

Southern Planning Committee

Agenda

Date: Wednesday, 26th May, 2021
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: The Assembly Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

Members of the public are requested to check the Council's website the week the Southern Planning Committee meeting is due to take place as Officers produce updates for some or all of the applications prior to the commencement of the meeting and after the agenda has been published.

The agenda is divided into 2 parts. Part 1 is taken in the presence of the public and press. Part 2 items will be considered in the absence of the public and press for the reasons indicated on the agenda and at the top of each report.

It should be noted that Part 1 items of Cheshire East Council decision meetings are audio recorded and the recordings are uploaded to the Council's website.

PLEASE NOTE-The meeting is open to the public but due to social distancing restrictions public attendance is limited and priority will be given to those people wishing to speak at the meeting with the remaining availability being allocated on a first to arrive basis. Masks will need to be worn by anyone entering or leaving the venue but not whilst seated.

PART 1 – MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS PRESENT

1. **Apologies for Absence**

To receive apologies for absence.

2. **Declarations of Interest/Pre Determination**

To provide an opportunity for Members and Officers to declare any disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests and for Members to declare if they have pre-determined any item on the agenda.

3. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** (Pages 3 - 6)

Please contact Helen Davies on 01270 685705

E-Mail: helen.davies@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies or requests for further information

Speakingatplanning@cheshireeast.gov.uk to arrange to speak at the meeting

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2021.

4. **Public Speaking**

A total period of 5 minutes is allocated for each of the planning applications for the following:

- Ward Councillors who are not members of the Planning Committee
- The relevant Town/Parish Council

A total period of 3 minutes is allocated for each of the planning applications for the following:

- Members who are not members of the planning committee and are not the Ward Member
- Objectors
- Supporters
- Applicants

5. **20/4673C Land at BROOKHOUSE ROAD, SANDBACH, Demolition of an existing dwelling and erection of Class E(a), E(b), E(c), sui generis units and 14 residential units, associated access, car parking and landscaping (resubmission of application 19/5010C) for Mr C R Muller, Muller Property Group (Pages 7 - 24)**

To consider the above application.

6. **20/5014N FORMER AGRICULTURAL UNIT WRENBURY HALL FARM, WRENBURY HALL DRIVE, WRENBURY, CW5 8EJ Retrospective change of use of land and agricultural building for Premier Development (Pages 25 - 34)**

To consider the above application.

7. **Appeals Report (Pages 35 - 54)**

To consider the above report.

THERE ARE NO PART 2 ITEMS

Membership: Councillors S Akers Smith (Vice-Chair), M Benson, P Butterill, S Davies, K Flavell, A Gage, A Kolker (Chair), D Marren, Naismith, J Rhodes, L Smith and J Wray

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Southern Planning Committee**
held on Wednesday, 31st March, 2021 at Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

PRESENT

Councillor J Wray (Chairman)
Councillor S Akers Smith (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors M Benson, J Bratherton, P Butterill, S Davies, K Flavell, A Gage,
D Marren, D Murphy, J Rhodes and L Smith

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mr. Daniel Evans- Principal Planning Officer
Mr. James Thomas- Solicitor
Mr. Andrew Goligher- Highways Officer
Miss Helen Davies- Democratic Services

LINKS TO MEETING RECORDINGS

Start-part way through Application 20/5479C:
<https://www.youtube.com/embed/9rjA7iyVHtk>

Part way through application 20/5479C- Continued to End:
<https://www.youtube.com/embed/GFYZyjEplcM>

55 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/PRE DETERMINATION

It was noted all Members received email correspondence in respect of application 20/4113N.

In the interests of Openness and Transparency, Councillor Kathryn Flavell declared an interest as the Portfolio Holder for Children and Families in respect of application 20/5479C.

56 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the virtual meeting held on 03 March 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

57 PUBLIC SPEAKING

RESOLVED:

That the public speaking procedure be noted.

58 20/4113N LAND AT, GRESTDY ROAD, SHAVINGTON, CREWE, FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW CARE-HOME FACILITY INCLUDING ACCESS, ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND INFRASTRUCTURE, FOR ANDREW BADDELEY, LIBERTY CARE DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Consideration was given to the above application.

(Mr. Andrew Baddeley, Managing Director of Liberty Care Developments and the Applicant attended the virtual meeting and spoke in respect of the application).

(It was requested that it be minuted that Councillor L Smith had concerns about the parking aspect of the application).

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the report the application be Delegated to the Head of Planning, and in consultation with the Chair of Southern Planning Committee resolve any significantly new issues arising from the extended consultation period; APPROVE subject to completion of a S106 Agreement and the following conditions.

S106	Amount	Triggers
Health	£25,920	50% prior to first occupation 50% prior to occupation of the 51st unit
Ecology	£14,268	On commencement of Development

- 1) Commencement of development (3 years)
- 2) Development in accordance with approved plans
- 3) Details of materials and finishes
- 4) Provision of Electric Vehicle infrastructure
- 5) Provision of Ultra Low Emission Boilers
- 6) Contaminated land – submission of updated phase 2 report prior to commencement of development
- 7) Contaminated land – submission of a verification report
- 8) Contaminated land – works to stop if any unexpected contamination is discovered on site
- 9) Contaminated land imported soil
- 10) Implementation of noise mitigation
- 11) Implementation of the landscaping scheme
- 12) Details of boundary treatment
- 13) Tree Protection
- 14) Submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Management Plan
- 15) Details for closure of existing access and footway reinstatement
- 16) Details of covered cycle storage and provision before first occupation
- 17) Design details of Bin Stores and provision before first occupation
- 18) Foul and surface water drainage to be connected on separate systems
- 19) Scheme of surface water drainage to be submitted, approved and implemented

- 20) Amended plan to be submitted to provide internal access/layout to a minimum of 5m width

In order to give proper effect to the Board's/Committee's intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation) in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice

59 20/5783C LAND ADJACENT TO 51, MAIN ROAD, GOOSTREY, CW4 8LH, ERECTION OF 2 OFFICE (USE CLASS B1) BUILDINGS WITH ASSOCIATED SERVICING AND CARPARKING, FOR M HENDERSON, HENDERSON HOMES

Consideration was given to the above application.

(Dane Valley Ward Councillor Andrew Kolker, Clerk to Goostry Parish Council, Ken Morris and Consultant for the Applicant Ivor Smits attended the virtual meeting and spoke in respect of the application).

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the report the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed development is for a new office development that would impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescopes which is a World Heritage Site. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy PS10 of the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Page 39 Review 2005, Policy SE14 of the CELPS and Policies SC2 and EB2 of the Goostrey Parish Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2) The proposed development is not an appropriate form of development in the open countryside as per Policy PG6 nor does not fall within any of the exceptions listed in this policy and thus constitutes an unwarranted form of development in the open countryside.
This would result in an urban encroachment into the open countryside which would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary to Policies PG6 (Open Countryside), EG1 (Economic Prosperity) and EG2 (Rural Economy) of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to ensure development is directed to the right location and open countryside is protected from inappropriate development.
- 3) There is tree/hedgerow cover on and adjoining the site (including a tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order). The application does not include an arboricultural impact assessment/ topographic survey. In this respect the submission does not accord with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations. Based on the information provided it is not possible to determine whether the proposed development could be accommodated on site whilst retaining the trees and hedgerows. There is insufficient information contained within this application and proposed development would not comply with Policy SE 5 of the CELPS and VDLC3 of the GNP.

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 Planning (Regulation), in consultation with the Chair (or in his absence the Vice Chair) of Southern Planning Committee, to correct any technical slip or omission in the wording of the resolution, between approval of the minutes and issue of the decision notice

60 20/5479C, PARTIAL CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL TO A MIXED USE FOR RESIDENTIAL AND CHILDCARE ON DOMESTIC PREMISES (RE-SUBMISSION OF PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 20/2742C), FOR MRS FODEN

Consideration was given to the above application.

(Dane Valley Ward Councillor Les Gilbert, Local Resident Barbara Smith and Agent for the Application Victoria Wood attended the virtual meeting and spoke in respect of the application).

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

The proposed use would cause unacceptable levels of noise, disturbance and on-street parking to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties. The approval of the development would therefore be contrary to the national planning policy guidance, CELPS Policies SD2, SE1, SE2 & CO2; CBLP Policies GR6 & GR17 and Holmes Chapel Neighbourhood Plan Policies TT1, TT3 and CW4 insofar as these policies strive to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

(This decision was contrary to the officers recommendation of approval).

(During consideration of the application, Councillor Jill Rhodes lost connection and therefore did not vote on the application).

61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and concluded at 1.28 pm

Councillor J Wray (Chairman)

Application No: 20/4673C

Location: Land at BROOKHOUSE ROAD, SANDBACH

Proposal: Demolition of an existing dwelling and erection of Class E(a), E(b), E(c), sui generis units and 14 residential units, associated access, car parking and landscaping (resubmission of application 19/5010C)

Applicant: Mr C R Muller, Muller Property Group

Expiry Date: 05-Mar-2021

Summary

The application site is within the Settlement Zone Line. The proposed development is allocated for retail development under policy DP4 of the CBLP and is supported by Policy HC2 of the SNP. The principle of the residential element of the scheme also complies with Policies PG2, EG5 and SE2 of the CELPS and HC2, PC3 and H1 of the SNP

The highways implications of the development are considered to be acceptable. The proposed development would comply with Policies SD1, SD2, CO1 (subject to additional cycle parking provision) and CO2 of the CELPS, Policies GR9, GR10 and GR13 of the CLP and Policies H5 and JLE1 of the SNP.

The amenity implications of the proposed development, including noise, air quality and contaminated land are considered to be acceptable and would comply with GR6 and GR7 of the CLP and SE12 of the CELPS. On balance it is not considered that the harm caused to the first floor flat at 43 High Street could be sustained as a reason for refusal.

There are existing trees within the vicinity of the proposed development. Trees on the periphery of the site are visible to the public and make a contribution to visual amenity. Given the site allocation of the site it is accepted that there will be tree losses as part of the proposed development although there is some harm which weighs against the proposal.

The impact upon protected species and ecology is considered to be acceptable. However it is acknowledged that the development would not provide a biodiversity net gain in accordance with policy SE3 of the CELPS.

The drainage and flood risk implications of the proposed development are considered to be acceptable and the development complies with Policy CE 13 of the CELPS.

The proposed development would not impact upon the adjacent PROW which would be retained. The development would comply with Policies CO1 of the CELPS, Policy GR16 of the CBLP, Policies PC5 and JLE1 of the SNP.

