

Application No: 24/4242/FUL
Application Type: Full Planning
Location: Land Off Peter De Stapleigh Way, Stapeley, Cheshire East,
Proposal: Full planning permission for the erection of a residential development (use class C3); public open space; green infrastructure; landscaping; access and associated infrastructure
Applicant: Muller Property Group and Anwyl Homes

Expiry Date: 23 January 2025

Summary

This application seeks full planning approval for a residential development of 40 units with associated landscaping, infrastructure and public open space within parts of the approved site for a mixed-use scheme granted on appeal by the Secretary of State in July 2020.

The proposed development would result in residential development located within “open countryside” beyond the Nantwich Sandbach Settlement Boundary contrary to policies PG6 of the CELPS and GS1 and H5 of the SBNP and in conflict with the Development Plan as a whole. However, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing and paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged. The NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Disbenefits

- The proposed development would result in residential development within the open countryside located beyond the Nantwich Settlement Boundary
- loss of approved mixed-uses including employment within the Maylands Park development

Benefits

- The proposal would result in the creation of 40 dwellings (30% affordable) which will contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply.
- The proposed development will have indirect economic benefits including additional trade for local shops and businesses, jobs in construction and economic benefits to the construction industry supply chain.
- The site is sustainably located given its location on the edge of a Key Service Centre with good accessibility to local services and facilities
- The development incorporates components and features of good design, although it is expected that further improvements will be made to southern part of site to address issues raised by the Design Officer. Given the urbanised context of the site in this edge of settlement location, this scheme would not be out of character with recent development in locality and at Maylands Park.
- Reduction of vehicle movements from those generated by commercial mixed uses of the approved “fallback position” (Maylands Park Phase 2 – mixed uses)
- Provision of an above-policy compliant level of POS provision resulting in additional social benefits.
- the application site benefits from full consent for commercial development which remains extant and constitutes a fallback position which should be given significant weight. The alternative development of the site for housing represents an effective use of land.

Neutral

- The layout and design of the scheme would not harm residential amenity
- The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the highway network.
- The proposals do not result in any significant ecological impacts and is acceptable subject to the imposition of planning conditions
- The proposal would not result in any significant flood risk/drainage issues
- The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on air quality with mitigation secured through planning conditions.

To satisfactorily address the impact on local services/facilities, contributions towards education, healthcare provision and off-site sport/recreation will be secured through a S106 agreement.

In summary, the development would significantly contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply and the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals when assessed against the policies within the NPPF. The proposed development would benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development which weighs heavily in support of the proposed development. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval

Summary recommendation

Approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

1. REASON FOR REFERRAL

The floor area of the development to be created exceeds the delegated threshold.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site (1.24 Ha) occupies the eastern part of the mixed-use development approved on land to the south of Peter Destapleigh Way that was granted outline planning approval (12/3747N) on appeal by the Secretary of State on 15th July 2020.

Reserved Matters approval was granted for the first phase of the mixed-use scheme (22/3170N) and related to a residential development of 188 dwellings, associated infrastructure and open space and ecological areas. This is located to the west of the application site.

Reserved Matters Approval 23/2566N was granted subsequently granted for Phase 2 of the mixed-use development comprising a Local Centre and Employment Development. This residential scheme is proposed to occupy the site of an office building and a group of industrial/warehouse units.

The Stapeley Gardens residential development lies to the east of the site. Under reserved matters approval 22/3170N a Great Crested Newt (GCN) mitigation area will run alongside the eastern site boundary. This adjoins the Stapeley Water Gardens GCN compensation area. Peter Destapleigh Way and the Cronkinson Farm residential development lie to the north of the site.

An access road was approved (12/3746N) to serve the mixed-use scheme from the existing traffic light junction off Peter Destapleigh Way.

The site is generally flat, former agricultural land bounded by native hedgerows to the south and east including some tree cover. The southern boundary adjoins existing farmland.

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPSAL

This application is one of three planning applications submitted in relation to land forming Phase 2 of the approved mixed-use development.

The two other applications comprise;

- A full planning application (24/4223/FUL) seeks approval for a retirement living development of 49 apartments on the opposite (western) side of the access road serving the wider site.
- An outline application 24/4228/OUT for an 80-bed care home relates to land to the east of the retirement living development and identified to accommodate a primary school as part of the mixed-use scheme. This application is to be considered at a future SPB meeting.

This application seeks full planning approval for a residential development of 40 units with associated landscaping and infrastructure. An area of Public open space is also proposed to serve the scheme, and this is located within the centre of the wider development adjoining and enlarging that of the approved David Wilson Homes residential scheme (Phase 1 - 22/3170N).

