

Public Document Pack



To: All Members of the Northern Planning Committee

Democratic Services
Westfields, Middlewich Road
Sandbach, Cheshire
CW11 1HZ

email: cherry.foreman@cheshireeast.gov.uk

DATE: 4 May 2018

Dear Councillor

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 9TH MAY, 2018

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at next Wednesday, 9th May, 2018 meeting of the Northern Planning Committee, the following update report.

Planning Update (Pages 3 - 6)

For application 17/3208M

Yours sincerely

Sarah Baxter

Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 May 2018**UPDATE TO AGENDA****APPLICATION NO.**

17/3208M

LOCATION

Lidl Store and Energie Fitness Club, Summerfield Village Centre, Dean Row Road, Wilmslow

UPDATE PREPARED

4 May 2018

REPRESENTATIONS

13 further letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Store not required
- Impact on neighbouring properties
- Loss of leisure facilities
- No public consultation from Lidl
- Increased congestion from this and additional houses in the area
- Applications to have Sunday/Bank Holiday deliveries have previously been rejected
- Lidl now advertising for staff to work through the night, 7 days a week
- To protect residents and to ensure the store was commensurate the store size was restricted to 13k
- CE own in house Urban Design team are concerned about the impact this store will have on residents
- 'Alternative facilities' quoted by Lidl are full and cannot accommodate the demand
- Lidl Leisure Needs Analysis is still flawed and contravenes Cheshire East's own policies which require facilities to be within 1 mile of the centre of the area
- Other facilities lack parking or public transport options
- Staff displaced from the removal of the recreation and leisure facilities have all gone into existing vacancies and not newly created posts
- Will divert trade from Wilmslow and Handforth centres, which are already undertrading
- No an appropriate site for a destination store
- Site is in neither a key service centre, nor a local centre nor a town centre it's a neighbourhood parade of local shops and was never intended to be a retail park
- Additional parking will bring additional traffic

- Building out of keeping with the area
- Pre-application comments given by case officer are his own view and arguably unprofessional
- Resembles a low level airport terminal building or factory
- Huge LIDL signage is reminiscent of some North American hoardings
- Decision to demolish existing store and build a new one is driven by cost consideration only
- Is the proposed development of appropriate scale and nature i.e. is its size required to serve the local community or to develop a destination store in order to increase trade, and traffic, from a much wider area?
- Reference to Handforth Dean development is a red herring
- Any development should be appropriate in scale. The planned development fails this test
- Will be one of the largest stores in Lidl's portfolio
- Will attract more shoppers from the whole of the South Manchester area and hence pull in a lot more traffic
- Sequential test ignores the imminent availability of both Halliwell Jones sites (BMW and Mini dealerships)
- Fails to fulfil the 'appropriate' aspect of the local plan with regards to serving the needs of the local community
- Deficient in parking provision
- If planning is approved, then they would have an even stronger case in a few years time to demolish the whole centre and put a vast hypermarket in there
- Over trading in Macclesfield was key to Barracks Mill appeal decision
- Contrary to town centre first policies
- No names and addresses on letters of support
- How can Lidl still say that this is something about "meeting local needs" when so few local people are in favour?
- Modified design is unsympathetic to both the commercial area and the shopping arcade
- store type is 'generic' and makes no attempt to reinforce local distinctiveness
- Other Lidl stores in Kent and Northern Ireland have two storeys
- Signage adds insult to injury
- remaining parade of shops will look visually "truncated" and asymmetrical
- Soft landscaping reduced to accommodate more parking
- Want reassurance that Highways has factored-in their safety by the provision of adequate walkways of 2 metres width
- no consultation with the police re the safety and security of residential area to rear
- The proposed store makes the parking situation worse
- Impact on other neighbouring stores
- The former Care Home site in Handforth remains available

2 further letters of support have also been received.

KEY ISSUES

The majority of the above comments have been addressed within previous reports. In terms of those comments not addressed in previous reports:

The site of the former care home in Handforth is assumed to be Cypress House at the southern edge of Handforth. This site is 0.3 hectares, which is a similar size to the existing Lidle store and car park site. As such this site would not be able to accommodate the proposed development even allowing for a degree of flexibility and is therefore not a sequentially preferable alternative. The existing Halliwell Jones sites remain in active use. Whilst there is an application for Halliwell Jones to build a new showroom at Coppice Way in Handforth, this has not been determined to date and as such there is no timescale or plans for when these sites would become available. As such they are not available and are not sequentially preferable sites.

Applications to extend delivery hours on the existing store have previously been refused. However the current proposal has different delivery arrangements which are acceptable subject to the mitigation details within the noise impact assessment and a restriction on night time deliveries. Both of which are covered by conditions listed in the original report.

The design officer did raise some issues with the proposal which were considered in the recommendation from officers. These issues were with regard to the inactive frontage facing Colshaw Drive; connectivity of the proposed location to the existing retail offer and adjacent residential; provision of adequate screening/ landscaping buffer to service yard and delivery and service location. The inactive frontage to Colshaw Drive is consistent with the existing gym building. The proposed fencing and existing landscaping mitigate for any impacts of this, as existing. This will also help to screen views of the proposed delivery bay from outside of the site. Revised plans have provided a continuation of existing footway past the neighbouring parade towards the Lidl entrance with clearly defined pedestrian routes across the car park to provide linkages between the proposal and the other shops. There will be some landscaping to the north east of the site, and with the extension of the brick piers with timber infill panels to the east boundary, the existing service yard will not be a prominent feature.

CONCLUSION

As in the original report a recommendation of approval is made.

This page is intentionally left blank