The impact of the development upon archaeology, infrastructure (education and health) and the affordable housing provision is acceptable.

The development of the site would have some employment benefits as identified above and this does attract some weight.

The proposed development fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area. It is acknowledged that the design of the proposed development has been improved since the earlier refusal. The development would result in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets and fails to have special regard to preserving or enhancing the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. The benefits do not outweigh this harm and the application is contrary to Policies SE1, SE2 and SE7 of the CELPS, Policies H2 and HC1 of the SNP and guidance contained within the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

PROPOSAL

This is a full planning application for the demolition of an existing dwelling known as 'The Croft' and the erection of a mixed-use scheme. The mixed-use scheme would consist of a three-storey building containing six ground floor commercial units (Classes E(a) Retail, E(b) restaurant/cafe and E (c) professional/financial services) with 14 two bedroom apartments above. Access and servicing would be taken from Brookhouse Road. The development includes the provision of 14 car parking spaces.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site extends to 2,024sqm. The site located within the Sandbach Settlement Boundary, the Sandbach Conservation Area and the Sandbach Area of Archaeological Potential as defined by the Congleton Borough Local Plan.

To the north of the site are numerous listed buildings which front High Street. The majority are Grade II but St Mary's Church is Grade II* and the Old Hall Hotel is Grade I.

The majority of the site forms part of allocation DP4(S1) of the Congleton Local Plan.

The site comprises 'The Croft', its residential curtilage and adjacent land including a number of trees. To the south of the site is the Waitrose Supermarket and its associated car park.

PROW Sandbach FP43 runs along the Brookhouse Road frontage of the site.

RELEVANT HISTORY

19/5010C - Full planning application for the relevant demolition of existing dwelling in a Conservation Area and erection of Class A1, A2, A3 and A5 units and 14 residential units,

associated access, car parking and landscaping – Refused 5th February 2020 for the following reason;

The proposed development would be at the higher end of less than substantial harm and fails to conserve or enhance the Conservation Area or surrounding Listed Buildings. The benefits of this scheme would not outweigh the identified harm. The proposed development fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and is contrary to Policies SD1, SD2, SE1, SE2 and SE7 of the CELPS, Policies BH4 and BH9 of the Congleton Borough Local Plan, Policies H2 and HC1 of the SNP and guidance contained within the NPPF.

POLICIES

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS)

MP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
PG1 – Overall Development Strategy
PG2 – Settlement Hierarchy
PG7 – Spatial Distribution of Development
SD1 - Sustainable Development in Cheshire East
SD2 - Sustainable Development Principles
SE 1 – Design
SE 2 - Efficient Use of Land
SE 3 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity
SE 4 – The Landscape
SE 5 – Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
SE 6 – Green Infrastructure
SE 7 – The Historic Environment
SE 9 – Energy Efficient Development
SE 12 – Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability
SE 13 - Flood Risk and Water Management
EG5 – Promoting a Town Centre First Approach to Retail and Commerce
IN1 – Infrastructure
IN2 – Developer Contributions
SC4 – Residential Mix
SC5 – Affordable Homes
CO1 – Sustainable Travel and transport
CO2 – Enabling Growth Through transport Infrastructure
CO4 – Travel Plans and Transport Assessments

Congleton Borough Local Plan (saved Policies)

DP4(S1) – Retail Sites
PS4 – Towns
GR6 – Amenity and Health
GR7 – Amenity and Health
GR9 - Accessibility, servicing and provision of parking
GR10 - Accessibility, servicing and provision of parking
GR13 – Public Transport Measures

GR14 - Cycling Measures
GR15 - Pedestrian Measures
GR16 - Footpaths Bridleway and Cycleway Networks
GR17 - Car parking
GR18 - Traffic Generation
NR3 – Habitats
NR4 - Non-statutory sites
NR5 – Non-statutory sites
BH4-BH5 – Listed Buildings
BH8-BH10 – Conservation Areas

Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan (SNP)

The Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan was made on 12th April 2016.

PC2 – Landscape Character
PC3 – Policy Boundary for Sandbach
PC4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
HC1 – Historic Environment
HC2 – Protection and Enhancement of the Town Centre
H1 – Housing Growth
H2 – Housing Layout
H3 – Housing Mix and Type
H4 – Housing and an Ageing Population
H5 – Preferred Locations
JLE1 – Future Employment and Retail Provision
IFT1 – Sustainable Transport, Safety and Accessibility
IFT2 – Parking
IFC1 – Community Infrastructure Levy
CC1 – Adapting to Climate Change

National Policy:

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Of particular relevance are paragraphs:

11 Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

50. Wide choice of quality homes

85-90 Ensuring the vitality of town centres

102-107 Promoting sustainable transport

124-132 Requiring good design

184-202 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

CONSULTATIONS:

Cheshire Archaeology: Condition suggested.

United Utilities: A public sewer crosses this site and UU may not permit building over it. UU will require an access strip width of six metres, three metres either side of the centre line of the sewer

which is in accordance with the minimum distances specified in the current issue of "Sewers for Adoption", for maintenance or replacement.

No objection condition suggested.

CEC Education: A contribution of £32,685 is required towards secondary education. There is no requirement for contributions towards primary education or SEN.

CEC Housing: This is a proposed development of 14 Residential dwellings with a site size of 0.2 Hectares. Therefore, the triggers to provide Affordable Housing have not been met. No objection.

Cadent Gas: No comments received.

Cheshire Police: Raise the following concerns;

- Low walled planters and front boundary wall will encourage informal seating and potentially create anti-social behaviour
- The parking is located away from residential entrances. There is no detail concerning lighting and CCTV. There will need to be measures to prohibit non-residents parking.
- Concern over the width of the fire access
- Concerns over the location of the bin store
- Concern over delivery vehicle provision and the safety of pedestrians
- Concern over the access to retail unit 3 which encourages access to the rear of High Street which has no lighting and poor surfacing
- The main residential access should be via video controlled intercom
- Cycle storage should be covered and overlooked. There are few active windows facing the cycle store

Historic England: Do not wish to offer any comments.

CEC Environmental Health: Conditions suggested in relation to lighting, travel plan, electric vehicle charging, low emissions boilers and contaminated land. Informatives also suggested.

CEC PROW: Informatives suggested.

CEC Head of Strategic Infrastructure: No objection. Condition suggested.

CEC Flood Risk Manager: Condition and an informative are suggested.

VIEWS OF THE TOWN COUNCIL:

Sandbach Town Council: The Town Council object to this application for the following reasons;

- The Town Council are unable to see any substantial material changes from the previous application that address any previous concerns.
- There is no urgent requirement for more Town Centre apartments with several other similar developments underway in the Town Centre.
- Sandbach has already identified more than its required allocation of residential development for the period of the Local Plan.

- The design of this application means the massing of buildings will cut off existing views of St Marys Church. This will not contribute towards the Heritage and Character or the Conservation area of Sandbach.
- There is also no need for additional shops units. There are currently existing vacant shop units in the Town Centre, with nothing to suggest that there is a demand for more.
- There doesn't appear to be adequate parking for customers or shop staff within this development, as well as only limited parking for potentially 54 residents and their visitors.
- This application has the potential to have a significant negative impact on Sandbach.
- As a result of the above, this application is in contravention of Planning Policies HC1, H2 and H3 of the Sandbach Neighbourhood Development Plan.

REPRESENTATIONS:

Letters of objection have been received from 17 local households which raise the following points;

- Sandbach is a thriving market town and development outside the town centre could devastate the town centre
- All that is proposed is already available within Sandbach
- Road infrastructure in Sandbach is at capacity
- Increased air pollution
- There is little difference to the refused application 19/5010C
- Loss of views to St Mary's Church
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Unclear what uses are being proposed
- Conflict with the neighbourhood plan
- Any bar or similar use will cause noise to the future occupants of the apartments
- The development is not in keeping with the Conservation Area
- The development will cause a shift away from the historic town centre
- Not enough parking is proposed
- Increased traffic
- There is too much new housing in Sandbach
- Impact upon local amenities – healthcare and schools
- Sandbach is at capacity
- Lack of parking in Sandbach Town Centre
- Divert footfall away from the High Street which would harm existing businesses
- There are vacant units within Sandbach Town Centre
- Pedestrian safety
- Traffic problems within Sandbach when there is an accident on the M6
- Loss of habitat
- Pollution of watercourse
- Poor design
- The application has been designed to maximise the profits of the developer
- Bland and boxy design is not in-keeping with the area

Letters of support have been received from 3 local households which raise the following points;

- More local businesses is a good thing
- The development extends the town centre
- The development fits in with the aesthetic of the town
- There is a national shortage of homes
- Support the local economy

A representation has been received from Cycling UK which makes the following points;

- Pleased that 16 cycle spaces are proposed but the two-tier cycle parking is difficult to use
- Concern that there is not adequate space for the cycle parking
- Concern that the cycle parking would not be visible
- It is not clear if the cycle storage could meet equality objectives
- There should be cycle parking for the retail units
- Off-site contributions should be secured for a Toucan crossing at Old Mill Road/Flat Lane, with the removal of the staggered barriers.

APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

Retail

The majority of the site forms part is allocated as part of Policy DP4(S1) of the Congleton Local Plan (a small part of the access onto High Street is outside the allocation). Policy DP4 states that the site is suitable for the development of retail uses. The principle of the proposed A1, A2, A3 and A5 at ground floor level is acceptable.

The site adjoins Principal Shopping Area as defined by Policy S4 of the Congleton Local Plan.

Policy EG5 of the CELPS identifies that the in the Key Service Centres, there will be a focus on the improvement of the convenience and comparison retail offer, with the potential to strengthen and enhance the retail offer, where suitable, as well as diversification to other uses such as offices, services, leisure, cultural and residential, as appropriate.

In terms of the Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) the site falls outside the Principal Shopping Area but within the Town Centre Boundary. Policy HC2 identifies that proposals for commercial, office, tourism, cultural, residential and retail (including A5 hot food takeaway) uses will be supported within the Town Centre.

As the site is in accordance with an up-to-date planning policy then there is no requirement for a sequential test or an impact assessment (required by the NPPF).

The principle of retail development on this site complies with the NPPF and Local and Neighbourhood Policies.

Housing

The site is located within the settlement boundary for Sandbach (a Key Service Centre). Policy PG2 states that in the key service centres *'development of a scale, location and nature that recognises and reinforces the distinctiveness of each individual town will be supported to maintain their vitality and viability'*.