The development comprises a mix of house types of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms which includes semi-detached, detached and apartment units. 12 No. dwellings will be affordable units equating to 30% overall affordable provision.

Access to the development will be via the access road leading southward from the traffic light junction on Peter Destaplegh Way which was also granted full planning approval (12/3746N) on appeal by the Secretary of State on 15th July 2020. Planning permission (21/1703N) was also subsequently granted for a section of internal spine road leading on from the southern end of the access road to serve the approved mixed-use scheme. This has now been constructed.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

23/2566N - Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning permission ref: 12/3747N for the appearance, scale, layout, and landscaping for Phase 2 mixed-use development including employment development (comprising office and warehouse and light industrial buildings) and local centre with parking, service yards and associated infrastructure. Approved 12th February 2024

22/3170N - Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning permission 12/3747N for the appearance, scale, layout and landscaping for Phase 1 residential development (Use Class C3) including internal access roads, public open space including NEAP, village green, community orchard and ecological areas, parking and associated infrastructure. Approved 26th May 2023

21/1703N - Full planning application for an internal spine road to serve land South of Peter Destaplegh Way. Approved 24th December 2021

12/3747N - Proposed residential development for up to a maximum of 189 dwellings; local centre (Class A1 to A5 inclusive and D1) with a maximum floor area of 1,800 sq.m Gross Internal Area (GIA); employment development (B1b, B1c, B2 and B8) with a maximum floor

area of 3,700 sq. m GIA; primary school site; public open space including new village green, children's play area and allotments, green infrastructure including ecological area; access via adjoining site B (see below) and new pedestrian access and associated works Allowed on Appeal 15th July 2020 (Ref APP/R0660/A/13/2197532)

12/3746N - New highway access road, including footways and cycleway and associated works. Allowed on appeal 15th July 2020 (Ref APP/R0660/A/13/2197529)

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

5.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was first published by the Government in March 2012 and has since been through several revisions. It sets out the planning policies for England and how these should be applied in the determination of planning applications and the preparation of development plans. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF is a material consideration which should be taken into account for the purposes of decision making.

6. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICY

6.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires decisions on planning applications to be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2010 – 2030) was adopted in July 2017. The Site Allocations and Development Policies Documents was adopted in December 2022. The policies of the Development Plan relevant to this application are set out below, including relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies where applicable to the application site.

6.2. Relevant policies of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPs) and Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Plan Policies Document (SADPD)

1. SADPD Policy PG 9: Settlement boundaries
2. SADPD Policy GEN 1: Design principles
3. SADPD Policy GEN 7: Recovery of planning obligations reduced on viability grounds
4. SADPD Policy ENV 1: Ecological network
5. SADPD Policy ENV 12: Air quality
6. SADPD Policy ENV 14: Light pollution
7. SADPD Policy ENV 15: New development and existing uses
8. SADPD Policy ENV 16: Surface water management and flood risk
9. SADPD Policy ENV 2: Ecological implementation
10. SADPD Policy ENV 3: Landscape character
11. SADPD Policy ENV 5: Landscaping
12. SADPD Policy ENV 6: Trees, hedgerows and woodland implementation
13. SADPD Policy ENV 7: Climate change
14. SADPD Policy RUR 5: Best and most versatile agricultural land
15. SADPD Policy RUR 6: Outdoor sport, leisure and recreation outside of settlement boundaries
16. SADPD Policy HOU 1: Housing mix
17. SADPD Policy HOU 12: Amenity
18. SADPD Policy HOU 13: Residential standards
19. SADPD Policy HOU 14: Housing density
20. SADPD Policy HOU 15: Housing delivery
21. SADPD Policy HOU 8: Space, accessibility and wheelchair housing standards
22. SADPD Policy INF 1: Cycleways, bridleways and footpaths
23. SADPD Policy INF 3: Highway safety and access
24. SADPD Policy INF 9: Utilities

