

# **Southern Planning Committee**

## **Updates**

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 28th January, 2015  
**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.

5. **14/2714N Former Hack Green RAF Camp, Coole Lane, Hack Green, Austerson, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 8AS: Change of use of land to provide 9 yards for 10 travelling showpeople's families, formation of roads and hard surfacing for The Hack Green Group** (Pages 1 - 2)
6. **14/5411N The Printworks, Crewe Road, Haslington CW1 5RT: Outline application for new residential development of up to 14 dwellings (resubmission of planning application reference 13/5248N) for Georgina Hartley** (Pages 3 - 4)
7. **14/4588N Land to rear of 144, Audlem Road, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 7EB: Reserved matters application for the erection of 33 dwellings with associated works to include landscaping following approved outline 13/1223N for Wainhomes (North West) Ltd** (Pages 5 - 6)
10. **14/5044C Land East of School Lane, Sandbach, Cheshire CW1 2LS: Variation of Condition 17 on Approved Application 13/4634C - Outline Application for up to 13 no. residential dwelling houses, associated infrastructure and ancillary facilities for Jean Pierpoint Paul Ferguson, and Grant and Helen Dinsdale** (Pages 7 - 8)
12. **14/5281C Land Adjacent 6 Heath End Road, Alsager, Cheshire: Proposal for a Garage, Greenhouse, Kitchen Garden and Access (Resubmission of 14/4462C) for Mr Adrian Girvin** (Pages 9 - 10)

---

Please contact Julie Zientek on 01270 686466  
E-Mail: [julie.zientek@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto: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

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28 January 2015**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

14/2714N

**LOCATION**

Former Hack Green RAF Camp, Coole Lane, Austerson

**UPDATE PREPARED**

26 January 2015

**CONSULTEES**

Education – Insufficient capacity in local schools, therefore financial contributions required.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

2 further letters of representation have been received making further comments in response to the published committee report, relating to the following matters:

- The Application is for a permanent permission, not a temporary one. Therefore, the absence of a five year supply of deliverable sites is irrelevant and no weight ought to be attached to it.
- Previous inspector identified land as excluded from definition of previously developed land. Given the absence of any further development on site (which is acknowledged in the committee report) and a further 10 years of uninterrupted encroachment of nature on the site, it is difficult to comprehend how such a decision has been reversed

**KEY ISSUES**

**Education**

Given that up to 20 units of accommodation are to be provided on the site, the views from Education are based on a total of 20 units. The proposed development will generate a total of 4 primary aged pupils and 3 secondary aged pupils.

Capacity has been considered in the local primary schools (i.e. those within 2 miles) and the local secondary schools (i.e. those within 3 miles), and forecasts indicate that there will be insufficient capacity in the local primary and secondary schools to accommodate the pupils generated by the development. Therefore, in the event that the application is approved, a sum

of £43,385 would be required for primary education and a sum of £49,028 would be required for secondary education towards accommodation for the pupils generated.

### **Response to representations**

Paragraph 25 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) states that, *“...if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission”*. With regard to the comments received in representation it is acknowledged that the current application is for a permanent permission, and not a temporary one.

However, paragraph 8 of the PPTS requires local planning authorities to set *“plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area”*. Paragraph 9 also requires local planning authorities, in producing their local plan, to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against their locally set targets. The Council do not currently have an adopted policy that is based on an accurate assessment of need and which identifies a 5 year supply of deliverable sites. Paragraph 14 of the Framework identifies a presumption in favour of granting planning permission where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. For this reason, the absence of an adopted policy based on an accurate assessment of need does weigh in favour of the application. But this does not outweigh the identified harm in this case.

In addition, paragraph 203 of Framework, requires local planning authorities to consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions. One such condition considered in the original report was for a temporary permission (which would therefore trigger paragraph 25 of the PPTS). However, the imposition of conditions was not considered to make the development acceptable even for a temporary period.

Turning to the matter of previously developed land, the previous Inspector's comments are noted and acknowledged in the original report. However, in order to be excluded from the definition of previously developed land as set out in the Framework, the remains of any permanent structure or fixed surface structure need to have blended into the landscape in the process of time. Following a site inspection, this is not considered to be the case with this site.