As a windfall site Policy SE2 states that development should;

- Consider the landscape and townscape character of the surrounding area when determining the character and density of development

- Build upon existing concentrations of activities and existing infrastructure
- Not require major investment in new infrastructure
- Consider the consequences of the proposal for sustainable development having regard to Policies SD1 and SD2

Paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should amongst other things *'support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes'*.

Policy EG5 states that *'the use of upper floors in town and other centres for non-retail uses will be supported, where appropriate'*. This is then repeated in Policy HC2 of the SNP which states that the use of upper floors for residential use will be permitted in the Town Centre where appropriate.

In addition to the above Policy PC3 of the SNP states that new development involving housing development will be supported in principle within the policy boundary for Sandbach. Policy H1 states that future housing growth will be delivered through existing commitments, sites identified in the CELPS and windfalls.

The principle of the residential element of the scheme complies with National, Local and Neighbourhood Policies.

Employment Generation

Policy SD1 of the CELPS states that development should wherever possible create a *'strong, responsive and competitive economy for Cheshire East'* and *'prioritise investment and growth within Principal Towns and Key Service Centres'*.

The application forms identify that the proposed development would create 40 full-time and 30 part-time employees. This needs to be weighed in the planning balance.

Highways Implications

The site is accessed from Brookhouse Road and there is a separate service delivery area and residential car park access proposed alongside the site. Brookhouse Road provides access to the Waitrose car park and Sandbach post office, it has an existing footway on the development side of Brookhouse Road.

The applicant has submitted trip generations for the level of peak hour flows arising from both the commercial and residential elements of the scheme. The levels of traffic generation from the scheme are low in the peak hours and although there is traffic congestion at the nearby A533/A534 roundabout the actual impact from these proposals will be very small and cannot be deemed a severe impact. Additionally, a high percentage of the trips associated with the retail element are trips that are already using the local road network and thereby reducing the impact further.

The 14 residential car parking spaces provided are slightly below CEC standards that require two spaces per apartment. However, this is a town centre location and there are existing parking

restrictions along the entire length of Brookhouse Road. As a result, the level of car parking is considered to be acceptable.

The submitted plans show that there will be a frontage footpath provided. The Highways Officer has requested that this should be upgraded to a wider 3m path. In this case the proposed footpath would be the same width as that existing and there would be no benefit to increasing the width to the frontage of the development only.

The proposed development will not have a material impact on the local road network and no objections are raised. The proposal is deemed to adhere with Policy GR9 of the CBLP, Policy SD1 of the CELPS and Policy IFT1 of the SNP with regards to highways matters.

Cycle Provision

The proposed plans show that the development would have cycle storage provision for the residential part of the scheme. However, this provision is below the standards contained within the CELPS which requires 1 space per apartment.

The comments from Cycling UK are noted and a condition could be imposed to secure an acceptable cycle parking provision to serve both the residential and retail elements of the scheme.

The comment made in relation to the upgrade of the pedestrian crossing at Flag Lane/Old Mill Road to a Toucan Crossing is noted. However, as there is no cycle route in this area there is no need for this upgrade.

Cycling UK have also requested that the staggered barriers on FP21 (Flag Lane) be removed. In response the Highways Officer has stated that these were added for safety purposes to stop cyclists/pedestrians running out onto Old Mill Road. As a result, these staggered barriers should be retained.

Amenity

The site is located within the Sandbach Town Centre and is largely surrounded by commercial premises. The nearest residential properties affected by this development are as follows;

- First floor flat at 43 High Street
- Bungalow at the rear of 49-51 High Street

All other properties affected by the development are in commercial use.

In this case the Congleton Borough SPG requires the following separation distances:

- 21.3 metres between principal elevations
- 13.8 metres between a non-principal and principal elevations

It should also be noted that the recently adopted Cheshire East Design Guide SPD also includes reference to separation distances and states that separation distances should be seen as a guide rather than a hard and fast rule. Figure 11:13 of the Design Guide identifies the following separation distances;

- 21 metres for typical rear separation distance
- 18 metres for typical frontage separation distance
- 12 metres for reduced frontage separation distance (minimum)

The first floor flat at 43 High Street has one window to its rear elevation facing the site. The property also has two windows to its side elevation and one window to the front elevation (all of which would be unaffected).

A Rightmove listing for the flat from 2019 shows that the window to the rear elevation serves a living room. The proposed development would have a separation distance of 17.1m from the rear window of this flat. The proposed development would have 13 windows at first floor (6 x bedroom, 3 x living room including 2 balconies, 1 x staircase, 1 x landing and 1 x store room) and 13 windows at second floor (3 x living rooms and 7 x bedrooms, 1 x staircase, 1 x landing and 1 x store room). It should be noted that some of the proposed windows would be set at an angle and would be obscured by the existing rear extension at 43 High Street. It is acknowledged that there would be some impact upon this first floor flat due to the proximity of this development and the resultant over-bearing and privacy impacts. However, given the existing tight urban grain in the centre of Sandbach it is not considered that this harm could be used as a reason for refusal.

The bungalow at the rear of 49-51 High Street has a rear elevation with four windows facing the site. The small private amenity space to this bungalow is located to the north and would not be affected. The proposed development would have a separation distance of 28m to the bungalow and the relationship is considered to be acceptable.

Noise

Concern has been raised in relation to noise from the ground floor units. A condition could be imposed to secure a scheme for acoustic enclosures of any fans and details of any ventilation and extraction equipment are submitted to the LPA for approval in writing.

In terms of the external seating areas proposed there are similar seating areas at the rear of 45 High Street and The George Hotel (39 High Street). There is no objection to these subject to the imposition of a planning condition to state that they should not be used any later than 21:00.

Air Quality

Policy SE12 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to ensure all development is located and designed so as not to result in a harmful or cumulative impact upon air quality. This is in accordance with paragraph 181 of the NPPF and the Government's Air Quality Strategy.

This proposed development is of a small scale, and as such would not require an air quality impact assessment. However, there is a need for the Local Planning Authority to consider the cumulative impact of a large number of developments within Sandbach. In particular, the impact of transport related emissions on local air quality.

Sandbach has two Air Quality Management Areas and, as such, the cumulative impact of developments in the town is likely to make the situation worse, unless managed.

In order to mitigate this proposed development conditions could be imposed in relation to a Travel plan, electric vehicle charging points and low emission boilers.

Contaminated Land

The application includes a Phase 1 Contaminated Land Report. This report does not recommend the submission of a Phase 2 report but does recommend a number of measures to protect future site users and other receptors. At the request of the Councils Contaminated Land Officer conditions could be imposed to mitigate the impact from contaminated land.

Lighting

Light spill from the development has the potential to impact upon the existing and proposed dwellings. The matter of lighting within the site could be controlled via the imposition of a planning condition.

Design/Built Heritage

The site is located within the Sandbach Conservation Area; to the north of the site are numerous listed buildings which front High Street. The majority are Grade II but St Mary's Church is Grade II* and the Old Hall Hotel is Grade I.

The Conservation Area was reviewed in the 2015/16 Character Appraisal and Management Plan, which highlighted the importance of the longer view into the Conservation Area from the south-west across the Waitrose car park towards St Mary's Church.

Proposal 11 of the Conservation Area management proposals seeks to enhance the quality of design for new development in the conservation area, whilst Proposal 12 seeks to protect and enhance views within, out and into the Conservation Area. In respect to both management proposals, this scheme fails to deliver the quality of development necessary to achieve these objectives as explained below.

The Croft is a recent building which has seen a number of extensions within a partly sylvan plot. The character of Brookhouse Road is eroded by the present frontage for part of the site boundary comprising dwarf wall, timber fencing and sporadic landscaping. The Croft has no individual conservation value although the site does contribute to the partial sylvan character on Brookhouse Road.

The Sandbach Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies this area as a potential regeneration area and therefore the principle of regenerating it is an opportunity for enhancement of the Conservation Area.

However, in order to achieve this, the development needs to be of a responsive quality that helps to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the group of listed buildings which line the High Street; and also Grade II* listed St Mary's Church.

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that *'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'*.

Since the refusal of application 19/5010C the design of the development has been amended. The main design amendments relate to the elevations with the removal of four of the projecting gables to the front elevation with the introduction of small flat roofed dormers. The glazing design has also been amended and the large glazed openings which were previously proposed have been replaced with more traditional fenestration (together with header and sill detailing). Brick detailing is now proposed at eaves levels and brick quoins are proposed. An alleyway is now proposed linking High Street and Brookhouse Road.

The rear elevation has been amended in a similar manner and now includes a larger, more prominent gable to the commercial unit when viewed between the gap in the buildings from High Street. It is accepted that the proposed elevational design has improved since the earlier refusal.

However, the scale, mass and height of the proposed development has not altered. The proposed development would be overly dominant and uncharacteristic in this historic context.

The existing view from High Street is of a mixed low-level rear development including shrubs and driveways. This is typical of the rear of burgage plots on historic town centres and as such it is neutral in character. The proposed development would change the views to an open rear service yard with a 2.5 storey tall building appearing very dominant behind. The scale, mass and height of the proposed development would create a visually discordant element when viewed in the context of the group of small scale, vernacular listed buildings on the High Street.

The scale, mass and height of the new development will adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Buildings within the vicinity of the site, especially the view into the Conservation Area from the west focused upon one of the principal heritage assets - St Mary's Church.

Given the height, mass, form and position close to the road, the proposed development would be uncharacteristic in its context in terms of the nearby residential properties and the supermarket which is set back from the road. The proposed development due to the scale, mass and form would dominate the site and Brookhouse Road. Therefore, it would dominate the adjacent Conservation Area and any glimpsed views from Brookhouse Road and across the car park from the A533 Old Mill Road

The grain of the proposed development, comprising a large footprint building, with two larger, subdivided development floorplates with a central linking section is also at odds with the finer grain, more organic character within this part of the Conservation Area. The established small grain development character of this part of the town centre which is an important characteristic of the Conservation Area. This would result in a harmful impact.

Due to the separation distances involved, the intervening landscaping and buildings, it is not considered that the development would have cause harm to the setting of The Old Hall a Grade I Listed Building

The proposed ground floor units could be occupied by A3 or A5 units. However, no details of any extraction systems that may be required have been provided.

The quality of the public realm on the Brookhouse Road is quite severely impacted upon by the provision of the servicing facility at the centre of the frontage and will also be affected by the off-street parking outside the site boundary.

The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets and the NPPF (para 196) identifies that;

'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'

This is consistent with Policy SE7 of the CELPS which requires development proposals that cause harm to a designated heritage asset and its significance, including its setting, to provide a clear and convincing justification as to why that harm is considered acceptable. Where that case cannot be demonstrated, proposals will not be supported. The Policy also allows a consideration of the level of harm in relation to the public benefits that may be gained by the proposal.

Furthermore, Policy HC1 of the SNP states that *'all developments, projects and activities will be expected to protect and where possible enhance designated heritage assets and their settings, maintain local distinctiveness and the character of identified features. Development should respect the historic landscape character and contribute to its conservation, enhancement or the creation of appropriate new features'*.

The development would result in less than substantial harm and this should be weighed against the public benefits of the development.

The proposed development is contrary to Policies SE1 and SE7 of the CELPS, Policy H2 of the SNP and guidance contained within the NPPF.

Archaeology

The application site is located within the Sandbach Area of Archaeological Importance. Previous investigations in the town have not revealed complex or deeply-stratified remains but early ditches, rubbish pits and property boundaries have all been recorded. It is entirely possible that similar remains would be revealed and destroyed during the proposed building works.

The loss of the archaeological deposits within the proposed development area may be mitigated by way of a programme of archaeological observation in order to identify and record any remains archaeological materials on the site. The programme of archaeological mitigation can be controlled through the imposition of a planning condition.

Public Rights of Way

PROW Sandbach 43 runs along the pavement to Brookhouse Road. This would be retained and an informative could be attached to safeguard the PROW. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its PROW impacts.

Landscape

The existing landscape assets have not been assessed or incorporated into the proposed development. The loss of existing soft ground and vegetation is a negative landscape impact which should be avoided. There are important roadside trees providing green infrastructure for the locality now, and there are young trees near the Post Office which do not seem to be recorded in the Applicant's Arboricultural Assessment but which have potential to be important landscape assets for the future.

The concerns raised about the loss of landscaping on the site raised by the Councils Landscape Officer are noted. However, given the site allocation and the policy support for the proposed development it is not considered that the landscape impact could form a reason for refusal. The impact upon built heritage is considered above.

Trees

Policy SE5 of the CELPS states that developments which result in the loss of trees that provide a significant contribution to amenity, landscape character or historic character will only be allowed where there are clear overriding reasons for allowing the development. Where the impacts are unavoidable then development should provide a net environmental gain by mitigation, compensation, or offsetting.

The site is located within the Sandbach Town Centre Conservation Area. There are existing trees within the vicinity of the proposed development. Trees on the periphery of the site are visible to the public and contribute to visual amenity.

The submission is supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment and an Arboricultural Method Statement. The AIA indicates that two individual trees and two groups of trees would be removed to accommodate the development and that one further tree would be removed due to condition. The result being that all the trees within the boundary of the development site would be removed. In this prominent location, the loss of healthy trees would be regrettable - two early mature Oak trees close to the southern boundary which the tree survey affords Grade B with an 80+ year estimated remaining life expectancy. The proposals would only afford limited space for replacement tree planting with the submitted landscape proposals showing 5 ornamental trees.

Ecology

Bats

The trees and buildings on site have some limited potential to support roosting bats. Based on the submitted survey the Councils Ecologist advises that roosting bats are not reasonably likely to be present or affected by the proposed development.

Badgers, Common Toad, Great Crested Newts

These protected/priority species are not reasonable likely to be present or affected by the proposed development.

Nesting Birds

The application site is likely to support low levels of breeding bird activity potentially including more widespread priority species such as House Sparrow. If planning consent is granted conditions could be imposed to safeguard protected species.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Local Plan Policy SE 3(5) requires all developments to aim to positively contribute to the conservation of biodiversity. Whilst the application site supports habitats of relatively limited value, the proposed development would result in a minor net loss of biodiversity. To comply with the Policy SE 3 (5) additional habitat creation proposals either on or off site. In this case no such measures have been provided and this is a failing in this proposed development.

Flood Risk/Drainage

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low probability of flooding). In this case the Councils Flood Risk Manager and United utilities have all been consulted as part of this application and have raised no objection to the proposed development in relation to flood risk/drainage subject to the imposition on planning conditions.

As a result the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its drainage and flood risk implications.

Education

A development of 14 dwellings is expected to generate 3 primary aged children, 2 secondary aged children and no SEN children.

The education department have confirmed that there is capacity within local primary schools to serve this proposed development.

There will be a shortfall within the local secondary schools and on this basis a contribution of £32,685.00 will be required to mitigate the impact of this development upon local secondary provision.

Affordable Housing

This is a proposed development of 14 dwellings within a Key Service Centre and Policy SC5 does not require the provision of affordable housing.

Infrastructure

As a development of 14 residential units the site falls below the threshold for open space and health provision.

CIL Compliance

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 it is necessary for planning applications with planning obligations to consider the issue of whether the requirements within the S106 satisfy the following:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The development would result in increased demand for education provision in Sandbach where there is limited spare capacity. In order to increase capacity of the local schools which would support the proposed development, a contribution towards secondary education is required. This is considered to be necessary and fair and reasonable in relation to the development.

CONCLUSION

The application site is within the Settlement Zone Line. The proposed development is allocated for retail development under policy DP4 of the CBLP and is supported by Policy HC2 of the SNP. The principle of the residential element of the scheme also complies with Policies PG2, EG5 and SE2 of the CELPS and HC2, PC3 and H1 of the SNP

The highways implications of the development are considered to be acceptable. The proposed development would comply with Policies SD1, SD2, CO1 (subject to additional cycle parking provision) and CO2 of the CELPS, Policies GR9, GR10 and GR13 of the CLP and Policies H5 and JLE1 of the SNP.

The amenity implications of the proposed development, including noise, air quality and contaminated land are considered to be acceptable and would comply with GR6 and GR7 of the CLP and SE12 of the CELPS. On balance it is not considered that the harm caused to the first floor flat at 43 High Street could be sustained as a reason for refusal.

There are existing trees within the vicinity of the proposed development. Trees on the periphery of the site are visible to the public and make a contribution to visual amenity. Given the site allocation of the site it is accepted that there will be tree losses as part of the proposed development although there is some harm which weighs against the proposal.

The impact upon protected species and ecology is considered to be acceptable. However it is acknowledged that the development would not provide a biodiversity net gain in accordance with policy SE3 of the CELPS.

The drainage and flood risk implications of the proposed development are considered to be acceptable and the development complies with Policy CE 13 of the CELPS.

The proposed development would not impact upon the adjacent PROW which would be retained. The development would comply with Policies CO1 of the CELPS, Policy GR16 of the CBLP, Policies PC5 and JLE1 of the SNP.

The impact of the development upon archaeology, infrastructure (education and health) and the affordable housing provision is acceptable.

Finally, the development of the site would have some employment benefits as identified above and this does attract some weight.

The proposed development fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area. It is acknowledged that the design of the proposed development has been improved since the earlier refusal. However, the development would result in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets and fails to have special regard to preserving or enhancing the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. The benefits do not outweigh this harm and the application is contrary to Policies SE1, SE2 and SE7 of the CELPS, Policies H2 and HC1 of the SNP and guidance contained within the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE for the following reason;

- 1. The proposed development fails to conserve or enhance the character of the Sandbach Conservation Area or the setting of surrounding Listed Buildings. As such the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to those assets. The benefits of this scheme would not outweigh the identified harm. The proposed development fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and is contrary to Policies SD1, SD2, SE1, SE2 and SE7 of the CELPS, Policies BH4 and BH9 of the Congleton Borough Local Plan, Policies H2 and HC1 of the SNP and guidance contained within the NPPF.**

In order to give proper effect to the Committee`s intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice.

If the application is subject to an appeal approval is given to enter into a S106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms;

S106	Amount	Triggers
Education	Secondary education contribution: £32,685.	Full amount prior to first occupation of any of the residential units.



Application No: 20/5014N

Location: FORMER AGRICULTURAL UNIT WRENBURY HALL FARM,
WRENBURY HALL DRIVE, WRENBURY, CW5 8EJ

Proposal: Retrospective change of use of land and agricultural building

Applicant: Premier Development

Expiry Date: 28-Apr-2021

SUMMARY

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle in terms of being capable for conversion in the open countryside and in the context of layout, scale and design, would not have an adverse impact on existing visual or residential amenities, design, highway safety, ecology, trees or flooding. The proposal is also supported in terms of rural economy and diversification.

The proposed development complies with the Development Plan as a whole and is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE with conditions

REASON FOR REFERRAL

This application is referred to Southern Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Davies for the following reason;

I would like to call this application in as I feel the access to the property is unsuitable for any quantity of vehicles. It is also in close proximity to a youth leisure facility which allows disabled children to have holidays in a quiet countryside location, if this site was approved then this peace and quiet would be gone.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The site and building were in previous agricultural use and are sited in a small cluster of buildings off Wrenbury Hall Drive.

This cluster of buildings consists of a residential property to the east and Wrenbury Hall a wedding venue to the south. There are also some residential properties further to the south off the shared access road, as well as some commercial uses in the form of care home and leisure facility for children.

The applicant also owns the attached building to the west and south which is in connection with a wider commercial and agricultural use.

Vehicular access is taken off Nantwich Road.

The site lies within the open countryside.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks consent retrospectively for the change of use of land and agricultural buildings for mixed use B1 (Light Industrial) & B8 (Warehouse) to create 9 storage units and associated external alterations.

The supporting information advises that present occupants include dog food company, Cheshire Hot Tubs, two joiners and professional car restorer.

The floor area of the units varies from 61.5m² to 63m².

RELEVANT HISTORY

20/4183N – Prior change of use of agricultural building to B1 (Light Industrial) storage (8 storage units) – Withdrawn 19-Oct-2020

P03/0752 – Conversion of Former Farm Buildings to Residential Use – Approved 19-Aug-2003

P03/0121 - Conversion of Farm Buildings to Residential Use – Withdrawn 30-Apr-2003

POLICIES

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Local Policy

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Adopted Version (CELP)

The following are considered relevant material considerations as indications of the emerging strategy:

Policy MP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy PG 1 – Overall Development Strategy

Policy PG 6 – Open Countryside

Policy SD 1 – Sustainable Development in Cheshire East

Policy SD2 – Sustainable Development Principles
Policy SE 1 – Design
Policy SE 4 – The Landscape
Policy EG1 – Economic Prosperity
Policy EG2 – Rural Economy

It should be noted that the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy was formally adopted on 27th July 2017. There are however policies within the legacy Local Plan that still apply and have not yet been replaced. These policies are set out below.

Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan (CNLP)

NE.20 Flood Prevention
BE.1 Amenity
BE.3 Access and Parking
BE.4 Drainage, Utilities and Resources
BE.6 Development on Potentially Contaminated Land
NE.5 Nature Conservation and Habitats
NE.9 Protected Species
NE.13 Rural Diversification
NE.15 Re-Use and Adaptation of a Rural Building for a Commercial, Industrial or Recreational Use

Wrenbury Neighbourhood Plan (WNP)

Policy LC1 – Character and Design
Policy LC2 – Landscape Character
Policy LC3 – Natural Environment and Biodiversity
Policy TR3 – Vehicular Access to and through the parish
Policy LEC1 – Local Economy

CONSIDERATIONS (External to Planning)

CEC Environmental Health (Cheshire East) – No objection subject to licencing informative

CEC Highways – No objection

View of the Parish/Town Council

Wrenbury Parish Council - Object on the following grounds (full comments available on the Councils website):

- Outside of settlement boundary and thus inappropriate development and does not relate to an existing business so does not meet this exception
- Proposed use should be located in a Principal Town
- Extent of B1 use has not been clarified
- No parking shown on the plans
- Access over historic bridge is inappropriate and may damage the bridge
- No details of material have been given
- Site is located within the open countryside with views from many directions

- Lacking information regarding the use of the site
- Detrimental Impact on the local economy
- How will water and waste be disposed of
- How will waste be collected
- No employees proposed so no employment benefit
- No opening hours proposed
- Noise from current use
- Impact of the use of existing business

Other Representations

16 letters of objection have been received which raise the following points;

- Will increase vehicular movements to and from the site
- Roadway inappropriate for increased movements
- Unsustainable location
- No details of parking areas
- Noise from existing use/harm to living conditions
- Odours/light pollution
- Criminal behaviour on the site
- Out of character with the rural area
- Asbestos in existing buildings
- No idea on waste collection
- Harm to existing business
- Applicants website advises that it proposed 54 units for B2 use and car smashing
- Inefficient publicity of the application
- Power supply to existing properties
- Contrary to PG6 as extensive alterations carried out
- Contrary to EG2 as noted in principal town
- Contrary to NE15 given traffic impacts
- No opening hours given
- Wear and tear on existing road
- No right of way exists over the private unadopted road
- Retrospective nature suggests the applicant would not comply with any approval
- The site has not been solely used for Agricultural purposes for in excess of 10 years and was in fact granted planning permission for commercial to residential use P03/0121 during 2003

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

The site lies largely in the Open Countryside as designated by the Adopted Cheshire East Local Plan, where policy PG6 states that within the Open Countryside only development that is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation, public infrastructure, essential works undertaken by public service authorities or statutory undertakers, or for other uses appropriate to a rural area will be permitted. This policy however also lists some exceptions, the most relevant here being:

- For the re-use of existing rural buildings where the building is permanent, substantial and would not require extensive alteration, rebuilding or extension
- For development that is essential for the expansion or redevelopment of an existing business

Policy LEC1 of the Wrenbury Neighbourhood Plan also '*encourages the retention and expansion of existing businesses, including through the sympathetic conversion of existing buildings*'.

Essential for the expansion or redevelopment of an existing business

The retrospective nature of the proposal is noted and thus it cannot be argued that the proposal relates to an existing business. However the supporting statement advises that some of the occupiers of the units themselves are existing businesses from the local area that have re-located to the site, although no detail has been given to advise why it is essential for the business to re-locate to this location.

Re-use of rural buildings

Usually to demonstrate that a building is both permanent and substantial a structural survey is recommended to assess whether or not the structure is able to accommodate the proposed conversion works.

In this instance no structural survey has been provided. However given that the building has already accommodated the proposed changes, it must be considered to both permanent and substantial for the purposes of this policy.

Next the extent of the changes needs to be considered. In this instance no extensions or re-building has been undertaken. Therefore, it is just the alterations that need to be considered. The supporting statement provides some commentary regarding the construction of the existing building and details what works have taken place, these include:

As existing the building was constructed as follows:

- Steel Portal Frame
- GRP Fibre cement roof with roof lights
- Concrete Floor
- Power and Lights connected

The proposed structure (alterations undertaken to allow for the change of use):

- Steel Portal Frame (retained as existing)
- Block Wall Construction with profile cladding sheets above
- GRP Fibre cement roof with roof lights (retained as existing)
- Concrete Floor (retained as existing)
- Power and Lights connected (retained as existing)
- Openings - The proposed requires inclusion of roller shutter doors.
- Internal arrangement will be created through block partition.

The main changes therefore appear to be the infilling of the frame with blocks and profile cladding sheets to the walls, openings to form windows and roller shutter doors and internal arrangements through addition of partition walls.

There is nothing in the policy to advise what works would be considered “extensive” and the works undertaken are generally in line with those changes permitted for conversion of rural buildings under the prior approval process and also in line with decisions allowed at appeal.

As a result, the proposal complies with PG6 as the building is considered to be permanent and substantial and has not result in extensive alterations, re-build or extension.

Character and Appearance

The proposal seeks to convert the existing agricultural building. The main changes are the infilling of the frame with blocks and profile cladding sheets to the walls, openings to form windows and roller shutter doors and internal arrangements through addition of partition walls.

These changes involve re-using the shell of the existing building and would not result in the building being extended or any increase in the bulk or height of the building. To this extent the impact of the building on the wider setting would remain largely unaltered.

The main change therefore would be the introduction of a number of openings to accommodate the proposed use. Whilst these changes would alter the visual appearance of this existing rural building to a more commercial appearance, this is an inevitable consequence of the overall policy support for the re-use of the rural building. The proposal also seeks to introduce some local brickwork to assimilate with the local area and the use of mixed steel sheeting and timber cladding is not untypical of rural buildings. There are some sections where the works appear incomplete as the steel cladding has not been finished however this could be secured by condition to ensure a consistent visual appearance.

Finally, it is also accepted that the proposed car parking area would also result in some visual harm as it would see more vehicles parked at the site, however as noted above this is an inevitable consequence of the policy support for the re-use of rural buildings. There would also have been some existing vehicle/machinery storage associated with the previous agricultural use. To this extent the visual harm is not considered to be significant.

Therefore, no significant harm to the overall character/appearance of the area.

Rural Economy

Policy EG1 (Economic Prosperity) advises that proposals for employment development on non-allocated employment sites will be supported where they are in the right location and support the strategy, role and function of the town, as identified in Settlement Hierarchy, Spatial Distribution of Development and in any future plans, including Neighbourhood Plans, where applicable.

Policy EG2 (Rural Economy) advises that proposals that provide opportunities for local rural employment development that supports the vitality of rural settlements and encourage the retention and expansion of existing businesses, particularly through the conversion of existing buildings and farm diversification will be supported provided it supports the rural economy, would not undermine

employment allocations, and could not reasonably be expected to locate within a designated centre, no harm to open countryside/appearance of the area and has adequate infrastructure.

The proposal clearly has some conflict with these policies as it is not sited within a designated employment area and there appears to be no reason why the use has to be located in this countryside location by reason of the products sold. It does however also have some compliance with these policies as it seeks to retain existing businesses (those businesses who have relocated to the site) through the conversion of an existing building. The supporting statement also advises that the use would also allow diversification of the farm as the buildings have been deemed surplus to requirements by the farmer who has still been able to farm the surrounding land owned by him without this building.

It is also appreciated that there is also conflict between Local Plan Policies in this regard, with the support given to conversion/re-use of existing buildings as contained within Policy PG6 of the CELP, NE.13 and NE.15 of the C&NLP and LEC1 of the WNP. There is also a strong emphasis in support of the conversion of rural buildings within the NPPF and paragraph 83a which states that planning decisions should enable *'the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings'*.

Residential Amenity

The nearest neighboring property is sited 28m away to the east and there are further properties sited to the south off the shared access road. Given that the proposal seeks to re-use the existing shell it is not considered that the proposal would cause any harm to living conditions by reason of overbearing/overshadowing impact or loss of privacy.

In terms of noise/disturbance, the Councils Environmental Health Team have been consulted and have not raised any objections in this regard. They note that generally B1 uses are much less noise intensive than say B2 uses and advise that condition could be used to control working hours to prevent potential disturbance during unsocial hours and also condition which prevents any outdoor working/storage to further limit noise disturbance. They also advise that despite the retrospective nature of the proposal, no noise complaints have been received for the site suggesting that the use has been operating without such concerns.

By their very definition B1 uses are uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to its amenity.

The use with the most potential to create noise would appear to be that for the restoration of cars. However the supporting statement advises that the occupant does not do body modifications etc and specialises in engine repairs, and his equipment is only smaller type stuff which are able to run off a normal 240V 3 pin socket power outlet. It also confirms that the site does not have 3 phase or commercial type power supplies to the units, which naturally limits the amount, size and scope of machinery allowed to be used within any unit. To this extent Environmental Health Officers are happy that subject to condition preventing any outdoor working that noise would be contained within the building.

It is also worth noting that the existing agricultural use would also have resulted in some noise, odour, and disturbance from both the use and vehicular movements.

As a result, subject to the suggested conditions, it is not expected that the proposal would cause any significant harm to living conditions of neighboring properties.

Access and Parking

Site description and current application proposal

The site is currently an agricultural building which would be converted to light industrial and storage, with adjacent hardstanding for parking. The building floor area is approximately 780sqm.

It would be accessed off Wrenbury Hall Drive which is a private access off Nantwich Road. The access serves a number of other uses including Wrenbury Hall, nursing home, and a small leisure facility for disabled children.

Safe and suitable access

The application site is small and is unlikely to generate more than half dozen vehicle trips during the busiest hour.

The site is accessed from Wrenbury Hall Drive which in turn is accessed from Nantwich Road. Wrenbury Hall Drive is narrow but there are informal passing places along its length. The access point off Nantwich Road is wide enough to allow 2 vehicles to pass each other if required and reversing onto Nantwich Road will not occur. The existing site could already potentially generate vehicle trips, now or in the future, including those from large agricultural vehicles. There have also been no recorded accidents at the access over the past 3 years.

There is sufficient hardstanding adjacent to the building to allow for parking.

Highways Conclusion

Given the small scale of the proposal, the existing use, the developments that already use Wrenbury Hall Lane together with there being no existing safety concern, the proposal is considered acceptable.

Therefore, given the above and the no objection from the Councils Highways Engineer, it is not considered that the proposal would cause any severe highway impacts.

Ecology

The Councils Ecologist has been consulted and has not raised any objection on Ecology grounds. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposal would have any significant ecology impacts.