- 25.SADPD Policy REC 2: Indoor sport and recreation implementation
- 26.SADPD Policy REC 3: Open space implementation
- 27.SADPD Policy REC 5: Community facilities
- 28.CELPS Policy MP 1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- 29.CELPS Policy PG 1: Overall development strategy
- 30.CELPS Policy PG 2: Settlement hierarchy
- 31.CELPS Policy PG 6: Open countryside
- 32.CELPS Policy PG 7: Spatial distribution of development
- 33.CELPS Policy SD 1: Sustainable development in Cheshire East
- 34.CELPS Policy SD 2: Sustainable development principles
- 35.CELPS Policy IN 1: Infrastructure
- 36.CELPS Policy IN 2: Developer contributions
- 37.CELPS Policy SC 1: Leisure and recreation
- 38.CELPS Policy SC 2: Indoor and outdoor sports facilities
- 39.CELPS Policy SC 3: Health and well-being
- 40.CELPS Policy SC 4: Residential mix
- 41.CELPS Policy SC 5: Affordable homes
- 42.CELPS Policy SE 1: Design
- 43.CELPS Policy SE 12: Pollution, land contamination and land instability
- 44.CELPS Policy SE 13: Flood risk and water management
- 45.CELPS Policy SE 2: Efficient use of land
- 46.CELPS Policy SE 3: Biodiversity and geodiversity
- 47.CELPS Policy SE 4: The landscape
- 48.CELPS Policy SE 5: Trees, hedgerows and woodland
- 49.CELPS Policy SE 6: Green infrastructure
50. SE 8: Renewable and low carbon energy
51. SE 9: Energy efficient development
52. CO 1: Sustainable travel and transport
53. CO 2: Enabling business growth through transport infrastructure
54. CO 4: Travel plans and transport assessments

6.3. Stapeley & Batherton Neighbourhood Plan(SBNP)

Policies of the Neighbourhood Plan relevant to the consideration of this application are:

- Policy GS 1 - Landscape and the Countryside.
- Policy GS 2 - Open Space
- Policy GS 3 - Woodland, Trees, Hedgerows, Walls, Boundary Treatment and Paving
- Policy GS 5 - Environmental Sustainability of buildings and adapting to climate change
- Policy GS 6 - Biodiversity
- Policy T 1 - General Transport Considerations.
- Policy T 2 - Pedestrian and cycle routes.
- Policy T 3 - Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways.
- Policy T 4 - Bus Services
- Policy T 5 - Improving Air Quality
- Policy T 6 - Identification of underground utility assets
- Policy C 1 - Existing and New Facilities
- Policy C 2 - New Business
- Policy C 3 - Scale, Design and Amenity
- Policy AWB 1 - Accessible GP practices
- Policy AWB 2 - Services for the elderly, disabled and for mental health.
- Policy AWB 3 - Provide for the sports needs of residents
- Policy AWB 4 - Community Facilities.
- Policy AWB 5 - Communications Infrastructure
- H1 - Housing Development.

H2 - Housing to meet Local Housing Needs.
Policy H3 - Tenure Mix.
Policy H4 - Design.
Policy H5 - Settlement Boundary.

7. Relevant supplementary planning documents or guidance

7.1. Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance do not form part of the Development Plan but may be a material consideration in decision making. The following documents are considered relevant to this application:

- Housing SPD
- Developer Contributions SPD
- Biodiversity and Net Gain SPD
- Environmental Protection SPD
- SuDS SPD
- Cheshire East Design Guide SPD

8. CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

Environmental Protection: No objection subject to conditions requiring the remediation of unexpected contamination, the suitability of imported soils, use of Ultra-low NOx emission boilers, implementation of CEMP and implementation of the submitted travel plan. Standard informatives are recommended relating to hours of construction, Piling, floor floating and dust management.

CEC Highways: No objection.

United Utilities: No objection.

Flood Risk Manager: No objection to drainage strategy, but comments that ideally some SuDS should be provided on this site (e.g. rain gardens or tree pits). Also, full hydraulic calculations are required to be provided for the scheme. Some FFLs are not above 150mm above all AODs for this site and will need amendment.

CEC Education : No objection subject to a financial contribution of £239,872 for secondary education and SEN, secured through a S106 Agreement

Strategic Housing : Object. A broader mix for the affordable rented units should be provided other than 1- bed flats. This should include the provision of 4-bedroom affordable rental dwellings.

NHS - No objection such to a financial contribution of £36,160 to be secured through S106 agreement is required to mitigate impact on healthcare provision.

Stapeley Parish Council: No comments received to this application

9. REPRESENTATIONS

None Received.

10. OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of the development

The application site lies outside of the defined settlement boundary for Nantwich and consequently within the area defined as 'open countryside'.

These proposals for residential development do not represent a form of development that would normally be allowed in the open countryside (under Policy PG 6) and represent a departure from the development plan.

