

Northern Planning Committee

Update Reports

Date: Wednesday 19th March 2014
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: The Capesthorpe Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

Update Reports (Pages 1 - 8)

Update reports for the following planning applications:

- Item 6 :14/0046M – Former Garage, Buxton Road, Macclesfield, SK10 1LZ
- Item 7: 13/3684M – Croft Park, Newton Hall Lane, Mobberley, Knutsford, WA16 7LN
- Item 8: 14/0004C – Parkhouse Residential House, Congleton Road, Sandbach, CW11 4SP
- Item 10: 14/0081C – Land to the East of Hermitage Lane, Cranage

Please Contact: Sarah Baxter
Phone: 01270 686462
E-Mail: sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 19TH MARCH 2014

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 14/0046M

**LOCATION: FORMER GARAGE, BUXTON ROAD,
MACCLESFIELD, SK10 1LZ**

UPDATE PREPARED 17th March 2014

Highways Conditions:

Amended plans have been submitted indicate that a suitable level of visibility can be achieved from the proposed site access. Those visibility splays are indicated on Drawing 05680-P1-133 Rev *. Therefore Condition 10 on page 41 can be removed as the vision splays will be shown on the approved plans and therefore controlled via condition 02.

For clarification, Condition 12 (provision of car parking) will ensure that the car park area is fully surfaced and marked out prior to first occupation.

The recommendation of approval remains.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 19TH MARCH 2014

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 13/3684M

**LOCATION: CROFT PARK, NEWTON HALL LANE, MOBBERLEY,
KNUTSFORD, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE, WA16 7LN**

UPDATE PREPARED 17th March 2014

Mobberley Parish Council:

Mobberley Parish Council has reiterated their opposition (page 48) to the application on the following grounds:-

- There is a lot of local opposition;
- Mobberley Parish Council do not feel that the road safety issues have been addressed adequately enough (even though the vans have moved back slightly);
- The appearance of park homes so close to the boundary of the road spoil the street scene and look out of place (even though landscaping is proposed);
- Injure the openness of the green belt; and
- The reduction of 2 vans and the siting of said vans slightly further back off the road does not make a significant difference.

Highways:

A additional condition is suggested which will ensure that the access, service road and car park areas are fully surfaced and marked out prior to first occupation of the site.

Ecology implications:

Whilst it is not anticipated that barn owls would be adversely affected by the development (Paragraph 1, page 53), the Ecologist has suggested (with the agreement of the applicant) that a condition requiring an additional survey (to Check for Barn Owls) to be undertaken and submitted prior to commencement of the works would be beneficial and prudent.

Therefore Condition 10 is suggested to be amended from '*Development in accordance with ecology statement*' to '*additional Barn Owls survey prior to commencement*'.

Foul Drainage:

Environmental Health raised concerns that the drainage provision was "unknown", on the original submission. Therefore the applicant may not of be able to demonstrate that the site has the appropriate space, suitability of the ground for a package plant or to demonstrate that a mains connection is possible or permissible

The application has submitted evidence from United Utilities which shows that Croft Park has its own septic tank. The applicant has also stated that the 7 additional park homes would be provided with foul drainage which would utilise this septic tank.

Environmental Health has confirmed they would have no objection provide that a condition is imposed on the application that controls foul sewerage arrangement. Condition 07 suggested on page 54 could cover these details being submitted prior to commencement. This condition would require a report of the suitability of any proposed system either the capacity of the existing croft part system to take the addition waste or full plans and capacity scheme for a new system

Land Contamination:

For clarity, condition 06 suggested on page 54 would require a Supplementary Phase II investigation to be carried out and the results submitted and approved prior to commencement. If the Supplementary Phase II investigations indicate that remediation is necessary then a Remediation Strategy shall also be submitted and approved.

An addition condition is suggested to ensure that a Site Completion Report is submitted and approved before the first use of the site if remediation is required.

Residential Amenity/Permitted Development Rights:

Due to recent legislation changes, site licences do not stipulate a separation distance for fire spread protection. This alternate legislation (regarding fire safety) is to provide a fire risk assessment, which the fire service approves. Therefore this spacing issue is out the control of a site licence.

Therefore a condition is suggested to ensure a typical site spacing of 6 meter between chalets that would in turn help govern the layout and intensity.

The proposed park homes will also benefit from Permitted Development Rights. Given the tight constraints on the site, it is considered necessary, relevant, enforceable, precise and reasonable (tests in NPPF Paragraph 206) to removed permitted development rights (Parts A to H) via condition on this occasion.

The recommendation of approval remains.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE – 19TH MARCH 2014

APPLICATION NO: 14/0004C

PROPOSAL: The construction of 10 service apartments ancillary to Park House Care Home and the conversion of number 12 Park House Mews into a community facility for the residents of the complex.

ADDRESS: Park House Residential House, Congleton Road, Sandbach, CW11 4SP.

APPLICANT: Edward Dale

Officer Comments

Noise

Environmental Protection were originally recommending refusal of the application due to lack of information relating to road noise. Although this does not form one of the reasons for refusal, and could have been controlled by condition, this information has now been received and has been assessed as being acceptable.

Trees

The report recommends refusal of the application on the grounds of lack of information relating to trees.

The applicant has provided a tree survey with accompanying tree constraints plan.

The tree report states the development would result in the removal of 9 trees located on the site frontage/and adjacent to the existing eastern driveway. Recommendations are made for the protection of 3 retained specimens. The trees identified for removal comprise 5 Grade B and 3 grade C specimens.

There are trees present on the site frontage which are not included in the tree survey. There is no topographic survey with the application and The Council do not have confidence in the accuracy of the submitted plan with the tree report. On this basis, Officers remain of the view that the submission does not accord with the guidance in BS 5837 and does not provide a sound basis on which to assess the application.

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Northern Planning Committee – 19th March 2014

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION No.

14/0081C – Outline planning for the construction of new residential development of up to 26 dwellings

LOCATION

Land to the East of, Hermitage Lane, Cranage

UPDATE PREPARED

17th March 2014

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:

3 additional neighbouring letters of objection have now been received. The main areas of objection relate to;

- Principle of housing development
- Cheshire East Council already have a 5-year supply of housing land
- Loss of Open Countryside
- Scale of development
- Impact upon Jodrell Bank

The specific measurements quoted in the Officer's Committee Report relating to services within the proximity of the site are also brought into question.

CONCLUSIONS

The issues raised by the objector have already been addressed in the committee report.

With regards to the concern raised by an objector regarding the validity of the measurements to nearby public services, it is noted within the delegated report that *'The performance against these measures is used as a "Rule of Thumb" as to whether the development is addressing sustainability issues pertinent to a particular type of site and issue. It is NOT expected that this will be interrogated in order to provide the answer to all questions.'*

As such, these additional consultation responses do not alter the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation

