



Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 12th August, 2015
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

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

Planning Updates (Pages 1 - 8)

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462
E-Mail: sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies, requests for further information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12 August 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

13/2765M

LOCATION

Land Off, Redhouse Lane, Disley, SK12 2EW

UPDATE PREPARED

10 August 2015

CONSULTEES

The Education Officer has reappraised the forecast for the number of pupils to be generated by the development and concludes that the development would generate 7 primary and 6 secondary school places. This would result in a contribution being required of £75 924.03 for primary education and £98 056.14 for secondary education.

REPRESENTATIONS

A recount of the number of objections / number of names on the petition(s) has been undertaken.

Letters have been received from approximately 77 households.

In addition, a petition has been submitted to the LPA which has approximately 267 names on it. The Petition is headed as follows: -

"We object to this development as we do not believe the impact of traffic on the residents of Buxton Road, Redhouse Lane, Meadow Lane, Hollinwood Road, Dryhurst Lane and other surrounding roads has been adequately considered and mitigated for.

We ask that a second access is provided for the development at Lower Greenshall Lane with traffic lights at this junction with the A6 and not at the junction of Redhouse Lane and the A6."

A petition was also set up on the www.change.org website, which has 334 signatures. All of the above representations can be found on the planning pages of the Cheshire East website.

The coordinator of the petition has commented as follows: -

It's clear from your report that this development will be approved and the traffic mitigation discussed afterwards. We know that this means little will be done to resolve the traffic problems. We'll get traffic lights and a short section

of pavement under the railway bridge. Phase 1 is well established and the traffic survey still hasn't been done (surely they must be at 50% occupancy now?). At the same time there are discussions about air quality in Disley and the possibility of removing traffic lights from the Air Quality Management Area in the centre of the village, yet the only solution offered to this development's traffic issues is to install traffic lights at the other end of the AQMA. As residents we know that these lights will be installed without consultation, air quality won't be considered, the pedestrian crossing, parking spaces and bus stops will be removed and none of the other traffic issues raised will be addressed - Redhouse Lane and Hollinwood Road will become even more dangerous.

This is the last chance to get Persimmon to pay for an adequate solution to the problem – a second access. You have dismissed this as you can't force Persimmon to have a second access. Let's be honest with the councillors - the second access won't happen because Persimmon don't want it, not because it's too expensive or impossible to do. A one way system through the development and moving the lights to Lower Greenshall Lane is a cheap option for Persimmon. No extra land needs to be bought for this.

Having talked to residents while collecting signatures the main concerns are:

- The impact of the extra vehicles on surrounding roads. Traffic is already a serious problem on these narrow roads.
- Money is needed for traffic calming on Redhouse Lane and the surrounding roads.
- Safety of pedestrians on Redhouse Lane and the surrounding roads where there are no pavements. Please watch the video that has been submitted of the chaos on Waterside with cars mounting pavements and vehicles reversing blindly. This happens at the top of Redhouse Lane, on Redhouse Lane by the junction with Meadow Lane, Redhouse Lane by the white cottages and the canal bridge, Dryhurst Lane and on Hollinworth Road. There are also stretches where people drive dangerously round bends.
- Safety of children walking to the playground via Redhouse Lane.
- Queues on Redhouse Lane (which will happen with or without traffic lights).
- Rat runs on Hollinworth Road and Dryhurst Road, this will happen with or without lights.
- The assumption to install traffic lights without a study to see if they are necessary or the best solution. The permission for phase 1 and the original outline permission required a traffic study first. Is Persimmon trying to get away with not doing this?
- Traffic lights at Redhouse Lane will not solve the problems and cause further problems on Buxton Road with queuing traffic resulting in increasing noise, vibration and pollution.
- The difficulty of exiting Meadow Lane. It is difficult to get out now as the visibility is poor. Queues of traffic will make it impossible. This is also a problem for residents living on Buxton Road near to the junction with Redhouse Lane. The houses opposite Redhouse Lane have

driveways – how will they get out if there are traffic lights? The ones on the same side as Redhouse Lane have driveways at the back of their houses and exit onto Redhouse Lane at the very top. It will be impossible for them to get out into queuing traffic.