Policy PG6 is consistent with Policies GS1 and H5 of the Stapeley and Batherton Neighbourhood Plan (SBNP) which seeks to restrict housing development in the open countryside in a similar manner. Although Policy H5 states that, "the focus for development will be on sites within or immediately adjacent to the Nantwich Settlement Boundary, with the aim of enhancing its role as a sustainable settlement whilst protecting the surrounding countryside" it adds that, "Outside the settlement boundary any development is subject to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy Countryside Policy PG 6 and other relevant policies of this Plan"

Importantly, in this case, reserved matters applications 22/3170N (phase 1 for residential uses) and 23/2566N (phase 2 for employment, commercial and mixed-uses) in line with the outline consent granted by the Secretary of State have been approved. Therefore, the application site benefits from full consent which remains extant and could be developed in accordance with the permissions already granted.

The proposed development would not comply with the requirements of policy PG6 of the CELPS or Policies GS1 and H5 of the SBNP. The proposal would therefore represent a departure from the Development Plan as a whole. However, planning law requires that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") requires that planning decisions apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As set out at paragraph 11d, if there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the proposal are out of date, planning permission should be granted, unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This is with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

The NPPF defines that being 'out of date' in the context of housing proposals includes situations where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

Consequently, the Council's housing land supply position and performance in terms of the housing delivery test is therefore a material consideration to take into account when assessing the benefits arising from housing schemes.

Key Issues

10.1 Housing Land Supply

The Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy was adopted on the 27th July 2017 and forms part of the statutory development plan. The plan sets out the overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and makes sufficient provision for housing (36,000 new dwellings over the plan period, equating to 1,800 dwellings per annum) in order to meet the objectively assessed needs of the area.

As the plan is more than five years old, deliverable housing land supply is measured using the local housing need figure (plus 5% buffer), which is currently 2,603 dwellings per year rather than the LPS figure of 1,800 dwellings per year.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies the circumstances in which relevant development plan policies should be considered out-of-date. These include:

- Where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (with appropriate buffer) or:
- Where the Housing Delivery Test Measurement indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing required over the previous three years.

In accordance with the NPPF, the council produces an annual update of housing delivery and housing land supply. The council's most recent Housing Monitoring Update (base date 31 March 2024) was published in April 2025. The published report identifies a deliverable five-year housing land supply of 10,011 dwellings which equates to a 3.8-year supply measured against the five-year local housing need figure of 13,015 dwellings.

The 2023 Housing Delivery Test Result was published by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities on the 12 December 2024 and this confirms a Housing Delivery Test Result of 262%. Housing delivery over the past three years (7,392 dwellings) has exceeded the number of homes required (2,820). The publication of the HDT result affirms that the appropriate buffer to be applied to the calculation of housing land supply in Cheshire East is 5%.

In the context of five-year housing land supply, relevant policies concerning the supply of housing should be considered out-of-date and consequently the 'tilted balance' at paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged

10.2 Sustainable Location and Accessibility

The site is located on the southern edge of Nantwich, which is identified by the CELPS as a Key Service Centre. Nantwich as noted within the CELPS, has a good range of local services, (schools, healthcare, public houses, shops, community facilities, sports provision and places of worship etc), access to public transport (rail and bus) and access to employment.

Furthermore, In granting outline planning approval (12/3747N) on appeal for the mixed-use scheme, which includes this site, the Secretary of State considered that the mixed-use site which included significant housing development (188 dwellings – phase 1) to be in a sustainable location and noted that Nantwich is one of the preferred locations for development in the CELPS.

This scheme along with retirement apartments proposal (24/4223/FUL) would however replace the previously approved employment and local centre. This would result in highly accessible employment and local facilities not being provided at the heart of the wider development area. However, notwithstanding this, the site is within walking/cycling distance of an existing secondary school, primary school, community hall, retail centre and other amenities within the wider Stapeley neighbourhood and employment opportunities within Nantwich and elsewhere are within the easy reach of the site.

In terms of pedestrian and cycling accessibility the site itself can access a segregated footway / cycleway provided on the northern side of Peter Destapleigh Way. The site is well placed to access bus services along Audlem Road.

The development site is therefore sustainably located given its location on the edge of a Key Service Centre and would minimise the dependence on the use of the private car.

10.3 Efficient Use of Land

Policy HOU14 of the SADPD requires residential developments to generally achieve a net density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. The proposed development would achieve a density of 33 dwellings per hectare in compliance with Policy HOU 14 .

The application site already benefits from full consent which remains extant, and this could be developed in accordance with the permissions already granted constituting a deliverable “fall back” position .

In overall terms it is considered that given the urbanised context of the site in this edge of settlement location, this scheme would not be out of character with recent development undertaken and approved within the locality and is therefore appropriate .

