

# Southern Planning Committee

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday 31st August 2022  
**Time:** 10.00 am  
**Venue:** Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe  
CW1 2BJ

---

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

5. **22/1302N - FIELD TO THE EAST OF AUDLEM ROAD, AUDLEM:**  
The development of 28 no. residential units, including 9 no. affordable dwellings, with associated infrastructure and landscaping (Pages 3 - 6)

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 31<sup>ST</sup> AUGUST 2022**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

22/1302N

**LOCATION**

FIELD TO THE EAST OF AUDLEM ROAD, AUDLEM

**UPDATE PREPARED**

**Revised plans**

A revised site plan has been received which has seen the number of houses on site increased from x24 dwelling, including 7 no. affordable units to x28 dwellings including 9 no. affordable units.

This has not resulted in any major changes to the layout with plots predominantly remaining in the same place but some detached properties swapped out for semi-detached properties to accommodate the increase in overall numbers.

No revised elevations have been provided however the revised site plan highlights that house type 7, which was a 2 ½ storey with dormers in the roof space, is no longer being proposed. Therefore all units are maximum 2 storey properties.

**Officer comments**

The officer report was based on the revised plans. The only change to the comment is at the bottom of page 23 where the report advised “It is also questioned whether 2.5 storey is appropriate on such a small scheme at the edge of the countryside, including one plot on the main frontage”.

It is accepted that all properties are now maximum 2 storeys high. However, this does not change the fundamental concerns with the layout/design as noted in the committee report.

**Additional representations based on the revised plans**

An additional x4 representations have been received on the revised plans these reiterate highway safety concerns, the strategic non-compliance, impact on limited services/infrastructure and question why the number of properties has increased.

Officer comment

The latest representations are noted. These replicate what has already been covered in the main committee report.

**Additional comments from Audlem Parish Council (APC) based on the revised plans**

Despite the fact there is an increase in the number of properties proposed, APC Councillors are happy with the significant changes that have been made to the original and consider they now meet the requirements of the Audlem Neighbourhood Plan as follows:

- Policy H1 – the size of homes proposed now reflects the needs of the village with 78% of the properties having 2 and 3 bedrooms. (The original proposal was 29%.)
- Policy H2 – the type of homes proposed now reflects the needs of the village with 61% of the properties being either semi-detached or mews. (The original proposal was 29%.)
- Policy H6 – the percentage of affordable homes is now above the 30% requirement of this Policy.

In addition, APC Councillors were advised that the Transport Statement was being revised to reflect the Parish Council's concerns about access by bus.

Councillors were advised at the meeting that Cheshire East Planners are asking for the pedestrian crossing to be moved further down Cheshire Street towards its junction with Heathfield Road. This proposal will not comply with Policy D8 of the Audlem Neighbourhood Plan, as it would require a footpath to be constructed on the Little Heath Green. This is listed as open green space and the construction of a footpath would have a detrimental effect on the green space. In addition, it is also questionable whether a crossing further away from McKelvey Way would be used to cross Cheshire Street.

As a result, Councillors have agreed to support the revised application as submitted, subject to a revised Transport Statement being produced.

Officer comment

The latest comments from APC are noted. This does not change the initial recommendation as set out in the main committee report as no concerns were raised from an affordable housing perspective which can be dealt with by way of Section 106 Agreement.

**Highway officer comments**

The Councils Highways officer has now been provided with revised plans and further traffic reports and has advised as below:

## Site description and current application proposal

The site is currently open field with no vehicle trips associated with it. It is located on the northern end of Audlem, approximately 850m from its centre, and is bound by farmland to the east, farmland and 2 residential properties to the north, farmland and residential properties to the south, and the A529 Audlem Road to the west.

The proposal is for residential development for up to 28 units, with a new vehicle access off Audlem Road. The application is similar to a previous one on this site which was refused but not on Highways grounds.

## Sustainable access

It has been proposed to access the site from Audlem Road for which there is currently no footway access on its eastern side. At the site access it has been proposed to include 2m footways on either side and to include a new footway, from the site access, along the eastern side of Audlem Road to its junction with Heathfield Road. Further details of this on a topographical plan where to be provided by the application to confirm the available width but these have not been provided and can be secured by condition.

A dropped kerb crossing to the opposite side of Audlem Road is to be provided and is acceptable to serve this scale of development.

## Safe and suitable access

The access dimensions that have been proposed are adequate for a development of this size to allow for safe access for all vehicle types. There is hatching on Audlem Road outside of the site access which will need amended to include a small right turn lane into the site. From measurements taken from the submitted plans this is deliverable with some minor amendments and should be secured by condition.

The visibility splays have been amended to provide more visibility in the leading direction, reflecting the previous application, and are now acceptable. The site frontage boundary will have to be reduced in height to allow for this.

## Network Capacity

Trip rates have been derived from TRICS and show approximately 15 to 20 two-way trips being generated from the site in each of the AM and PM peak hours. These trips will also be distributed throughout the network and therefore the traffic impact on the surrounding road network will be minimal.

## Internal Layout

The internal access width is 5.5m and then further in reduces to 4.8m, which is sufficient to serve this level of development. There is also sufficient turning area for larger vehicles.

In the vicinity of plot 1 more turning area should be provided for plot 1 residents and for visitors, and this can be secured by condition. A bin collection point for plots 1 to 5 close to what will be the adopted highway should be provided, and this be secured by condition.

### Conclusion

The access and layout are acceptable subject to minor amendments, and no objection is raised with the following conditions and informative:

- Condition: prior to commencement details of a footway connection to Heathfield Road shall be submitted and approved.
- Condition: prior to commencement details of a right turn lane for the access shall be submitted and approved.
- Condition: prior to commencement details of additional turning area outside of plot 1 shall be submitted and approved.
- Condition: prior to commencement details of a bin collection point for plots 1 to 5 within 15m of the main access road shall be submitted and approved.
- Informative: the applicant will be required to enter into a s38 Agreement regarding the construction and future adoption of the internal road layout, and a s278 agreement for the proposed off-site works.

### Officer comment

Comments of the Councils Highways Engineer are noted. Given the conclusion that Audlem Road is capable of accommodating the additional number of vehicles and with suitable site access it is not considered that the proposal would pose any severe highway safety concerns and as such is considered to comply with relevant highway safety policies within the CELPS, CNLP & ANP.

Therefore the comments do not change the initial recommendation as set out in the committee report but would result in x4 additional conditions and x1 informative.

### **Recommendation**

No change to initial recommendation as per the main committee report.