

Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday 12th November 2025
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.

6. **25/0454/PIP - LAND OFF WATERLOO ROAD, POYNTON, CHESHIRE EAST, SK12 1RZ: Permission in Principle for up to 2 no. dwellings** (Pages 3 - 6)

This page is intentionally left blank

Northern Planning Committee 12 November 2025

UPDATE TO AGENDA

Application No: 25/0454/PIP
Application Type: Permission in Principle
Location: Land Off Waterloo Road, Poynton, Cheshire East, SK12 1RZ
Proposal: Permission in Principle for up to 2 no. dwellings
Applicant: Henderson Homes Ltd
Date Prepared: 07 November 2025

1. CONSULTATIONS

- 1.1. Poynton Town Council have commented on the Planning Officer's Report.
- 1.2. Poynton Town Council believes that the Report for the Meeting of the Northern Planning Committee on 12 November 2025 is seriously misleading, as it omits or misreports relevant information, including comments by Cheshire East's own staff.
- 1.3. Poynton Town Council have requested that the report should be withdrawn and rewritten to correctly address the errors and omissions outlined below: -
 - Risk to Protected Trees;
 - Heritage Implications;
 - Flood Risk; and
 - Maps of Built-up Area.

2. OFFICER APPRAISAL

- 2.1. In response to queries raised following the publication of the committee report officers would indicate the following: -

Risk to Protected Trees:

- 2.2. The comments from the Council's Tree Officer were not summarised in the consultations (external to planning), as the tree officer is not external to planning.
- 2.3. The Town Council is correct that the Tree Officer did conclude they were unable to support the application.
- 2.4. The Tree Officers comments were not omitted from the report, rather it is the case that arboricultural constraints are not a determining factor when reviewing Stage 1 applications for Planning in Principle.

- 2.5. The granting of this Stage 1 Permission in Principle would not result in the removal of the protected trees. These trees remain protected and remain subject to Tree Preservation Orders.
- 2.6. The applicant is not required to provide any details in relation to the Trees nor the access, for a Stage 1 Permission in Principle application.
- 2.7. If and when, an application for the Technical Design Stage (Stage 2 Permission in Principle) for the site comes forward, full details in relation to the protected trees would be required and an assessment at that time would be made in relation to CELPS Policy SE5 and SADPD Policy ENV6.
- 2.8. If the applicant fails to provide the relevant details in terms of the protected trees, and indeed the access details, within any future Stage 2 Application, this, would be a sufficient reason to reject that application.

Heritage Implications:

- 2.9. The Conservation Section were consulted on the application. The Conservation Section have made no comment to the application.
- 2.10. The Town Council is correct in that the Conservation Officer at the time of the 2022 Outline Application did object to that scheme. No determination of that scheme was made by the Local Planning Authority. That application was an Outline Planning Application not a Permission in Principle. As such, they are assessed and determined differently, notwithstanding that there has been no change to the site or the heritage status of Waterloo House.
- 2.11. Officers are stating that in the determination of this stage 1 Permission in Principle, we are unable to object to an application on heritage grounds, as any impacts on that heritage asset would be 'less than substantial'. During the determination of the Technical Design Stage, that, less than substantial harm, to the adjacent building would be considered and assessed.

Flood Risk:

- 2.12. Officers are aware of the detailed comments contained within the consultation response from the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 2.13. The reasoning for the summation was not to be disingenuous; it was because the technical requirements of any future drainage strategy are not germane to the determination of this stage 1 Permission in Principle.
- 2.14. These technical requirements for flood risk assessments and drainage strategies are not uncommon for schemes of this nature. Officers look forward to ensuring that the details are fully provided and examined during the determination of any Stage 2 application submitted.

Map of Built-up Area

- 2.15. All maps, tables, and illustrations contained within the officer report, have been included to aid Members discussion in determining this application and are for visual purposes and not the defining factor in Officers' recommendation.

3. Conclusions

- 3.1. Officers understand the potential difficulties in determining new types of planning applications. Officers also appreciate the concerns raised by the Town Council, in relation to protecting trees and to ensure neighbouring properties are not affected by further surface water flooding.
- 3.2. Officers do however disagree with the Town Council, and do not believe that the report is '*seriously* misleading', nor that it omits or misreports relevant information.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1. No change to recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank