

# Strategic Planning Board

## Updates

---

**Date:** Tuesday, 4th September, 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 committee agenda.

4. **17/4034M Land South of Chelford Road, Macclesfield: Outline Planning Permission (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of up to 232 dwellings for Redrow Homes and Jones Homes North West (Pages 3 - 6)**
5. **17/4277M Land Between Chelford Road and Whirley Road, Chelford Road, Henbury: Outline Application for the erection of up to 135 dwellings with access from Chelford Road and Whirley Road and associated open space for Frederic Robinson Ltd (Pages 7 - 10)**
6. **18/0294M Land North of Chelford Road, Macclesfield: Outline Planning Application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of up to 31 dwellings for Mr Tom Loomes, Jones Homes (North West) Ltd (Pages 11 - 14)**

---

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

---

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**APPLICATION NO:** 17/4034M

**LOCATION:** LAND SOUTH OF, CHELFORD ROAD, MACCLESFIELD

**PROPOSAL:** Outline Planning Permission (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of up to 232 dwellings.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### **Archaeology**

Comments have now been received from Cheshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service who have considered the submitted Archaeological Assessment. They have raised no objections to the application subject to the following condition;

*No development shall take place until a scheme for the implementation of a programme of archaeological works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.*

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Macclesfield Town Council**

Further comments have been received from Macclesfield Town Council that are slightly different wording in respect of Air Quality and the updated comments are as follows;

*Air Quality – this proposal must be considered in parallel to 17/4277M and 18/0294, on land facing, on the opposite side of Chelford Road. The proposals total 398 dwellings (potentially an additional 600 to 800 cars registered to that area), impacting on road traffic and associated air pollution. Provision must be made to ensure all measures are in place to reduce air pollution / improve air quality. Significant on site provision for electric vehicle charge points must be mandated. Safe cycling and walking routes for ingress and egress must be prioritised to make sustainable transport a wholly accessible and safe option.*

### **Henbury Parish Council (HPC):**

Henbury Parish Council have submitted a further representation objecting to this application on the following grounds:

Air Quality:

- Removal of monitoring tube that didn't fit the model (CE257) which had the highest reading
- Tube CE91 should be reinstated as there are at least 11 properties that are likely to be 20% above the 40ug/m<sup>3</sup> limit

- No consideration of the impact of signal queues outside of peak hour and the corresponding impact on pollution
- The three Broken Cross/Henbury developments, when combined with increased development levels around Macclesfield, will endanger the health of residents

### Transport:

- No convincing traffic modelling and survey work was performed and at suboptimal times
- Pedestrian access and usage surveys were undertaken when school children were off during exam time
- Survey results ignored where they show higher flow rates on the A537
- Developers are only required to mitigate their development, but CEC should be aware of the overall context surrounding the development and impact on traffic/air quality
- Tesco Express Store at Broken Cross not taken into account and King's School and Bolin Meadow developments not factored in

### Environment:

- Putting a road through a Local Wildlife site (17/4034M) is completely against planning policy. No mention made of this in the submission or by Case Officer. NPPF states that LWSs must be safeguarded.

### Peat:

- Extraction of peat is contrary to Policy SE 10 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy

### Flood Risk / Hydrology:

- No consideration given to the impact on Cock Wood LWS which will be taking all the run-off and should be protected
- Effectiveness of attenuation takes questioned

### Education:

- Contributions from the developers have been agreed but no serious consideration made of the actual school availability in the local area of which there is a lack of.

Comments are also made concerning the need for these sites in the context of the 5 year supply and that the current submissions are not of a required standard to allow SPB to make a decision.

## **OFFICER COMMENT**

### Air Quality

The Council's Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) queried the removal of a monitoring tube (CE257) from the air quality assessment. The applicant provided an updated set of data with tube CE257 included in the verification. The updated data also showed negligible impacts throughout the conclusions on the EPU remained unchanged.

