has now been revoked and the site provides free car parking. These spaces are usually full, but presumably that this is due to the fact that they are free of charge. The existing parking area could at any time be fenced off and restricted, without any form of development taking place. For this reason, little weight can be given to the loss of the existing parking spaces as an impact of the development.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure is also satisfied with the proposed level of parking.

Access

Due to the one way system in operation in the Health Centre's car park, which requires access through the application site, it would in theory be possible for Health Centre visitors to utilise the applicant's parking and access.

The applicants have confirmed that:

- Parking within the site would be managed via an enforcement regime, which would discourage unauthorised ad-hoc parking;
- Free movement of traffic onto Alderley Road would not be permitted from Wilmslow Health Centre/ Chapel Lane. It is envisaged that control would be maintained via a combination of fixed bollards and a barrier control system.

It is recommended that condition 9 within the original report is amended to require details of the above measures to be submitted and approved.

Use Class

The use of the building will be subject to the submission and approval of an operational plan. Within the original report, it was recommended that this should be part of the s106 agreement; however, there is no reason why it cannot be dealt with by condition. An additional condition is therefore recommended.

Open Space

The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on planning obligations does include a requirement for the provision of POS for sheltered housing schemes of 20sqm per unit, which is half of the requirement for a standard housing development. If standard housing developments cannot provide open space, then the requirement is a financial contribution of £1,500 per bed space towards off site provision. Therefore, it follows that the requirement for open space contributions would be £750 per bed space in apartments on a sheltered scheme.

It is acknowledged that this is not a sheltered housing scheme, however the development is essentially residential in nature, and will inevitably have infrastructure requirements similar to a typical sheltered housing scheme. The proposal includes 109 bedrooms, and no open space can be provided on site. Therefore, a financial contribution of £81,750 will be required.

These funds would be used to fund improvements to existing open space infrastructure at Gravel Lane, Lindow Common, Carnival Fields, The Carrs and allotments within Wilmslow.

Heads of Terms

A s106 legal agreement will therefore be required to include the following heads of terms:

- £81,750 for off-site provision of public open space for improvements, additions and enhancement of existing public open space facilities at Gravel Lane, Lindow Common, Carnival Fields, The Carrs and allotments within Wilmslow.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations

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

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

The commuted sum in lieu of public open space is necessary, fair and reasonable, as the proposed development will provide 57 extra care units of

accommodation. The occupiers of which will use local facilities as there is no open space on site, as such, there is a need to upgrade / enhance existing facilities. The contribution is in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

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

CONCLUSION

As in the original report, it is recommended that the application is delegated to Planning and Enforcement Manager to approve subject to the receipt of the outstanding bat surveys and mitigation as required, the conditions listed in the original report, the additional conditions below, and the Heads of Terms above.

Additional conditions

- Communal facilities not to be open to non residents
- Provision of car parking prior to occupation
- Submission of operational plan
- Development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural details

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 29 APRIL 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 15/0283M

LOCATION Lode Hill, Altrincham Road, Styal

UPDATE PREPARED 27 April 2015

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways – objection raised to the proposal due to concerns about the amount of parking proposed.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

As stated above, a consultation response has now been received from the highways department who have provided the following comments:

Traffic Assessment and Infrastructure

There is no Transport Statement submitted with the application although in consideration of the traffic impact of the development the application is acceptable. The site already has a considerable level of airport parking that will have traffic movements associated with it which will be removed in this planning application, the proposed new hotel in daily general operation would not add sufficient additional traffic movements to the local highway network to warrant a traffic impact reason for refusal.

The existing access point will be retained to the site and the gates are to be positioned further back into the access to provide improved storage space for vehicles to wait off the highway. The internal layout of the site would be private and the access splits into two separate accesses to provide access to the car parks. The servicing will take place to the rear of the building.

Car Parking

In total there are 37 car parking spaces proposed for the Hotel, the applicant has stated that the number of car parking spaces has been kept to a minimum given the sustainable location of the site. Given the rural location of the site, it is my view that trips to and from the site will be car dominated and very few guests, if any, will arrive by non car modes. The footway network is limited there is a footway on one side of Altrincham Road only and there is no footway at all close to the site. Additionally, there are no footways provided internally within the site. In regards to car parking numbers, 37 spaces for 35 bedrooms may have been considered acceptable although account needs to be taken of the ancillary uses that the hotel will have such as restaurant/bar,

health spa, offices and potentially a wedding venue. There are no details provided of the number of staff that will be employed at the site and clearly provision for staff parking within the site is an important consideration.

Summary and Conclusion

Given the existing use of the site, the proposed change to a hotel of this scale is an acceptable use in highway terms as it does have a material traffic impact on the local highway network. Whilst, the applicant is of the view that this is a readily accessible site to non car modes, it is likely that the vast majority of trips will be car based given the rural location of the site and that staff will travel to the site by car. This is a large site and further car parking can be provided within the site if necessary but given the current plan submitted I would have to raise objections on the grounds of lack of car parking.

Given the concerns raised with regard to parking numbers, it is proposed that an additional reason for refusal be attached to the original recommendation relating to inadequate parking provision.

It is also worth noting that whilst there is space within the site to provide additional parking as required by highways, this would have a knock on impact on the Green Belt and on the visual amenity of the area. Any need to provide additional parking would therefore add further weight to the original Green Belt objection to the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

The original recommendation of **REFUSAL** remains with an additional highways reason for refusal due to inadequate parking facilities being provided for the proposed hotel and associated facilities.