Drainage/Flood Risk

The application site is located within a Flood Zone 1 and as such does not require submission of a Flood Risk Assessment.

In this regard given that the proposal seeks a change of use of an existing building there would be no increased flood risk issues from the use of the building. Similarly, the car parking would take place on an existing graveled area and thus should not pose any increased drainage issues.

As a result, the proposals will not cause any significant issues from a flooding/drainage perspective.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS(S) FOR THE DECISION

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle in terms of being capable for conversion in the open countryside and in the context of layout, scale and design, would not have an adverse impact on existing visual or residential amenities, design, highway safety, ecology, trees or flooding. The proposal is also supported in terms of rural economy and diversification.

The proposed development complies with the Development Plan as a whole and is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. **Cladding work to finish within 3 months of decision**
2. **Retained to the approved plans**
3. **Operational hours 830am-530pm Monday to Friday and 9am-2pm Saturdays and not at all Sundays/Bank Holidays**
4. **Parking area to be provided within 3 months of decision**
5. **No outdoor working/storage**
6. **Use restricted to B1, B8 and E(g)**

In order to give proper effect to the Board`s/Committee`s intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation) in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice





Working for a brighter future together

Southern Planning Committee

Date of Meeting: 26 May 2021

Report Title: Planning Appeals Report

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Toni Fox

Senior Officer: David Malcolm: Head of Planning

1. Report Summary

- 1.1. A statistical overview of the outcome of Planning Appeals that have been decided between 1st January 2020 and 31st March 2021. The report provides information that should help monitor the Council's quality of decision making in respect of planning applications.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That the Report be noted.

3. Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1. To acknowledge the appeal outcomes from the Council's decision making on planning applications.

4. Other Options Considered

- 4.1. The report is for information only and no other options are applicable

5. Background

- 5.1. All of the Council's decisions made on planning applications are subject to the right of appeal under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Most appeals are determined by Planning Inspectors on behalf of the Secretary of State. However, the Secretary of State also has the power to make the decision on an appeal rather than it being made by a Planning Inspector - this is referred to as a 'recovered appeal'.

- 5.2. Appeals can be dealt with through several different procedures: written representations; informal hearing; or public inquiry. There is also a fast-track procedure for householder and small scale commercial developments.
- 5.3. All of the Appeal Decisions referred to in this report can be viewed in full online on the planning application file using the relevant planning reference number.
- 5.4. This report relates to planning appeals and does not include appeals against Enforcement Notices or Listed Building Notices.

6. Commentary on appeal statistics

- 6.1. The statistics on planning appeals for the reporting period are set out in Appendix 1 and 2.
- 6.2. The statistics are set into different components to enable key trends to be identified:
 - Overall performance;
 - Outcomes by type of appeal procedure;
 - Outcomes of delegated decisions;
 - Outcomes of committee decisions;
 - Overall numbers of appeals lodged;
 - Benchmarking nationally.
- 6.3. The overall number of appeals lodged has remained consistent and averages out at approximately 120 planning appeals annually. At present, approximately 25% of decisions to refuse planning permission will result in a planning appeal.
- 6.4. In terms of the outcomes of the appeals decided, the performance is close to but slightly below the national average.
 - 29% of all section 78 appeals were allowed in the reporting period, compared to a national average of 24%.
 - 38% of all householder appeals were allowed compared to a national average of 35%.

7. Implications of the Recommendations

7.1. Legal Implications

7.1.1. As no decision is required there are no legal implications.

7.2. Finance Implications

7.2.1. There are no financial implications.

7.3. Policy Implications

7.3.1. There are no policy implications.

7.4. Equality Implications

7.4.1. There are no Equality implications

7.5. Human Resources Implications

7.5.1. There are no HR implications

7.6. Risk Management Implications

7.6.1. There are no risk management implications

7.7. Rural Communities Implications

7.7.1. There are no direct implications for rural communities.

7.8. Implications for Children & Young People/Cared for Children

7.8.1. There are no direct implications for children and young people.

7.9. Public Health Implications

7.9.1. There are no direct implications for public health.

7.10. Climate Change Implications

7.10.1. There are no climate change implications

8. Ward Members Affected

8.1. The Report relates to all Wards. The report is for noting only.

9. Consultation & Engagement

9.1. Not applicable.

10. Access to Information

- 10.1. Planning Appeal statistics for 01-Jan-2020 to 31-Mar-2021 (Appendix 1 and 2)

11. Contact Information

- 11.1. Any questions relating to this report should be directed to the following officer:

Name: Peter Hooley

Job Title: Planning and Enforcement Manager

Email: peter.hooley@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Planning Appeals Report

Appendix 1. Planning Appeal Statistics 1 Jan 2020 – 31 March 2021

	All Planning Appeals decided in the specified period					
	Public Inquiry	Hearing	Written Representation	S.78 Appeals Total	Householder Appeals	OVERALL TOTAL
Number of Appeals determined	7	8	82	97	47	144
Allowed	6	4	18	28	18	46
Dismissed	1	4	64	69	29	98
Percentage allowed	86%	50%	22%	29%	38%	32%
	<p><i>Note: appeals that were withdrawn, deemed invalid or part allowed/part dismissed are excluded from the figures provided.</i></p> <p><i>S.78 Appeals are all planning application appeals excluding the Householder Appeals process.</i></p>					

Appeals arising from Planning Committee and Delegated Decisions

	Committee Decisions	Delegated Decisions	Total
Number of appeals determined	21	123	144
Allowed	16	30	46
Dismissed	5	93	98
Percentage allowed	76%*	24%	32%

**Of the appeals against committee decisions, 11 followed decisions made contrary to officer recommendation of which 8 were allowed (73%)*

Appeals Lodged

	Public Inquiries	Hearing	Written Rep	Household fast-track	Total
1 Jan 2020 – 31 March 2021	3	7	92	41	143

**Figures are subject to future revision due to delay between date appeals lodged and start date confirmed by PINS.*

Planning Appeals Report

Benchmarking**Latest national figures for s78 Planning Appeals**

1 Jan – 31 Dec 2020				
	Public Inquiry	Hearings	Written Representations	All
Number of appeals determined	122	385	8886	9393
Percentage allowed	52%	42%	23%	24%

Latest National figures for Householder Appeal Service

1 Jan - 31 Dec 2020	
	Householder
Number of appeals determined	4012
Percentage allowed	35%

Source: Planning Inspectorate Statistics 12.04.2021.

Appendix 2. Appeals determined 1st Jan 2020 – 31st March 2021

LPA ref.	Site Address	Development Description (short description only)	Decision Level	Procedure	Appeal Outcome	Committee Overturn Y/N
12/3747N	LAND BETWEEN AUDLEM ROAD/ BROAD LANE & PETER DESTAPLEIGH WAY, STAPELEY	Residential development up to a maximum of 189 dwellings - Local centre (Class	Strategic Planning	Public Inquiry	Allowed	No
12/3746N	Land off Peter Destapeleigh Way, Nantwich	New highway access road, including footways and cycleway and associated works.	Strategic Planning	Public Inquiry	Allowed	No
18/2153N	DODDINGTON ESTATE, BRIDGEMERE, NANTWICH, CHESHIRE CW5 7PU	Outline application for development of 12 sites for residential development	Strategic Planning	Public Inquiry	Allowed	Yes
19/3784C	Land South Of, OLD MILL ROAD, SANDBACH	Full planning application for erection of a care home (class C2), 85 new dwellings	Strategic Planning	Public Inquiry	Allowed	No
16/5678M	Land at junction of Earl Road and Epsom Avenue, Handforth	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of five units to be used for Class	Strategic Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	No
19/0529C	Land To The South Of, CREWE ROAD, ALSAGER	Application seeking outline planning permission	Strategic Planning	Informal Hearing	Allowed	Yes
19/2539C	Land South Of, OLD MILL ROAD, SANDBACH	Hybrid Planning Application for development	Strategic Planning	Public Inquiry	Dismissed	No
19/3889N	LAND OFF CREWE ROAD, WINTERLEY	Outline application for the erection of up to 55 dwellings with associated works	Southern Planning	Public Inquiry	Allowed	No
18/2925N	New Start Park, WETTENHALL ROAD, REASEHEATH, CW5 6EL	Removal of planning condition 1 (3 years)	Southern Planning	Informal Hearing	Allowed	No
18/2413C	Land Adjoining Meadowview Park, DRAGONS LANE, MOSTON	Change of use of land from agricultural land for stationing of caravans	Southern Planning	Informal Hearing	Allowed	No
19/1653C	Land Adjacent To Swanwick Hall Drive, Off BOOTH BED LANE, GOOSTREY	Proposed new stable block, menage, access track and change of land use	Southern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	No

Planning Appeals Report

19/1360N	Former greenkeeper's shed and surrounding service area, Former Gorstyhill Golf Club, Abbey Park Way, Crewe, Weston	Change of use of greenkeeper's shed to B8 (storage and distribution) with	Southern Planning	Written Representations	Dismissed	Yes
18/6202M	BLACKFORD, WILMSLOW PARK NORTH, WILMSLOW, SK9 2BA	Residential Development comprising 4, 2-storey dwellings with accommodation in r	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	Yes
19/1708M	90, TYTHERINGTON DRIVE, MACCLESFIELD, SK10 2HN	Demolition of existing garage and out buildings and erection of two number 3 bed	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	Yes
19/3831M	51, HANDFORTH ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 2LX	Demolition of existing 2 detached properties and erection of 60-bedroom care hom	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	Yes
19/4862M	HILLSIDE, 21, ADLINGTON ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 2BJ	Demolition of the existing nursing home and the construction of a new building p	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	Yes
19/1395M	OAKHURST, TOFT ROAD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 9ED	Construction of new detached dwelling	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	Yes
19/2254M	FERNLEA, STANLEY ROAD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 0DJ	Construction of 3 dwellings following demolition	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Allowed	Yes
19/4167M	STONE COTTAGE, 14, SUMMERHILL ROAD, PRESTBURY, SK10 4AH	Outline application with some matters reserved for construction of three infill	Northern Planning	Informal Hearing	Dismissed	No
19/2035M	Land adj Yew Tree Farm, MOOR LANE, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 6BX	Demolition of existing building and construction of 2no. new dwellings	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Dismissed	Yes
19/1955M	LAND ADJACENT TO WITHINLEE HOLLOW, WITHINLEE ROAD, PRESTBURY, SK10 4AT	Erection of a dwelling house with associated works including landscaping	Northern Planning	Written Representations	Dismissed	Yes
19/5659N	LAND AT THE COTTAGE, PECKFORTON HALL LANE, PECKFORTON, CW6 9TG	Outline Planning Permission for the erection of 1 No. detached dwelling,	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/5660M	STONE COTTAGE, 14,	Outline application with Some Matters	Delegation	Informal	Allowed	

