



Southern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 9th April, 2014
Time: 1.00 pm
Venue: Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe
CW1 2BJ

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

Updates (Pages 1 - 16)

Please contact Julie Zientek on 01270 686466
E-Mail: julie.zientek@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies, requests for further information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION NO: 14/0381N

PROPOSAL: Outline application for the erection of two detached family homes and double garage

ADDRESS: Land at Bunbury Heath, Bunbury Heath, Tarporley, Cheshire

APPLICANT: Mr James France-Hayhurst

DATE UPDATE PREPARED: 4th April 2014

Further Representation Received

It is the agent's wish that Member's attention is drawn to a supporting statement 'The Character and Identity of Bunbury Heath' which has been submitted by the applicant submitted in support of the application.

Officer Comment

The character statement does not alter the assessment of this application as being contrary to Policy NE.2 (Open Countryside).

Recommendation: No change to the recommendation

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9th April 2013

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO

14/0183N

LOCATION

Adj. 16 Huntersfield, Shavington, Crewe, CW2 5FB

UPDATE PREPARED

7th April 2014

Amended drawings have been submitted by the applicant that omits the detached garages from the proposals (as requested by Officers).

The recommendation on the application is Approval with conditions.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE – 9TH APRIL 2014

APPLICATION NO: 14/0084N

PROPOSAL: Erection of 8No. dwellings, vehicular access, associated car parking and landscaping.

ADDRESS: Land at Maw Green Road, Crewe..

APPLICANT: RJC Regeneration Ltd

Erratum

The Policy section of the report incorrectly refers to the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review. This should be the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE – 9TH APRIL 2014

APPLICATION NO: 13/4904N

PROPOSAL: Full planning permission for 11 dwellings including access and associated infrastructure.

ADDRESS: Land off Wrens Close, Nantwich.

APPLICANT: Mr F Lloyd Jones

Erratum

The Policy section of the report incorrectly refers to the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review. This should be the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE – 9TH APRIL 2014

APPLICATION NO: 13/5162N

PROPOSAL: Outline application for erection of up to 26 dwellings, access and open space Resubmission of 13/3210N

ADDRESS: Land East of 22 Heathfield Road, Audlem.

APPLICANT: Frank Hockenhull

Erratum

The Policy section of the report incorrectly refers to the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review. This should be the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

Highways

Audlem Parish Council have submitted a highways report that they commissioned which concludes that the application should be refused. This report has been assessed by the Strategic Highways Manager who makes the following comments:

“With regard to Mr Boone’s comments on the scheme, there are a number of points that I would raise.

Accidents

*There are no PIA’s recorded on the roads near the site in the last five year accident record, this is confirmed by Mr Boone but there absolutely is no evidence to say that there are no accidents because **only** locals use these roads, clearly there are visitors, deliveries etc on a daily basis.*

Traffic generation

The trip rates submitted by the applicant are not unduly low and even if we use the higher rate suggested by Mr Boone then it will not result in an additional trips, this is because the applicant has estimated the site will generate 14 trips and the difference is a 5 further trips.

In any event, this level of additional traffic cannot be deemed to have a severe impact on the road network.

Safety Audit

CEC did commission an independent safety audit on the access design to assess whether there were any major safety issues that would lead to a recommendation of refusal on the application. Although, in my view there were no major design issues, the applicant has not had the opportunity to

consider the safety audit and provide a response to the safety audit and also address the points raised by Mr Boone. Therefore, I would have to request a deferral to allow the applicant to consider Mr Boone's points and also be given the CEC audit."

Audlem Parish Council

Following the publication of the Committee Agenda, Audlem Parish Council have submitted the following comments:

"We welcome the conclusions and recommendations of the above report. We would like to draw attention to the following.

Housing Land Supply

We welcome the conclusion that the site is not required for the 5-Year Housing Land Supply plus buffer.

The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) dated 6th March 2014 confirms that as the Cheshire East Local Plan strategy has been submitted, there are strong grounds to refuse the application on the grounds of prematurity.

Affordable Housing Numbers

We note with some concern the significant divergence between the housing requirements indicated by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013 and those provided by Cheshire Homechoice.

Although some social housing is now being built on the site of the old Thornton House, Cheshire Street, there is still a requirement for further social housing to be provided in Audlem.

Amenity and Landscape

We are pleased to note that the Planning Officer recognises that, 'in reality the proposals do have the potential to have a significant landscape and visual impact on an attractive rural local area'. However, we feel that certain issues are too important to be left until Reserved Matters stage. These are:

- Layout and design and over-dominance*
- The lack of a landscape and visual appraisal or assessment.*

Public Open Space

We strongly object to the request for a floodlit multi-use games area, which would be totally inappropriate in this location.

