

# Strategic Planning Board

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 12th November, 2014  
**Time:** 10.30 am  
**Venue:** Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe  
CW1 2BJ

---

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

**Planning Updates** (Pages 1 - 6)

---

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462  
E-Mail: [sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk) with any apologies, requests for further  
information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

---

This page is intentionally left blank

**STRETEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 12 November 2014**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

14/0114M

**LOCATION**

Harman Technology Site And Adj Land, Ilford Way, Town Lane, Mobberley, Knutsford, Cheshire

**UPDATE PREPARED**

10 November 2014

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Further comments have been received from a resident from Mobberley and on behalf of the Tatton Estate.

**Letter on behalf of Tatton Estate**

In the conclusion part of the Officer's report it states: -

"The proposal would bring about a number of benefits as listed in the conclusion as part of the report from 10 July 2014. A key part of the proposal is that if approved it would allow a development that would safeguard an existing local employer, Harman. Achieving local economic objectives is therefore a significant benefit of the application. Securing Harman alone will secure the future of more than 200 jobs, around 40% of which are from residents in Cheshire East itself". This is clearly a material consideration to which Officers have recorded significant weight in reaching the planning balance.

The Estate is strongly supportive of job creation. However, the writer is concerned that they can see no provisions within the section 106 heads of terms, nor within the proposed planning conditions which will ensure that the economic benefits (namely procuring a more efficient, purpose built new facility for Harman) will actually be secured. The writer of the letter strongly urges therefore that this shortcoming is addressed by specific additional provision in the section 106 Agreement, assuming Members are minded to grant planning permission.

The 10 July Officer's report contained a heads of term stating: "Speculative new build office space (15,403 sq ft) across 2 floors with 34 car parking spaces, to be developed if demand can be established through a 36 month agreed marketing process end period".

The 12 November Officer's report states in the conclusion that the development cannot absorb the costs of developing the space on a totally speculative basis, given the commitment to secure Harman on site. However, the report states that the applicant would work constructively with the Council over the next few years to market the site allocated for new employment and promote interest for its development. The requirement to market the allocated employment site does not feature in either the section 106 heads of terms listed in the 12 November Officer's report nor the suite of conditions set out in the 10 July Officer's report.

If a mechanism for the marketing of the allocated employment site is not secured then there is danger that this process will not be undertaken and the future local employment and investment benefits envisaged would be lost.

The Education Department's consultation response is clear that Mobberley Primary School is oversubscribed, under sized and difficult to expand based on presently predicated increases in pupil numbers, ignoring the impacts of this development. Education Officers highlight the need for a commuted sum contribution towards expanded provision and request a fully serviced site to be made available in order that Mobberley Primary School can be relocated. This land, if not ultimately required, would be released back to the developer, which is a conventional approach in major schemes such as this one.

However whilst the Case Officer has framed the recommendation to capture the required commuted sum, the request for land to be reserved has apparently been ignored. Moreover, the planning application does not include in the description of development any reference to a primary school. If the Education Department does require land to be provided there would not appear to be any mechanism to call for this and the indicative scheme for the site makes no reference to reserve a site for a school. The inability to adequately ensure primary education will be available for pupils arising from the scheme, given the evident difficulties highlighted by the Education Officers, seems to have been largely ignored, and in practical terms, remains unresolved.

The section 106 heads of terms in the 12 November Officer's report secures £247,483 towards highways improvements. The 10 July Officer's report states the development will have a direct impact on both the Brook Street/Hollow Lane and Adams Hill/A50 Toft Road junctions and that a contribution of £247,483 is required to mitigate this impact. The heads of terms in the 12 November Officer's report does not however make it clear what the highways improvements contribution will be used for. It is therefore requested that the heads of term is amended to state:

£247,483 towards highways improvements to be made to junctions at A537 Brook Street and Adams Hill, Knutsford.

The second letter is from resident of Mobberley who is concerned that the 'Conditions' attached to Manchester Airport's approval to construct their second main runway have not been sufficiently considered.

The main condition, that the writer refers to is that all aircraft on take-off from runway 23 left and 23 right are requested to turn right, then left and then left then right back onto their route to the 'Airways Corridor Flight Path'. This detour is in order to circumvent Knutsford because of the associated risks of noise and inconvenience. The above named proposed development creates a dense area right at the point where aircraft commence their right turn which in essence contravenes the condition applied to the planning application for the second runway.

The writer draws attention to the extract from Volume 3 of the Inspectors Report sections 3.25/3.26 'Hazards and Risk; and 'Proof of Evidence of Risk of Grounds Facilities from aircraft incidents at Manchester Airport.'

### **OFFICERS APPRAISAL**

There is clearly a necessity to deliver 200 jobs from any future development on this site for Harman. The mechanism for doing so would by virtue of conditions 4 and 7 on page 74 of the committee Agenda report, which requires the industrial redevelopment to be developed in accordance with the approved plans and a phasing plan.

