Public Document Pack



Northern Planning Committee Update

Date: Wednesday, 4th February, 2015

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.

Planning Update (Pages 1 - 4)



NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE - 4 February 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

14/3884M

LOCATION

Land off Rotherwood Road, Wilmslow

UPDATE PREPARED

2 February 2015

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

Jones developed the houses on the south side of Springfield Drive many years ago and retained the land on the north which is now subject to this application. Springfield Drive is an adopted highway, and therefore it must take access from another public highway – Rotherwood Road. Jones will have rights of way over both Rotherwood Road, between Moor Lane and Springfield Drive, and Springfield Drive itself by virtue of them being public highways whether or not the deeds also grant rights of way. Jones are therefore able to access the land held for development over the public highway. The fact that part is not recorded as maintained at public expense does not affect the public rights.

Whilst the application currently shows access off Rotherwood Road, as the proposal is in outline with all matters reserved, if the Rotherwood Road access point does prove to be an issue, this could be moved to Springfield Drive in a subsequent reserved matters application.

REPRESENTATIONS

130 further letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- · Impact on wildlife
- Increased noise pollution
- Increased traffic
- Visual impact
- Impact on health and education facilities
- Impact on highway safety
- Loss of openness
- Increased flooding
- No need for more new houses
- Impact upon popular restricted byway

- Vibrations from piling
- Loss of trees
- Brownfield sites available
- Land is subsiding
- Developer has no right of access
- No very special circumstances
- Impact on Lindow Moss
- Lack of consultation from developer
- Encroachment into Green Belt in a sensitive location

CONSULTATIONS

Flood Risk Manager – No objections subject to conditions relating to disposal of surface water and drainage

Cheshire East Local Access Forum – Upgrading the Restricted Byway on Rotherwood Road would be in complete contradiction to the stated intention, and its effect would be to destroy several circular routes and reduce even further the amount of Restricted Byways in the Cheshire East area Strategic Highways Manager – Concerns are raised with regard to the unsuitability of the access, and the lack of appropriate ownership to carry out any improvements.

Wilmslow Town Council – Recommend refusal on the grounds that, with no exceptional circumstances, this is inappropriate development in the Greenbelt; access concerns are not satisfactorily addressed; the Ecological Survey lacks adequate detail; and that this development pre-empts the outcome of the Local Plan.

KEY ISSUES

Flood Risk

According to the Environment Agency (EA) surface water flood risk maps, the lower lying parts of the site may be at risk from surface water flooding. Appropriate measures will need to be incorporated in the development proposals to ensure this risk can be suitably mitigated. The site is located in an area with known drainage issues and based on the information provided in Section 6 of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment there are concerns over how the site may be drained in the future. This will need to be addressed the developer within the reserved matters application. The Flood Risk Manager raises no objections subject to conditions relating to surface water management and drainage.

Highways

For the avoidance of doubt, the Strategic Highways Manager does not raise any objections to the proposal on traffic generation or road safety grounds. However, the proposal will involve the use of a currently unsuitable access over Rotherwood Road, and in the absence of any assurance that improvement works can be carried out on this road (as it appears that

Rotherwood Road is owned by a third party), the development would not have an acceptable access.

Other matters

With regard to the additional comments received in representation, these largely reflect the comments that were summarised and considered within the original report.

The matter of the holding objection from the Public Rights of Way team is still being investigated with the applicant, and will be reported as a verbal update.

CONCLUSION

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