- The proposal is to remove some parking spaces from Buxton Road increasing the problem of limited parking.
- The removal of the pedestrian crossing opposite Arnold Rhodes playground. This is ideally placed for children coming from the Chantry Road estate. Children and adults will not walk the extra distance to the lights at Redhouse Lane.
- The removal of bus stops outside the White Lion pub and Methodist Church. The proposal is to relocate these but there is no indication of where they will be. These are important bus stops. The one by the Methodist Church is used by children getting the school bus to Poynton. It is the only one with a shelter (unless you walk into the village centre) and is on a wide stretch of pavement with good visibility of approaching buses. The next nearest stop at Greenhill Road is on a bend and a narrow strip of paving. It is too dangerous for groups of children to wait.
- The impact of traffic lights on air quality. Many of these residents are in the Air Quality Management Area or walk their children to school through the AQMA. The data used in the air quality management report didn't use representative data. The monitoring points and receptors used were not the ones nearest to the junction. SEMMS predicted traffic data was not used. This means the report is useless.
- There was concern that an up to date traffic report was not done. The original was flawed (over predicted the traffic from the drum factory and assumed all traffic would travel up Redhouse Lane) and done 5 years ago.
- The difficulty in accessing the Methodist Church car park if there are traffic lights. Hold ups already happen while cars are waiting to turn right into the church as there are cars parked on the opposite side of the road stopping vehicles from overtaking on the inside (no-one wants to see more parking spaces lost from Buxton Road). It will be dangerous to turn right out of the car park in queuing traffic.
- Fears this will remove more parking spaces from Redhouse Lane and Buxton Road. People are starting to convert gardens to driveways where they can. This is not sustainable.
- The difficulty parking on Buxton Road in queuing traffic. Impatient drivers rushing to the lights won't wait while people reverse park.
- There has never been a study into opening up a second access to Lower Greenshall Lane. This seems the obvious solution to these concerns.

Finally, an email was received from Smiths of Marple, who operate a bus to Poynton High School. The writer comments that the proposal includes the removal the present bus stop at the junction of Redhouse Lane and the A6. This stop is used by a large number of young people travelling to school daily, and the writer feels it would be dangerous, if no suitable new bus stop was

provided, this stop is used by 4 to 5 busses, more or less together and quite a large area of road space would be required.

CONCLUSION

The views of the residents are noted and it is considered that the relevant highways related issues were covered in the main agenda report.

The contributions required by the Education Officer are necessary, fair and reasonable and comply with the CIL Regulations.

The recommendation remains as per the main agenda report as approval subject to a S106 Agreement.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12 August 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

15/2180M

LOCATION

29, GLEBELANDS ROAD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 9DZ

UPDATE PREPARED

10 August 2015

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Further to the Committee Report written in support of this application, amended plans have been submitted for Member consideration.

As indicated on the revised plans, the following alterations have been made:

- Formation of three car park spaces per unit;
- Increase in separation distance between the two proposed dwellings from 4.5 meters to 7 meters;
- Reduction in first floor accommodation to the rear elevations; and
- Amendment to Street View B to increase distance between proposed dwelling and neighbouring property of No.31 to correspond with Proposed Block Plan.

The amendments are considered to be an improvement to the original scheme through a reduction in the massing of development as viewed from public vantage points. As a result the proposed dwellings sit more comfortably within the plots and with improved legibility to correspond with the character of the surrounding built form.

The reduction to the first floor accommodation increases the separation distances between dwellings, however it is important to note that at this stage matters of the internal floorplans are not for consideration, merely the principle of constructing two, two storey dwellings on the application site.

CONCLUSION

The alterations assist in providing a more appropriately formed development, which meet the guidance's contained within BE1, H1, H4, H5, DC1, DC3, DC38 and DC41 of the Local Plan, and the application is recommended for approval.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE – 12th August 2015

APPLICATION NOs: 15/1126C

PROPOSAL: Removal of the existing manege, erection of one Detached Dwelling and Timber Carport, New Access and Landscaping

ADDRESS: Land at Hiverley Cottage, CHELFORD ROAD, TWEMLOW

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs C Hulley

Officer Comments

Affordable Housing

Since publication of the agenda, officers have secured amended plans to address the requirement to provide 3 affordable units on this site. To ensure that the 3 affordable units address the required need in Twemlow (which comprises of 1x 1 bed, 1x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed units), Plots 1, 2 and 4 have been amended in terms of their size to provide this size of accommodation. This would comprise a pair of semi-detached two-storey units on plots 1 and 2 and detached bungalow on Plot 4. These units would be similar in character and appearance to the other units on the development and would be acceptable in terms of design. The units would have no greater impact on the amenity afforded to the nearest neighbour than the scheme already submitted. The proposals are therefore found to be acceptable in terms of affordable housing as discussed in the main agenda reports pack.

Other Comments

Following Members' site visit, there has been a query regarding who the future management responsibilities of the existing pond towards the far south-eastern corner of the site will fall with. Confirmation has been provided by the agent that the responsibility would be split between plots 3, 5 and 6 backing onto the pond. Any future management and maintenance would be the responsibility of the landowners. It is recommended that details of such are secured under the landscaping scheme which is recommended by condition no. 6.

RECOMMENDATION - No change to recommendation, except condition no. 6 shall include details of a management scheme for the future maintenance of the on-site pond:

6. Landscape scheme and management scheme for on-site pond to be submitted

This page is intentionally left blank