A phasing condition is proposed that 'none of the residential dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until the new buildings for Harman technology as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan have been completed.'

The list of Section 106 items referred to on page 72 of the Main Agenda report is an abridged version of that tabled on page 27.

The Heads of Terms for a Legal Agreement on page 72 of the main Agenda report states that the following: -

"Speculative new build office space (15,403 sq ft) across 2 floors with 34 car parking spaces, to be developed if demand can be established through a 36 month agreed marketing process and period".

It is envisaged that the wording above would be expanded to ensure that a mechanism would be built in to ensure that the marketing is carried out.

The education contribution requirement is considered on page 53 of the Agenda report. It is reiterated that there is no requirement from the Education department at this stage to require a school to be accommodated on the site. If this position were to change, then the applicant has confirmed that they would be willing to work with Cheshire East Council to deliver a school on site. The transfer of land to the Council is already addressed though the proposal for the open space to be adopted by the Council, which is covered in the

committee report Heads of Terms. However, should the local authority choose not to adopt the open space areas, then further provision can also be made within the S106 for the transfer of land to the local authority for education purposes, if required. We can re-iterate, as we have done in previous correspondence that the landowner is happy with this arrangement and there are no objections to this being made a requirement of the S106.

On the issue of highways improvements, it is clear that the contribution of £247 483 would be used towards highway improvements to be made to junctions at A537 Brook Street and Adams Hill.

The safety concerns which have been raised have been considered on a number of occasions during the application process. However, the site does not fall within any safeguarding zone and if there were safety concerns then one would expect Manchester Airport to raise an objection. On the basis that Manchester Airport have raised no objections, it is considered that a refusal on the grounds of aircraft safety could not be sustained.

## **CONCLUSION**

The views of the resident and on behalf of the Tatton Estate are noted and clarity has been provided on the issues raised above.

The recommendation remains as per the main agenda report as approval subject to a S106 Agreement.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 12<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2014**

**APPLICATION NO:** 14/2913C

**PROPOSAL:** Application for Reserved Matters the appearance, landscaping, layout & scale for Phase 2 to include 179 dwellings on planning application no: 10/2608C.

**ADDRESS:** Land to the South of Hind Heath Road, Sandbach

**APPLICANT:** Stewart Ball, Bovis Homes Ltd

**Additional Information**

The number of dwellings proposed on this site has been reduced from 179 to 177 as per the amended layout plan referred shown in the key plans. All references to 179 units within the officer report need to be corrected. This would result in an overall development of 249 dwellings. This phase of the development is as follows:

- 15 x one bed units (in 2 apartment blocks)
- 38 x two bed units
- 55 x three bed units
- 12 x three/four bed units
- 32 x four bed units
- 25 x five bed units

There would be no change to the number of affordable housing units that would be provided on this site.

**Consultations:**

**Public Open Space:** A 2 bay, 2 cradle and 2 flat swings are required, this is standard minimum.

**Additional Representations**

One additional representation has been received which raises the following points:

- The officer report has little of no consideration of land stability issues
- The issue of land stability was raised by the Cheshire Brine Board was raised at the outline stage which recommended certain design measures to mitigate this development. It is unclear how this is being actioned

**Additional Information**

**Ecology**

At the time of this update the outstanding Badger Report and information in relation to the habitat adjacent to the Canal was still awaited. This will form part of a verbal update.

### **Public Open Space**

The proposed development would provide the following areas of POS:

Phase 1 – 2,963sqm

Phase 2 – 4130sqm

Total – 7092sqm

This level is considered to be acceptable.

In terms of children's play provision the UU secured as part of the outline application and condition 30 of outline permission require a LEAP with 5 pieces of equipment. In this case a plan has been submitted and the details are not considered to be acceptable. Amended details will be secured through the use of an additional planning condition.

### **Brine Board**

The issue of brine subsidence will be dealt with at the Building Regulations stage.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE subject to the following conditions**

- 1. Approved Plans**
- 2. Materials in accordance with the details submitted for approval**
- 3. Landscaping details to be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing (including land levels for the proposed POS)**
- 4. Implementation of the approved landscape scheme**
- 5. Boundary treatment details to be in accordance with the approved details**
- 6. Development to proceed in accordance with the AIA and Tree Protection Plans**
- 7. Details of the LEAP to be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing**
- 8. Details of proposed land levels in accordance with the submitted plans**
- 9. Full detailed design and construction details of the storage lagoon to be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing.**
- 10. Details of the LEAP shall be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing.**

**In order to give proper effect to the Board's/Committee's intentions and without changing the substance of the decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Strategic & Economic Planning, in consultation with the Chair (or in his absence the Vice Chair) of Strategic Planning Board, to correct any technical slip or omission in the wording of the resolution, between approval of the minutes and issue of the decision notice.**