

Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday 6th August 2014
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

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

7. **14/1991M-Demolition of existing residential dwelling (20 Priory Lane). Construction of ten residential properties (5x semi-detached) with associated parking new access road etc, 20 Priory Lane, Macclesfield for Mark Edwards, Contour Homes Ltd (Pages 1 - 4)**
9. **14/1945M- Demolition of existing buildings on site and erection of residential development comprising of 18 two storey dwellings, Land off Saville Street, Macclesfield for Saville St Garage Ltd The Helpful Hand (Pages 5 - 6)**
11. **14/2222M-Demolition of bungalow, garage and summer house, erection of new dwelling, replacement of timber gates and hard and soft landscaping, Red Walls, Parkfield Road, Knutsford for IGG Group (Pages 7 - 8)**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 6 AUGUST 2014

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 14/1991M

LOCATION 20 Priory Lane, Macclesfield, SK10 3HJ

UPDATE PREPARED 4 August 2014

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation:

The original building on the site was an old farm house and is shown on the 1830s Tithe Map. The property is not listed or locally listed. Whilst it is accepted that the building has architectural merit, following discussions with the Council's Conservation Officer, the building is considered highly unlikely to warrant listed status and is also unlikely to be considered for local listing.

United Utilities:

United utilities originally commented on 10 June 2014 raising no objection to the application, subject to conditions. This consultation was superseded by an updated consultation response dated 25 July 2014, also raising no objection to the application, subject to conditions.

REPRESENTATIONS

9 Rayleigh Close Macclesfield

Their concerns are as follows -

- There would be additional vehicles entering and exiting Priory Lane from the proposed development.
- There are 2 schools and a leisure centre in close proximity, which create a high level of road traffic and in particular children entering and leaving school.
- We have concerns that there would be substantial loss of mature trees in turn a loss of habitat for birds and wildlife including bats.
- The proposed development would mean an increase in noise and possible lack of privacy; in what has been a quiet residential close for past 26 years that we have lived here.

18A Priory Lane - Land ownership:

As stated in the Committee Report 20 Priory Lane is currently council owned land, Contour Homes have started a dialog with the owners of 18a Priory Lane, regarding their right of access over the strip of land on the southern boundary.

It was understood that Contour Homes has agreed the boundary position with the owner on the basis that Contour transfers the Council's leasehold interest in the strip of land to No.18a at completion.

However, the owner of 18a Priory Lane has stated that whilst there have been some informal discussions, no agreement has been reached. The owners of 18a Priory Lane have engaged the services of an independent Surveyor who has established the width of the land in question.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Conservation:

As stated above, whilst attractive, the building is not listed and would not justify listed status, either nationally or locally. The application site is not within a Conservation Area.

The conversion of the existing property was not envisioned by Cheshire East, when marketing the site and to alter the scheme at this stage would make the application unviable and jeopardise this affordable housing scheme.

Drainage:

In relation to the updated consultation response from United Utilities, in their advice on the easement required for the public sewer that crosses the site, they have added the following text *'or such other solution to be specifically agreed in writing with UU.'*

This will enable the applicant to agree an offset in the easement strip with UU. The applicant has discussed the principles of a workable solution of with UU and this does not involve altering the site layout.

In relation to site drainage, officers contend that the line running under Priory Lane is a sewer not a culvert. Our information suggests it is carrying surface water from Rayleigh Close and Birtles Road, and that no surface water soaks away or drains into it from Priory Lane. The applicant had the sewer line CCTV surveyed to locate the manhole at the bottom of the site. The survey concluded the sewer is approximately 900mm wide, made of concrete and roughly 6m below ground level.

Regarding the current issue of surface water, whatever the current issues are with rising surface water, leaking mains, as part of the development of the land the applicant will have to address these issues and solve them via a remediation strategy and drainage strategy supplied by their engineer.

A solution to the current problem can be found and the applicant will not be able to build the homes without addressing this issue. If the site is not developed it is hard to see how this issues will be addressed.

Land ownership

The transfer of land is a civil matter. However, it is noted that the original plans submitted by Contour Homes encroach over land which 18a Priory Lane have Rights of Access to. Revised plans have been submitted to address the area of land in question.