The situation regarding tubes in the Broken Cross area is under review, as are all of the tube sites across the borough on a periodic basis to see whether more tubes are needed, or to remove ones that aren't necessary anymore. It's worth noting that the replacement tube CE257, is actually closer to the roadside than CE91 was so it was probably determined at the time that it would be fully representative of the previous location. The higher tube result from CE91 has been queried against the modelled data. The dispersion modelling has been unable to replicate the results shown by CE91 for a variety of reasons. If the assessment was done using 2016's data only, and therefore, including CE91, this would have meant that the dispersion model would have been based on one tube only as the others weren't in use until the start of 2017. Modelling using only one tube leads to more inaccurate results so the preference will always be to use as many tubes as available, hence using 2017's data.

The assessment uses an educated approximation of the non peak hour queue length which also takes into account the signalisation of the junction at Broken Cross. The developments themselves are not considered to have a detrimental impact on air quality subject to the proposed mitigation measures.

### Peat

Policy SE 10 of the CELPS relates to proposals for minerals development. Its aims are to ensure there is a sustainable provision of minerals within the Borough. Whilst bullet 9 of Policy SE 10 states that the Council will "not support proposals for peat extraction from new or extended sites", this is in reference to sites for the working and mining of minerals. This is a scheme for residential development and therefore Policy SE 10 is not applicable to this application.

The submitted Geo-Environmental Assessment which accompanies the application confirms that peat is present on the site. It also confirms that some areas of peat will need to be excavated and backfilled with material to enable appropriate ground works to be undertaken and suitable foundations to be used. In the interests of environmental sustainability, the excavated material could be placed elsewhere within the site. This detail could be secured at reserved matters stage when the precise position of buildings and the internal roads are known.

### Flood Risk

The proposed flood and drainage attenuation measures and the impacts of the development on ecology have already been assessed and deemed to be

acceptable. This is an issue that will be addressed through the conditions and reserved matters application.

### Education

The impact of the proposed development on school places has been assessed in the context of the capacity of the local schools. Accordingly, the financial contributions sought towards education would be used to facilitate the inclusion of those pupils generated by the proposals within the schools in the area.

The site is included within the five year supply and makes a valuable contribution to maintaining a five year supply.

Any further transport comments will be provided verbally to members.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

No change to the overall recommendation set out in the Committee Report with the exception of the above archaeological condition replacing condition 29 on page 29 of the agenda.

**APPLICATION NO: 17/4277M**

**LOCATION: Land Between Chelford Road And Whirley Road,  
CHELFORD ROAD, HENBURY**

**PROPOSAL: Outline application for the erection of up to 135 dwellings with access from Chelford Road and Whirley Road and associated open space**

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Henbury Parish Council (HPC):**

Henbury Parish Council have submitted a further representation objecting to this application on the following grounds:

#### **Air Quality:**

- Removal of monitoring tube that didn't fit the model (CE257) which had the highest reading
- Tube CE91 should be reinstated as there are at least 11 properties that are likely to be 20% above the 40ug/m3 limit
- No consideration of the impact of signal queues outside of peak hour and the corresponding impact on pollution
- The three Broken Cross/Henbury developments, when combined with increased development levels around Macclesfield, will endanger the health of residents

#### **Transport:**

- No convincing traffic modelling and survey work was performed and at suboptimal times
- Pedestrian access and usage surveys were undertaken when school children were off during exam time
- Survey results ignored where they show higher flow rates on the A537
- Developers are only required to mitigate their development, but CEC should be aware of the overall context surrounding the development and impact on traffic/air quality
- Tesco Express Store at Brokem Cross not taken into account and King's School and Bolin Meadow developments not factored in
- Carriageway width not sufficient for a right turn ghost island for access to 17/4277M

#### **Peat:**

- Extraction of peat is contrary to Policy SE 10 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy

#### **Flood Risk / Hydrology:**

- No consideration given to the impact on Cock Wood LWS which will be taking all the run-off and should be protected
- Effectiveness of attenuation takes questioned

Education:

- Contributions from the developers have been agreed but no serious consideration made of the actual school availability in the local area of which there is a lack of.