Planning Appeals Report

	SUMMERHILL ROAD, PRESTBURY, SK10 4AH	Reserved for construction of two infill dw		Hearing		
19/3328M	Wood Cottage, Leach Lane, Lower Withington, SK11 9DY	Full permission for a replacement dwelling, detached garage and associated lands	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/3531C	LAND ADJACENT TO PUDDLE BANK LANE, APPROXIMATELY 225M NORTH-EAST OF BROOK HOUSE FARM HOUSE, ASTBURY, CW12 3NW	Retrospective planning application for fencing at field entrance	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/4940M	KINGS ARMS SERVICE STATION, ALDERLEY ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 1PZ	Variation of condition 8 (Opening Hours) on application 18/5937M to read as foll	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/4860M	Wayside, HOUGH LANE, ALDERLEY EDGE, SK9 7JE	Proposed two storey side extension to existing residential property	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/2423N	PUMP COTTAGE, KINGS LANE, CRANAGE, CW10 9LX	Retrospective application for Change of Use of land to garden	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/3400M	LINDEN, TABLEY ROAD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 0NE	Proposed two storey front & side extension, single storey rear extension and gen	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
20/1657C	Roddymoor Mill House, ROUGHWOOD LANE, HASSALL, CW11 4XX	Erection of a recreational children's tree house within the curtilage of Roddymo	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
20/0794M	26, FALLIBROOME ROAD, MACCLESFIELD, SK10 3LD	Dormer window on front roof	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
20/0796M	66, BLACKHILL LANE, KNUTSFORD, WA16 0EQ	Proposed single storey / two storey front and rear extensions	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
20/0849M	TREE TOPS, STATION ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 4JP	Rear single and two storey extension with front porch and internal alterations.	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
20/1015M	26, COCKSHEADHEY ROAD, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5QZ	Rear two storey extension.	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
20/1816N	110 , Samuel Armstrong Way,	Move garden fence to boundary.	Delegation	Householder	Allowed	

Planning Appeals Report

	Crewe, CW1 4SH			Appeal Service		
19/5277N	82, COPPICE ROAD, WILLASTON, CW5 6QD	Two storey side extension, a single story side extension and a single storey rear	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/0962C	Field View, 9, CONGLETON ROAD, SMALLWOOD, CW11 2YH	Construction of a new single vehicular drop kerb in front of property	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/5194M	11, OVERDALE ROAD, DISLEY, SK12 2RJ	Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/5747M	1, Oak Brow Cottages, ALTRINCHAM ROAD, STYAL, SK9 4JE	Retention of Building to Provide Ancillary Residential Accommodation	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
20/0015M	24, HIGHFIELD ROAD, BOLLINGTON, CHESHIRE, SK10 5LR	Construction of a detached garage, parking area and widening of the existing	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/2912M	Green Lane Farm, GREEN LANE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5LG	Alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling - re-submission	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/3042M	RED GABLES, MERESIDE ROAD, MERE, WA16 6QR	Remodelling and extension including two storey rear extension, conversion	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/2400M	Knowles House Farm, HOLLIN LANE, SUTTON, SK11 0HR	Conversion of existing attached single-storey outbuilding to ancillary domestic	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/3836C	Holly Bank Farm, HOLMES CHAPEL ROAD, DAVENPORT, CW12 4SS	Proposed extension to existing outbuilding to form double garage and implement	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/5028M	THE COTTAGE, ASHLEY ROAD, ASHLEY, CHESHIRE, WA15 0QP	New garage with gym & facilities in roof space	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/5090M	Chorlton House, FULSHAW PARK, WILMSLOW, SK9 1QH	Erection of a two-storey side extension	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/4895M	4, OAKWOOD COURT, BEECHFIELD ROAD, ALDERLEY EDGE, CHESHIRE, SK9 7AT	Two storey extension to side and excavation of garden to form patio	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/3283N	AGRICULTURAL BUILDING, HAWKSBILL HALL,	Prior approval for a proposed change of use of an agricultural building	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	

Planning Appeals Report

	HOLLYHURST ROAD, WRENBURY, CW5 8HT					
18/5952N	BADDILEY LANE FARM, BADDILEY LANE, BADDILEY, CW5 8BP	Certificate of Lawful Existing Use	Delegation	Public Inquiry	Allowed	
20/0136C	21, REES CRESCENT, HOLMES CHAPEL, CHESHIRE, CW4 7NL	Certificate of lawful proposed use for conversion of loft space to accommodation	Delegation	Written Representations	Allowed	
19/0217N	OLD HOUSE BARN, BADDILEY LANE, BADDILEY, CW5 8BP	First floor extension over existing single storey section of barn including	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Allowed	
19/2147C	Heathfields, NEW ROAD, MORETON, CW12 4RX	Certificate of lawful proposed development of incidental outbuilding	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/2627C	17, GLASTONBURY DRIVE, MIDDLEWICH, CW10 9HR	Construction of a detached brick and tile garage at the front of my home 5m wide	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/2672M	1 WATERLOO BARN, Alderley Park, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4JW	Proposed single storey rear extension to existing residential property	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5887M	Orchard Cottage, BACK LANE, PLUMLEY, WA16 9SF	Two storey rear extension extending 3m from the rear wall	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/2309M	Grove End Farm, Blossoms Lane, WOODFORD, WOODFORD, SK7 1RF	Prior change of use of the conversion of an agricultural building to a single dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1775M	35, APPLETON WALK, WILMSLOW, SK9 2HN	Prior Approval for conversion of a former Estate Management Office B1 to Two FI	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1659N	HAYCROFT FARM, PECKFORTON HALL LANE, PECKFORTON, TARPORLEY, CHESHIRE, CW6 9TF	Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed agricultural	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1383N	Radley Wood Farm, WHITCHURCH ROAD, SPURSTOW, CW6 9TD	Prior approval for change of use from agricultural building to a single dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5158M	Ollerton Hall & Ollerton End, POTTS LANE, OLLERTON,	Listed building consent for reconfiguration of two dwellings to create a single	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

	WA16 8SF					
20/2673M	1 WATERLOO BARN, Alderley Park, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4JW	Proposed single storey rear extension to existing residential property	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5157M	Ollerton Hall & Ollerton End, POTTS LANE, OLLERTON, WA16 8SF	Reconfiguration of two dwellings to create a single dwelling with ancillary	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/3559C	1, Sparrow Grove Barns, DRAGONS LANE, MOSTON, CW11 3QH	Single storey rear extension (resubmission)	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/4381M	6, PARK LANE, PICKMERE, CHESHIRE, WA16 0JX	Erection of a wooden shed 3m width 5m length 2.5m height in the front driveway,	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/1603M	BOUNDARY FARM, PEACOCK LANE, HIGH LEGH, WA16 6NT	Proposed reconstruction / replacement of outbuilding as ancillary domestic build	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/2364C	FAIR VIEW FARM, BLEEDING WOLF LANE, SCHOLAR GREEN, ST7 3BH	Alterations to provide bedroom and en-suite bathroom in existing roof space and	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/2657N	20, ARLEY PLACE, WISTASTON, CW2 6QW	Proposed repositioning of brick screen wall	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/2721M	2, MIDDLEHILLS, MACCLESFIELD, CHESHIRE, SK11 7EQ	First floor side extension	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/2789M	Reindeer Cottage, CHELFORD ROAD, OLLERTON, WA16 8RD	Infill small area between existing living room / kitchen and bedroom	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/5928C	14, COLDMOSS DRIVE, SANDBACH, CW11 4HW	Ground floor front extension and front first floor dormer extension and internal	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/0004M	Beech Cottage, KNUTSFORD ROAD, KNOLLS GREEN, MOBBERLEY, WA16 7BW	Create a single space drive to the front of the property with a metal bi-fold	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/5162M	HIGHFIELDS, HOLMES CHAPEL ROAD, LOWER WITHINGTON, CHESHIRE,	New garage and access	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

	SK11 9DH					
19/5532N	2 THE SYCAMORE, Bradeley Hall Farm, BRADELEY HALL ROAD, HASLINGTON, CW1 5HR	Window and door's replacement	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1860M	1A, BRENT CLOSE, POYNTON, SK12 1HS	Erection of a new fence at the property boundary to replace existing hedgerow	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/1987M	BROWN OWL COTTAGE, GOLBORNE LANE, HIGH LEGH, WA16 0RD	Construction of a first-floor side/rear and two-storey side extension with glaze	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/2190M	BRADFORD LANE FARM, BRADFORD LANE, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4TR	Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of replacement outbuilding	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/1528M	LITTON, CROSS LANE, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 2DD	Re modelling of the dwelling, Two storey rear and side extension and new raised	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/1677C	13, LIME CLOSE, SANDBACH, CW11 1BZ	Remove oversized/partially dead conifers fit new smaller fence	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/0954M	6, BARLOW ROAD, WILMSLOW, SK9 4BE	Hip to gable roof alterations and rear dormer construction	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/0802N	PINNACLE FARM, COOLE LANE, NEWHALL, NANTWICH, CW5 8AY	Variation of Condition 2 (location of garage) on Approved 19/4819N	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4028M	17, FLETSAND ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 2AD	Erection of Timber Climbing Frame (Retrospective)	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/4861N	59, Talbot Way, Stapeley, Cheshire East, CW5 7RR	Proposed two storey rear extension with garage conversion into granny annexe	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/4261M	Crown Farm, FROG LANE, PICKMERE, WA16 0LL	Erection of glazed link	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/4288M	Beech Tree Cottage, LONG SHOOT ROAD, LOWER WITHINGTON, SK11 9DX	Proposed replacement of conservatory and porch New 2000mm high wall to front bou	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/4326M	Lower Kinderfield Farm, HOLLIN LANE, SUTTON,	Proposed extension and alterations	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