Relationship between plot 7 and numbers 3 and 7 Rayleigh Close

Discussions with the applicant have taken place regarding the four properties proposed towards the rear of the site. Plots 7 to 10 cannot be moved due to the location of the 900mm surface water sewer which crosses the site and the required 6m easements.

That being said, the applicant has agreed to alter the design of these plots to remove the gables and incorporate a hipped roof design on Plots 7 to 10. This will result the reduction of the mass and bulk of the end elevation of plot 7.

Shared Ownership:

Currently this is not something the applicant has considered as the tender brief from Cheshire East for the land tender specifically details the housing need relating to two and three bed homes which will be delivered. However, the applicant is happy to agree a local lettings policy or sign up to a cascade agreement, subject to Cheshire East approval.

CONCLUSION

None of the additional comments received raise any new issues that would merit a change in recommendation. Therefore the original recommendation of approval remains as stated in the original report.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 6 AUGUST 2014

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 14/1945M

LOCATION Land off Saville Street, Macclesfield

UPDATE PREPARED 4 August 2014

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Flood Risk:

It would appear that the site currently drains into Knights Pool via the culvert on the northern edge of the site. Whilst officers believe that any flood risk issue can be readily resolved with some on-site attenuation to meet current design standards and the applicant should be able to route surface water to the same outfall, a Flood Risk Assessment would still be required.

Loss of employment:

The applicant has confirmed that the following businesses would be affected by the redevelopment of the site:

- Saville Street Motors - proprietor Mr C Pointon plus 1no. employee
- Macclesfield Spray and Repair - proprietor Mr L McAllister (sole trader)
- Hulley Roofing - storage unit only
- DW Windows - storage unit only

Therefore three jobs may be affected. They have all been informed that their leases will not be renewed in light of the current application.

Greenspace:

The Greenspace commuted sum would be payable on the implementation of the development and not a condition of receiving planning permission.

Amenity Implications:

A Site Section has been received in relation to the properties on Barber Street. Number 44 Barber Street would be the most affected by the development. However:-

- The minimum distance to the gable wall is 15.77 metres which is more than the minimum recommended;
- The gable is not at right angles to the property and it is angled away from it;
- In terms of loss of view or light the gable will not be as high as the current trees are, and accepting the fact that a blank gable is probably a less desirable view than foliage the suggestion of planting and bushes on the bank at the back of the garden will ameliorate this somewhat.

- The aspect is almost due north so loss of sunlight into the garden would not be a significant issue, notwithstanding that the existing trees would probably have more effect on the light into the garden with the additional height and the canopy.

CONCLUSION

As the applicants are still preparing a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and as the drainage strategy will form a significant part of the FRA report (which will also consider flood risk from Knights Pool, sewers and overland flow) officers are recommending that the recommendation is changed to a 'defer and delegate' approval to officers in conjunction with the Chairman of Committee subject to the submission of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 6th August 2014

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

14/2222M

LOCATION

RED WALLS, PARKFIELD ROAD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 8NP

UPDATE PREPARED

4th August 2014

REPRESENTATIONS

Since preparing the original report, further representations have been received from the occupiers of Holly Tree House, Sandings and The Firs Coach House, raising the following issues:

- The Firs Coach House were not notified of the proposed development
- Adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- Adverse impact on neighbouring properties
- Environmental Issues regarding drainage and impact on protected trees
- Constitutes overdevelopment of the plot

KEY ISSUES

These additional comments have been carefully considered. The Firs Coach House does not adjoin the boundary of the application site and so a neighbour notification letter was not sent to this property. Furthermore, a site notice was erected within the vicinity of the site.

As noted in the original report, Parkfield Road comprises dwellings of a variety of architectural styles and the proposed dwelling is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of this part of the Legh Road Conservation Area.

The development is not considered to constitute overdevelopment of the plot and is considered to be of a size, scale and siting that would not over dominate neighbouring properties or the street scene.

The Tree Officer and United Utilities raise no objections to the development and subject to conditions the development is not considered to adversely impact on protected trees or drainage of the site.

CONCLUSION

Whilst the additional objections have been considered, as in the original report the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with all relevant policies in the development plan and there are not considered to be any other material considerations that would carry sufficient weight to refuse the application. Therefore a recommendation of approval is made, subject to conditions.