### **Save Macclesfield Green Belt (SMGB):**

Save Macclesfield Green Belt have commented that the site contains a number of peat and silt deposits which would need to be removed to facilitate the proposals. On this basis, the SMGB consider that the application is contrary to Policy SE 10 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS), which states that the 'Council will not support proposals for peat extraction from new or extended sites'.

### **OFFICER COMMENT**

#### **Air Quality**

The Council's Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) queried the removal of a monitoring tube (CE257) from the air quality assessment. The applicant provided an updated set of data with tube CE257 included in the verification. The updated data also showed negligible impacts throughout the conclusions on the EPU remained unchanged.

The situation regarding tubes in the Broken Cross area is under review, as are all of the tube sites across the borough on a periodic basis to see whether more tubes are needed, or to remove ones that aren't necessary anymore. It's worth noting that the replacement tube CE257, is actually closer to the roadside than CE91 was so it was probably determined at the time that it would be fully representative of the previous location. The higher tube result from CE91 has been queried against the modelled data. The dispersion modelling has been unable to replicate the results shown by CE91 for a variety of reasons. If the assessment was done using 2016's data only, and therefore, including CE91, this would have meant that the dispersion model would have been based on one tube only as the others weren't in use until the start of 2017. Modelling using only one tube leads to more inaccurate results so the preference will always be to use as many tubes as available, hence using 2017's data.

The assessment uses an educated approximation of the non peak hour queue length which also takes into account the signalisation of the junction at Broken Cross. The developments themselves are not considered to have a detrimental impact on air quality subject to the proposed mitigation measures.

### **Peat**

Policy SE 10 of the CELPS relates to proposals for minerals development. Its aims are to ensure there is a sustainable provision of minerals within the Borough. Whilst bullet 9 of Policy SE 10 states that the Council will “not support proposals for peat extraction from new or extended sites”, this is in reference to sites for the working and mining of minerals. This is a scheme for residential development and therefore Policy SE 10 is not applicable to this application.

The submitted Geo-Environmental Assessment which accompanies the application confirms that peat is present on the site. It also confirms that some areas of peat will need to be excavated and backfilled with material to enable appropriate ground works to be undertaken and suitable foundations to be used. In the interests of environmental sustainability, the excavated material could be placed elsewhere within the site. This detail could be secured at reserved matters stage when the precise position of buildings and the internal roads are known.

### **Flood Risk**

The proposed flood and drainage attenuation measures and the impacts of the development on ecology have already been assessed and deemed to be acceptable. These matters are covered on pages 53 and 56 of the Agenda Reports Pack.

### **Education**

The impact of the proposed development on school places has been assessed in the context of the capacity of the local schools. Accordingly, the financial contributions sought towards education would be used to facilitate the inclusion of those pupils generated by the proposals within the schools in the area.

Any further transport comments will be provided verbally to members.

### **PROCEDURAL MATTERS:**

At Page 41 of the Agenda Reports Pack at the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, the total number of units of this application and that being considered under planning ref; 18/0294M should read ‘166’ not ‘165’.

At Page 59 of the Agenda Reports Pack, condition 6 and 7 should be read as a single condition and should read as follows.

“6. Implement Broken Cross highway improvements prior to first occupation of any dwelling on the site”

Condition 21 should be removed as it repeats the requirement of condition 18.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approve as per the recommendation on page 58 of the Agenda Reports Pack subject to an amendment to condition nos 6 / 7 and the removal of condition no. 21.