	SK11 0NN					
19/3210C	THE STABLES, NEWCASTLE ROAD, SMALLWOOD, SANDBACH, CHESHIRE, CW11 2GB	Single storey rear extension to the rear elevation to create additional living s	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/3436M	HOLLY CORNER, PADDOCK HILL, MOBBERLEY, CHESHIRE, WA16 7DH	Rear two storey extension	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/3490M	ROXBURGH, LEGH ROAD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 8NR	Removal of existing 1.8m high timber vertical boarded fence to Legh Road	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/3493N	32, DAVENHAM CRESCENT, CREWE, CW2 7RZ	Replacement of existing garage and a garden room	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
19/3721M	20, BEECHWOOD, KNUTSFORD, WA16 8AR	Re-roofing to raise the height of the roof ridge and provide two bedrooms	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/0183C	Oakwood Farm, OAKWOOD LANE, MOSTON, CW11 3PR	Removal of existing concrete/asbestos garage, and replace with new conservatory	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/0238M	14, COPPICE ROAD, POYNTON, CHESHIRE, SK12 1SL	Two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and single-storey front	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Dismissed	
20/1651M	10, TOWN LANE, MOBBERLEY, WA16 7PY	Proposed rear ground floor extension, roof alterations and new dormers	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5627N	Land north of EARDSWICK LANE and east of Bradfield Green Farm, Crewe	Change of use of disused agricultural site to landscaping/bulk supplies	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/3123M	BROAD OAK FARM, LEEK OLD ROAD, SUTTON, CHESHIRE, SK11 0JA	Change of use for the conversion of barn to dwelling.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/2651M	SPRINGSETT FARM, CHELFORD ROAD, PRESTBURY, SK10 4PT	New domestic garage set within existing slope of field and associated landscaping	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/3427C	Paul Sheard Autos, NEWCASTLE ROAD, ASTBURY, CHESHIRE EAST, CW12 4JX	Change of use to mixed use comprising of MOT station, car repairs and hand car w	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

19/3147M	HEALD COURT, 34, HAWTHORN LANE, WILMSLOW, SK9 5DG	Replacement of windows in apartment building	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1560M	LAND OFF DAVENPORT LANE, MOBBERLEY	Retention of storage container	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1568M	LAND OFF DAVENPORT LANE, MOBBERLEY	Retention of Timber Shed used in Association with Recreational Use of Ponds	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4816M	LAND OFF, MOSS LANE, OVER TABLEY, CHESHIRE	Construction of agricultural implements and welfare building.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4021M	CO-OP Foodstore, WELLINGTON ROAD, BOLLINGTON	Retrospective application to turn the existing turning head into additional	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4380M	Land on the side of Welsh Row, Nether Alderley, Macclesfield	Place a storage unit on site to safely and securely hold tools used to maintain	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
17/5461M	Land Opposite F Rudd And Sons Nursery, STOCKS LANE, OVER PEOVER, WA16 9EZ	Retrospective application for surface car parking for up to 300 cars	Delegation	Informal Hearing	Dismissed	
18/5271M	2, CROFT LANE, KNUTSFORD, WA16 8QH	Erection of a single detached dwelling within the gardens of adjacent properties	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/3633N	Holly Cottage & Collingwood, WRENBURY HEATH ROAD, WRENBURY HEATH, CW5 8EQ	Outline application for re-submission of a previous outline application	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/3698N	Land at, BROAD LANE, STAPELEY	Two detached houses with new shared access	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/2203M	GRASS LANDS NURSERY, FREE GREEN LANE, OVER PEOVER, WA16 9QY	Proposed conversion of an existing building into a single dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/3794M	Eaton Cottage Moss Lane, EATON, CW12 2FY	Construction of new residential dwellings.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4054M	207, BIRTLES ROAD, MACCLESFIELD, SK10 3JH	Demolition of garage and outbuildings, extension of existing house, and erection	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4085M	LAND AT, ASCOL DRIVE,	Change use from class B8 (storage or	Delegation	Written	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

	PLUMLEY, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE	distribution) to class C3 (dwellinghouses),		Representations		
19/4443M	DOMEK, 48, TOWERS ROAD, POYNTON, STOCKPORT, CHESHIRE, SK12 1DE	Replacement of a single family dwelling with 3 family dwelling houses	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4598M	Land At, MOTTRAM ROAD, ALDERLEY EDGE	Full planning application for conversion and extensions to barn	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/0533M	LAND AT MOTTRAM ROAD, ALDERLEY EDGE	Full planning application for conversion and extensions to barn	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/0772M	LAND BETWEEN 4 & 6, SHRIGLEY ROAD NORTH, POYNTON	Variation of condition 2 of 19/3950M (Erection of two detached dwellings with as	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/0775M	DUNMOW, MERESIDE ROAD, MERE, WA16 6QZ	Replacement dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1110M	Land North East Of, STOCKS LANE, OVER PEOVER	Infill development comprising the erection of two dwellings	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1114M	BROADHEATH FARM, MACCLESFIELD ROAD, OVER ALDERLEY, SK10 4SN	To extend the existing farmhouse, conversion of the existing barn to provide	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1575C	THE HEATH VICARAGE, SCHOOL LANE, SANDBACH, CW11 2LS	Erection of 2 no. dwellings	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/1789N	CINDER LANE FARM, CINDER LANE, REASEHEATH, CW5 6AJ	Erection of Two Dwellings	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/2247C	Land adjacent to Newton Brewery Inn, WEBBS LANE, MIDDLEWICH	Proposed detached property (re-submission of 20/0002C)	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/0159N	Land Adjacent to 14, SWINBURNE DRIVE, CREWE, CW1 5JE	Outline planning permission for a new detached bungalow	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5867C	Land Off, BRAMHALL DRIVE, HOLMES CHAPEL	New Bungalow (resubmission of planning application reference 18/6386C)	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/2007N	THE OLD VICARAGE, WRINEHILL ROAD,	Outline application with all matters reserved for a single dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

	WYBUNBURY, CW5 7NU					
19/2821M	The Old Surgery, CHURCH LANE, MOBBERLEY, WA16 7RD	Demolition of existing dwelling and new replacement dwelling and associated work	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/2862M	NORTHFIELDS, CASTLE HILL, MOTTRAM ST ANDREW, SK10 4AX	Infill dwelling with associated groundworks, drainage, landscaping, access	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1230N	LAND ADJACENT TO, Swan Inn, WRENBURY ROAD, MARBURY	Erection of detached dwelling house and creation of access onto Wrenbury Road.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1767M	42, JACKSONS EDGE ROAD, DISLEY, STOCKPORT, CHESHIRE, SK12 2JR	New 3 bed dwelling with attached garage and garden	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1771C	LAND ADJACENT 19, MEADOWSIDE LANE, SCHOLAR GREEN, ST7 3LE	New dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1891C	LAND AT DEAN HILL, NEWCASTLE ROAD, BETCHTON, CW11 2TG	Proposed development of a subterranean innovative code 5 dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
17/0680N	51, Main Road, Goostrey, Crewe, CW4 8LH	Construction of a single dwelling house	Delegation	Informal Hearing	Dismissed	
17/4451C	51, Main Road, Goostrey, Crewe, CW4 8LH	Construction of one detached and two semi-detached houses	Delegation	Informal Hearing	Dismissed	
19/0131C	21, CHELFORD ROAD, SOMERFORD, CW12 4QD	Demolition of existing house and construction of new residential development.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/1343C	32, Congleton Road, SANDBACH, CW11 1HJ	New dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/2265M	2, BROOK STREET, MACCLESFIELD, SK11 7AA	Outline application to infill the 1st floor and convert from commercial to resi	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/0178N	27, Park Road, Willaston, CW5 6PN	'Granny annex' in keeping with our existing bungalow and neighbouring dormer bun	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/0384M	BROOK COTTAGE, CHELFORD ROAD, GREAT	Replacement dwelling, associated garage and landscaping	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	

Planning Appeals Report

	WARFORD, CHESHIRE, SK9 7TL					
19/1061C	7, MOODY STREET, CONGLETON, CW12 4AN	Demolition of Existing 2 storey Office Building and Ancillary storage buildings	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/2403C	Land to the rear of 16, SWEETTOOTH LANE, SANDBACH, CW11 1BE	Proposed new dwelling in residential curtilage of 16 Sweettooth Ave.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/2721N	13, THE BROADWAY, NANTWICH, CW5 6JH	Outline planning permission for the Erection of a detached house	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
20/3139C	19, MEADOWSIDE LANE, SCHOLAR GREEN, CHESHIRE, ST7 3LE	New dwelling	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5007C	Thurlwood Upper Lock, FARAMS ROAD, RODE HEATH	Proposed dwelling (change of house type)	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5222M	Land between 33 and 35, Carleton Road, Poynton, SK12 1TL	Outline approval for demolition of double garage and the construction of a	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/5656N	Oakville, BACK LANE, SPURSTOW, CW6 9TE	Proposed conversion of agricultural barn to provide single residential dwelling.	Delegation	Written Representations	Dismissed	
19/4044M	MORTON STABLES, WOOD LANE WEST, ADLINGTON, SK10 4PA	Proposed new stables, composting toilet and horse exercise arena.	Delegation	Written Representations	Part allowed/Part dismissed	
19/3136M	ROCKS BARN, Rocks Farm, MUDHURST LANE, DISLEY, SK12 2AN	Proposed first floor bedroom extension, single storey conservatory	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Part allowed/Part dismissed	
19/3173M	ROCKS BARN, Rocks Farm, MUDHURST LANE, DISLEY, SK12 2AN	Single storey conservatory extension and single storey side extension	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Part allowed/Part dismissed	
20/1961M	17, BOLLIN HILL, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 4AN	Dormer construction	Delegation	Householder Appeal Service	Withdrawn	
19/4924M	HOLLY CORNER, PADDOCK HILL, MOBBERLEY, WA16 7DH	Certificate of lawful proposed development of two storey rear extension	Delegation	Written Representations	Withdrawn	
20/0182M	HEALD COURT, 34,	Development of up to 90 off-street long	Delegation	Informal	Withdrawn	

Planning Appeals Report

	HAWTHORN LANE, WILMSLOW, SK9 5DG	stay car parking spaces with ancillary		Hearing		
19/1574M	Percivals View, MOSS LANE, OLLERTON, WA16 8SW	Construction of proposed stable building	Delegation	Written Representations	Withdrawn	
19/0360M	Percivals View, MOSS LANE, OLLERTON, WA16 8SW	Construction of proposed stable building	Delegation	Written Representations	Withdrawn	
19/0038M	BROOK HOUSE FARM, Farm Complex LONDON ROAD, ADLINGTON, CHESHIRE, SK10 4DU	Comprehensive development, including the restoration of listed farmhouse	Delegation	Written Representations	Withdrawn	
18/4703C	DEAN HILL, NEWCASTLE ROAD, BETCHTON, CW11 2TG	Outline application for proposed development of a sub-terraneum innovative code	Delegation	Written Representations	Withdrawn	

This page is intentionally left blank