



Northern Planning Committee

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 4th March, 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 Updates (Pages 1 - 6)

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462
E-Mail: 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

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 04 MARCH 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 14/5148M

**LOCATION: 1, SCOTT ROAD, PRESTBURY, CHESHIRE,
SK10 4DN**

UPDATE PREPARED 2nd March 2015

ISSUES

Councillors are made aware, for the avoidance of doubt, that the proposed rear of the property is fronting 'Springfields', with the main non-vehicular entrance to the property on the opposite side.

The proposed development would lie circa 12m from the rear boundary of the site.

A revised street scene plan has been submitted to reflect the changes to the design of the proposed development and to show it in context with the recently approved development on the adjoining site (which has not been built as yet).

The Officer's recommendation remains of one for approval, subject to conditions.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 4th March 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

14/5635M

LOCATION

Cheshire Windows and Glass, Armitt Street, Macclesfield SK11 6SD

UPDATE PREPARED

02 March 2015

CONSULTATIONS

A consultation response has been received from the Strategic Highways Manager.

This is an outline application with only access to be determined at this stage although internal layout details have been provided and also indicative details for the car parking provision.

This site is an existing industrial site that is located in a predominately residential area and is close to the town centre and local services. As this site has an industrial use there is an existing traffic generation associated with it and when compared to the 10 unit residential scheme, the additional trip movements do not have a significant traffic impact.

There is a main access onto Hatton Street and also access to 2 car parking spaces off Armitt Street, both these access locations can provide the necessary visibility splays and as regards to access, which is the subject of this application there are no objections.

There is a 150% provision of car parking on the site and given the accessible location, the Strategic Highways Manager accepts this level of provision on the site, although this matter is not being determined at this stage.

In summary there are no objections to the proposed access points subject to conditions.

REPORT

For clarification, this application is for 10 dwellings with all matters apart from access reserved.

The comments from the Strategic Highways Manager are noted, and it considered appropriate to add a condition with regards to visibility splays to ensure that the access to the site is safe.

CONCLUSION

The views of the Strategic Highways Manager are noted and clarity has been provided on the matter of highway safety.

The recommendation remains as per the main agenda report as approval subject to conditions.

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 4 March 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

13/4995M

LOCATION

Land off, Brook Lane, Alderley Edge

UPDATE PREPARED

2 March 2015

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

The applicant has responded to the Committee report noting that:

- The Design Officers comments were not included.
- Photomontages were provided, and trust you can incorporate these images
- As the Government have effectively removed the CSH from the planning system and only increased building regulations by c. 6% last year it is extremely unlikely that Carbon Neutral will be achieved next year. We think these comments are disingenuous and give the committee members false information.
- The report makes no reference to Cheshire East's own reports stating that Green Belt land will have to be built on to address the housing shortage – this gives members a distorted view of what is likely to happen in the future.
- The figures relating to footprint are a little disingenuous and in correct – the internal floor area is c. 900 sqm.

KEY ISSUES

The applicant's comments are addressed in turn below.

Design officer comments

The design officer's comments were incorporated into the original report, however further comments are provided below:

The design officer notes that if the dwelling was visible within the street scene it would likely be out of context with surrounding houses and would be considered poor design under policy BE1. The local context is varied, however, buildings are generally traditional in form, over two storeys with a much smaller footprint and sited comfortably within the landscape. The fact the building isn't visible doesn't really relieve this fact any. The artificial landscaping and landscape screening is testament to the inappropriateness of

development here. The summary document states “blends seamlessly into the landscape” however, to get the building to sit within the landscaping as proposed, the site will be excavated and re-contoured. The full visual appearance of this onto Brook lane hasn’t been provided. The design seems to be driven by making the dwelling invisible to reduce the impacts on the Green Belt; however, in order to do this the site is having to compromise and change.

From the evidence provided it would appear that there may be glimpses of the building, especially at night and during the winter months when the perimeter planting is not in leaf. There will be elements which would give physical evidence of a development being present on the site, and it would still be a substantial development in the Green Belt, despite high levels of screening.

Achieving level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes is a benefit of the proposal, and the application explains how the proposal will reach this standard. Whilst this is a good starting point, all houses will need to reach this level by 2016 so this tempers the weight that can be afforded to this.

The single level and compatibility for disabled access is clearly a very positive factor and will allow the dwelling to be used by all. However, the layout doesn’t appear to promote seamless family living, with all the accommodation being sited to one part of the house and living accommodation to the other, it appears quite disjointed.

Code for sustainable homes

With regard to the other comments from the applicant, it is accepted that the Government are looking to rationalize the range of technical standards that can currently apply to new housing. This may well include the transition in delivering zero carbon homes policy through the Building Regulations, rather than the code for sustainable homes. However, in the absence of any other timescales for this the Government’s intention that zero carbon homes will be required by 2016 must be taken at face value.

Housing land supply and Green Belt sites

It is acknowledged that there may ultimately be a requirement for Green belt land to be used to meet housing requirements. However, any such sites should be allocated through the strategic local plan process, rather than on an adhoc basis through the consideration of separate planning applications. Furthermore, the sensitivity of this particular section of Green Belt is highlighted in the original report.

Floor area

The internal floor area figure put forward by the applicant is noted; however, the original report refers to the footprint of the building, not the internal floor area, which is not considered to be misleading.

CONCLUSION

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