**APPLICATION NO: 18/0294M**

**LOCATION: Land North Of, CHELFORD ROAD, MACCLESFIELD**

**PROPOSAL: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of up to 31 dwellings**

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Henbury Parish Council (HPC):**

Henbury Parish Council have submitted a further representation objecting to this application on the following grounds:

#### Air Quality:

- Removal of monitoring tube that didn't fit the model (CE257) which had the highest reading
- Tube CE91 should be reinstated as there are at least 11 properties that are likely to be 20% above the 40ug/m<sup>3</sup> limit
- No consideration of the impact of signal queues outside of peak hour and the corresponding impact on pollution
- The three Broken Cross/Henbury developments, when combined with increased development levels around Macclesfield, will endanger the health of residents

#### Transport:

- No convincing traffic modelling and survey work was performed and at suboptimal times
- Pedestrian access and usage surveys were undertaken when school children were off during exam time
- Survey results ignored where they show higher flow rates on the A537
- Developers are only required to mitigate their development, but CEC should be aware of the overall context surrounding the development and impact on traffic/air quality
- Tesco Express Store at Broken Cross not taken into account and King's School and Bolin Meadow developments not factored in
- Carriageway width not sufficient for a right turn ghost island for access to 17/4277M

#### Peat:

- Extraction of peat is contrary to Policy SE 10 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy

#### Flood Risk / Hydrology:

- No consideration given to the impact on Cock Wood LWS which will be taking all the run-off and should be protected
- Effectiveness of attenuation takes questioned

Education:

- Contributions from the developers have been agreed but no serious consideration made of the actual school availability in the local area of which there is a lack of.

### **Save Macclesfield Green Belt (SMGB):**

Save Macclesfield Green Belt have commented that the site contains a number of peat and silt deposits which would need to be removed to facilitate the proposals. On this basis, the SMGB consider that the application is contrary to Policy SE 10 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS), which states that the 'Council will not support proposals for peat extraction from new or extended sites'.

### **OFFICER COMMENT**

#### **Air Quality**

The Council's Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) queried the removal of a monitoring tube (CE257) from the air quality assessment. The applicant provided an updated set of data with tube CE257 included in the verification. The updated data also showed negligible impacts throughout the conclusions on the EPU remained unchanged.

The situation regarding tubes in the Broken Cross area is under review, as are all of the tube sites across the borough on a periodic basis to see whether more tubes are needed, or to remove ones that aren't necessary anymore. It's worth noting that the replacement tube CE257, is actually closer to the roadside than CE91 was so it was probably determined at the time that it would be fully representative of the previous location. The higher tube result from CE91 has been queried against the modelled data. The dispersion modelling has been unable to replicate the results shown by CE91 for a variety of reasons. If the assessment was done using 2016's data only, and therefore, including CE91, this would have meant that the dispersion model would have been based on one tube only as the others weren't in use until the start of 2017. Modelling using only one tube leads to more inaccurate results so the preference will always be to use as many tubes as available, hence using 2017's data.

The assessment uses an educated approximation of the non peak hour queue length which also takes into account the signalisation of the junction at Broken Cross. The developments themselves are not considered to have a detrimental impact on air quality subject to the proposed mitigation measures.

## **Peat**

Policy SE 10 of the CELPS relates to proposals for minerals development. Its aims are to ensure there is a sustainable provision of minerals within the Borough. Whilst bullet 9 of Policy SE 10 states that the Council will “not support proposals for peat extraction from new or extended sites”, this is in reference to sites for the working and mining of minerals. This is a scheme for residential development and therefore Policy SE 10 is not applicable to this application.

The submitted Geo-Environmental Assessment which accompanies the application confirms that peat is present on the site. It also confirms that some areas of peat will need to be excavated and backfilled with material to enable appropriate ground works to be undertaken and suitable foundations to be used. In the interests of environmental sustainability, the excavated material could be placed elsewhere within the site. This detail could be secured at reserved matters stage when the precise position of buildings and the internal roads are known.

## **Flood Risk**

The proposed flood and drainage attenuation measures and the impacts of the development on ecology have already been assessed and deemed to be acceptable. These matters are covered on pages 80 and 82 of the Agenda Reports Pack.

## **Education**

The impact of the proposed development on school places has been assessed in the context of the capacity of the local schools. Accordingly, the financial contributions sought towards education would be used to facilitate the inclusion of those pupils generated by the proposals within the schools in the area.

Any further transport comments will be provided verbally to members.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Approve as per the recommendation on page 84 of the Agenda Reports Pack.

**This page is intentionally left blank**