### **CONCLUSION**

As in the original report a recommendation of refusal is made.

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2015**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

14/5411N

**LOCATION**

*The Printworks, Crewe Road, Haslington, CW1 5RT..*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

26<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**Flood Risk Manager**

“We have reviewed the proposals and whilst we have no objections in principle on flood risk grounds, we would like to make the following comments.

The applicant is advised to investigate the potential for discharging into the ordinary watercourse to the south of the site. Surface water discharges from the proposed site should mimic existing pre-development Greenfield run-off rates (restricted surface water discharges to apply) and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, priority should be given to the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).

If it is proposed to discharge into the watercourse, it should be noted that any alterations to an ordinary watercourse would be subject to consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 from Cheshire East Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). For further information regarding this, please contact Cheshire East Council’s flood risk management team.”

**Representations**

One further representation has been received from a Winterley resident. This expresses concerns about the following:

- Difficult for Officers to defend the appeal while supporting this application
- Too much importance placed on the lack of a 5 year supply of housing land.
- The settlement boundary should not be ‘flexed’ through the development control process, but should be dealt with through the emerging local plan
- The gap between Haslington and Winterley would be ‘nibbled’ away at

- 'Flexing' the settlement boundary will create 'open season' for more development applications

### **Recommendation**

Condition 10, included in the main report covers the drainage issues, therefore there is no change to the recommendation in the report.

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2015**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

14/4588N

**LOCATION**

*Land to rear of 144 Audlem Road, Nantwich.*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

26<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**Flood Risk Manager**

“We have reviewed the proposals and can confirm that provided that the appropriate levels can be achieved, we would be happy in principle with the drainage arrangement.”

**Highways**

Additional drawings have been submitted relating to the access and refuse vehicle tracking. A response is awaited from the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and a verbal update will be provided to Committee at the meeting.

**Recommendation**

Condition 10, included in the main report covers the drainage issues; therefore there is no change to the recommendation in the report.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2015**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

14/5044C

**LOCATION**

*Land east of School Lane, Sandbach.*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

26<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**Councillor Corcoran**

Cllr Corcoran submitted an email on 19<sup>th</sup> January, informing Officers that there had been a serious crash over the weekend at the junction of Church Lane and Heath Road. He questioned whether the recommendation should be reviewed or the application withdrawn.

This email was forwarded to the Head of Strategic Infrastructure. His response is set out below.

*“Clearly the junction of Church Lane and Heath Road is a very different prospect to the concern of the Head of Strategic infrastructure regarding the additional private garage court access proposed by the developer for this application to serve a small number of parking spaces.*

*The reason why the HSI objected to this second access on the frontage of this site was primarily with regard to quality of design and the level of place making that could be achieved within the site if the affordable housing element was accessed via the primary access rather than the separate access proposed.*

*It is also desirable to minimise the number of junctions and junction turning movements onto an existing highway in any event however it is my understanding that the LPA have taken the view that the wider planning balance outweighs these ancillary highway concerns.”*

**Representations**

One further representation has been received from Sandbach Heath Neighbourhood Forum. This puts forward the following objections to the proposal:

- Urbanising effect on School Lane

- Fragmented approach to both the houses and traffic management
- Technically and socially divisive
- No obvious community benefit
- Adverse impact on highway safety

**Recommendation**

No change to the recommendation in the report.

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2015**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

14/5281C

**LOCATION**

*Land adjacent 6 Heath End Road, Alsager.*

**UPDATE PREPARED**

26<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**Highways**

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure has no objections, but recommends inclusion of an informative relating to the vehicular crossing with the public highway.

**Recommendation**

No change to the recommendation in the report.

Include the following informative on the decision notice:

**Informative:-** Prior to first development the developer will enter into and sign a Section 184 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980 and provide a new vehicular crossing over the adopted footpath/verge in accordance with Cheshire East Council specification. The developer should contact: [CEHSouth@cheshireeasthighways.org](mailto:CEHSouth@cheshireeasthighways.org)

This page is intentionally left blank