

# Strategic Planning Board

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 31st January, 2018  
**Time:** 10.30 am  
**Venue:** The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

---

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

**Planning Update** (Pages 3 - 6)

---

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462  
E-Mail: [sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto: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**

**STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD–31<sup>st</sup> January 2018**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

16/6237M

**LOCATION**

Priory Park, Priory Lane, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 4AE

**UPDATE PREPARED**

29/01/2018

**KEY ISSUES**

**Updated Arboricultural Officer Comments received**

Following the publication of the agenda, updated comments from the arboricultural officer have been received based on amended plans.

Further to consultation comments dated 13/4/2017, it has been advised that there is no realistic alternative to the widening of the existing access to the Rugby Club as any access located to the south will have a greater impact in terms of tree loss.

The original Tree Loss Mitigation Plan submitted in August 2017 to offset the loss of protected trees (Tyler Grange Drawing 10276/P08b May 2017 Revision B) showed 4 additional Lime trees to be planted to the left of the widened access in the area of open space. The most recent Mitigation Plan (Tyler Grange Drawing 10276/P08c May 2017 Revision C) now shows two housing plots and the loss of four replacement Lime trees.

The tree officer has advised that additional planting along the Priory Lane frontage is required to offset the loss of the two protected trees. The agent has suggested further planting adjacent to the footpath opposite the proposed bungalows to the south of the site and a further tree in addition to the three replacement Beech trees to the north of the site. Tyler Grange is to be instructed by the agent to provide a Revision d Tree Loss Mitigation Plan for submission.

Should permission be granted for this application and subject to the submission of an Amended Tree Loss Mitigation Plan outlined above conditions shall apply.

At the time of the update report the amended plan has not been received. However this is expected to be provided prior to the committee meeting and members will be updated by way of a verbal update.

### **Updated Ecology Comments received**

Following the publication of the agenda, updated comments have been received from the Council's ecologist.

In order to deliver an enhancement for this species and biodiversity in general as required by the NPPF I advise that the submitted plan be amended to include the provision of a wildlife pond as recommended by the submitted survey report.

#### **Bats**

Evidence of what appears to be a minor bat roost was previously recorded in the club house proposed for demolition. No evidence of bat activity was recorded during further surveys in 2016 or 2017. It is advised therefore that this roost does not appear to be active and considering the minor nature of the roost and the amount of time that has passed since evidence of bats was recorded I advise that the proposed development would not be likely to result in an offence under the habitat regulations.

A number of trees were identified by the submitted habitat survey as having potential to support roosting bats. A number of these trees appear to be retained however an Ash tree (target note 14 on the habitat plan and possible referred to as T34 on the tree survey) appears to be lost as a result of the proposals. A second ash tree with bat roost potential (target note 15) does not appear on the tree survey or tree loss plan therefore the ecologist is uncertain as to the current status of this tree.

It is advised that the further bat survey should be undertaken to include any trees identified as having potential to support roosting bats that would be affected by the proposed development. A report of this survey must be submitted prior to the determination of the application.

The agent is aware of the requirements and an updated plan to including the pond has been provided. The further bat survey is due to be submitted prior to the committee meeting. Members will be updated by way of a verbal update in relation to the outstanding matter.

### **Amended plans received**

Following the publication of the officer's report, work has been carried out by the agent in order to resolve reasons 2 and 3 for refusal.

With regard to reason 2 which relates to the design and layout of the proposed housing development, a number of amendments have been made to the elevations of properties

Reason 2 is worded as follows:

*Whilst amendments have been made to the scheme through the application process, it is considered that the absence of dual aspect properties on all corner plots, the lower level of detailing on certain units producing a noticeable difference in terms of design across the two halves of the site, and the styling of the standard house types has not been amended to reflect local distinctiveness. Therefore the proposals do not fully comply with policy SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy which requires that new development should create a sense of place by ensuring design solutions achieve a sense of place by protecting and enhancing the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements.*

- All corner plots now have dual aspect elevations.
- The rear of the mews properties now have greater elevation detail and height variations to break up the massing.
- The bungalows now have bay windows on the side elevations so do not have blank elevations which gives natural surveillance.

It is considered that the proposed amendments resolve a number of the issues raised in the reason for refusal, and the quality of the development will be higher as a result. Therefore in the case officer's view condition 2 can no longer be sustained as a reason for refusal. However the materials palette and detailing is crucial in this location and for this development, therefore if recommended for approval would need to be controlled through appropriately worded conditions, including an inset window detail condition to provide further relief to elevations and control over windows, doors and rainwater goods to achieve a high quality finish.

Reason 3 is worded as follows:

*The proposed apartments within the scheme would back on to the rear of the properties, resulting in overlooking of these properties from the rear. The back to back measurements are at 14m and 16m which is contrary to saved policy DC38 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan which requires at least 25m for facing habitable room windows. Therefore it is considered that plots 63, 64, 65 and the first floors of the apartment building would result in direct overlooking to habitable room windows and would injure the amenities of future occupiers contrary to policy SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan which states that all new developments should ensure that there is an appropriate level of privacy for new and existing residential properties.*

Following the submission of amended plans, the rear elevations of the apartment building has no habitable room windows at first floor and the kitchen windows are obscurely glazed. There is now no direct overlooking as a result of the development, and further due to the removal of the lounge windows from first floor altogether, the feeling of being overlooked has been removed. The ground floor windows in the apartments serving the kitchen remain non-obscure glazed, as no overlooking could occur due to sufficient boundary treatments proposed at ground floor level. It is considered that the

amendments made address the concerns relating to amenity, and the proposal is no longer contrary to saved policy DC38 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan. Therefore reason 3 is removed.

Reason for refusal 1:

It is proposed that due to the above changes, reason for refusal 1 is amended to reflect this.

Reason 1 – the only reason for refusal at this time will be reworded as follows:

- 1. The proposal represents an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt. The proposed pavilion building would be materially larger than the building it replaces, the proposal will introduce a significant increase in hardstanding resulting in encroachment of built development and the housing proposal is an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt by definition. A case for very special circumstances has been put forward however this does not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and does not outweigh the other harm identified in terms of the under-provision of affordable housing provision as a result of the robust viability exercise, which weighs against the proposals in the planning balance. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policy PG3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan and saved policy GC1 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.**