Agricultural Land Assessment

For the purposes of clarity, we point out that this is Grade 2 and 3a land.

Medical Infrastructure

The PPG includes a new section on Health and Wellbeing and health infrastructure which reinforces Cheshire East Council's view at the first application, that this should be taken into account in planning decision making.

Public Sewer

We support the Planning Officer's view that 'a condition should be imposed requiring submission of full details of foul and surface water drainage for approval' We also note with concern that there is a public sewer that runs through the site."

RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee Update

Southern Planning Committee 9th April 2014

Application No.: 14/0456N

Variation of conditions 2 & 8 on approval 13/3046N - Change of use from shot-blasting heavy goods vehicles to car repairs, dismantling and salvage of parts

The agent (Richard Ellison) acting on behalf of the objector living at 269 Newcastle Road, Shavington has raised the following additional points which he would like Members of the Southern Planning Committee to consider:

- There is significant disappointment and dismay over your recommendation as there has been no change in circumstances since the decision on the application last September.
- It you recommended the hours conditions to be attached last time and the committee agreed, how can you change your mind now?
- There is no justification to state that you have looked at appeal decisions and planning history and you have come to a different conclusion now as all these documents were available to you then and yet you still attached the hours condition. How do you explain this change? There is nothing in your report to explain the change in your view. This needs to be brought to members attention;
- I believe you discussed the need for an extra condition if the application is approved regarding the need for fencing on the boundary with the Tomlinsons. I would be grateful if this could be added because of the present inadequate hedging on that boundary. You should have seen this on your site inspection since I have previously drawn it to your attention;
- Your report states that the business is unviable because of the hours restriction. This is clearly nonsense since it has been operating for well over a year. My client considers that it will continue to operate in an unregulated manner regardless of the outcome of next weeks committee; and
- I was very disappointed to hear from my client that your were not aware of the current situation concerning the discharge of conditions on the previous application despite you being the case officer. I suspect none have been discharged.

OFFICER RESPONSE

The concerns of the objector are noted, however, the applicants agent stresses that if the additional hours of working are not permitted it would make the proposal unviable and would result in the loss of a number of jobs. The NPPF strongly supports economic development, particularly in rural areas and as such this is a strong material planning

consideration, which cannot lightly be put aside. Furthermore, colleagues in Environmental Health have been consulted and raise no objection.

Environmental Health Officers have been out on site and they state 'I have visited the site and witnessed the operations at unit 5, which from a noise perspective; primarily consists of a compressor, air gun and angle grinder. At the boundary of the closest residential property the compressor was not audible, when the air gun and angle grinder were in use together (which I was informed was a worse case scenario), the noise was only just audible at the boundary. However this was then masked by noise from the large industrial unit at the front of the site. Therefore I am satisfied that if operated within the current restrictions i.e. with the doors closed, any noise from the activities should not adversely impact on the amenity of local residents. Particularly given that some of the units on the Business Park do not have any hours of operation restrictions and could operate 24/7.

However to be more in line with the current hours of operation across the site, I would recommend that proposed Condition 2 variation is amended to read:

Hours of operation outside the building are restricted to the following:

Monday – Friday 08.00hrs to 18.00hrs

Saturday 08.00hrs to 14.00hrs

Sundays and Bank Holidays Nil

Hours of operation inside the building are restricted to the following:

Monday – Friday 08.00hrs to 22.00hrs

Saturday 08.00hrs to 16.00hrs

Sundays and Bank Holidays 10.00hrs to 16.00hrs

The amendment from the applicant's proposed hours is that work inside the building can not start until 10am on Sundays and Bank Holidays'.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed alterations to the hours of working as required by EHO are accepted and reasonable

The objector states that the existing boundary hedgerow is quite patchy in places and if the proposal is approved they would like a 3m high boundary fence to be erected along the boundary so that development is screened. Whilst it is acknowledged that in some places the boundary hedge is quite patchy, it is not considered that the erection of a 3m high boundary fence is reasonable. It is noted that there is a separation distance of approximately 60m separating the two properties and located in between are a number of industrial buildings. Furthermore, it is noted that the garage located to the front of the site stores a number of vehicles adjacent to the site boundary in question. Therefore, given the separation distances and existing uses and storage areas in the locality, it is not considered reasonable to request such a condition. It can also be confirmed that the conditions relating to the previous application have been discharged.

Recommendation

The recommendation for approval still stands subject to the changes in hours of operation as required by EHO.

This page is intentionally left blank