10.4 Design

Policies SD2 and SE1 of the CELPS expect that development proposals consider the wider character of a place in addition to that of the site and its immediate context, to ensure that it reinforces the area in which it is located. These principles are also reflected in the CEC Design Guide.

The importance of securing high quality design is specified within the NPPF and Policies SE1, SD1 and SD2 of the CELPS, GEN1 of the SADPD and the Cheshire East Design Guide . In particular, development proposals should consider the wider character of a place in addition to that of the site and its immediate context, to ensure that it reinforces the area in which it is located. These principles are echoed by SNP Policy H4 and also reflected in the CEC Design Guide and the “Building for a Healthy Life Framework” (BHL).

The Council’s Design Officer has undertaken an assessment of the application using the BHL framework which is reflected in the commentary below. BHL uses a traffic light system, with the aim of eliminating reds, whilst maximising the number of greens.

The performance of the proposed scheme is summarised in the table below. A more detailed commentary in relation to each of the considerations has also been provided but not included within this report.

Integrating into the Neighbourhood				Distinctive Places				Streets for All			
1 Natural Connections	2 Walking, cycling public transport	3 Facilities and services	4 Homes for everyone	5 Making most of what’s there	6 Memorable character	7 Well defined streets/ spaces	8 Easy to find your way around	9 Healthy streets	10 Cycle and car parking	11 Green and blue infrastructure	12 Back of pavement, front of home
G	G	G	G	A	A	A	G	A	A	A	A

During the course of the application the site layout and house types have been amended in response to concerns raised by the Design Officer. As a result, the scheme has improved and consequently no red ratings appear in the revised assessment above, although there are still a number of ambers.

In summary, the Design Officer considers that the Key enhancements to the scheme are:

- The layout of the northern part of the site has been improved through the creation of a more continuous building line, limiting the impact of car parking on the primary frontage and to “book end” the gateway, reflecting aspects of the proposed retirement apartments (24/4223/FUL) on the western side of the spine road.
- A future connection point has been provided in the Southeastern part of the site, providing for potential future connectivity between this site and land to the south
- The house type detail has been adjusted to more closely reflect that for the existing housing to the west (Phase 1) and the proposed design for the apartments (24/4223/FUL). This provides more coherence within the wider development area by different developers.

In terms of the key issues which remain to be satisfactorily addressed, the Design Officer comments that :

- The development still feels quite cramped within the southern part of the site, although a constrained site, it is considered that an improvement in design quality should be secured.
- For a modest scheme it feels a little too formal in parts. There is still limited space for street trees, which isn’t consistent with the NPPF or the CEC Residential Design Guide.
- The drainage proposals do not include above ground SuDS such as rain gardens/swales. Both could potentially be incorporated if the intensity of the scheme were reduced, notwithstanding the previously approved arrangement for the centralised drainage basin as part of phase 1.
- The treatment of the southern edge of the site is very hard, albeit recognising the land to the south might be brought forward for future development. However, a softer edge should be secured than presently proposed.
- The parking court and frontage parking area to plots 10-13 need to be improved to ensure they do not detract from the scheme

It is expected that further amendments will be made to the scheme to ensure that the design issues summarised above are satisfactorily addressed and an update will be provided to SPB. On this basis, and subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Policies SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the CELPS, GEN1 of the SADPD and the Cheshire East Urban Design Guide.

10.5 Highways & Accessibility

Background

It was established under full planning approval 12/3746N (access road) that the access to the mixed-use development would be via the traffic light-controlled junction of Peter Destapleigh Way and Pear Tree Field. The detailed junction arrangements for the access road with Peter Destapleigh Way were approved under full planning approval 12/3746N. In addition, there is a separate approval (21/1703N) for the main internal spine road serving the site which connects with the southern end of the approved access road leading to the junction with Peter Destapleigh Way (12/3746N). This route incorporates a cycle way/ footway which provides reasonably direct access from the mixed-use site to the primary school located off Pear Tree Field via pedestrian crossing facilities at the traffic light-controlled crossroads junction.

Much of this highway infrastructure has been provided and will now be utilised to serve this proposed residential development as well as Phase 1 and the proposed developments of 49 retirement living units (24/4223/FUL) and an 80-bed care home (24/4228/OUT).

The mixed-use development approved on appeal of which phase 1 (residential – 188 units) is being implemented, is bound by the terms of the S106 agreement which secure highway contributions: including financial contribution towards a bus service, provision of new bus stops and for a pedestrian crossing on Peter Destaplegh Way (position to be agreed).

Access and Layout

The extant permission (reserved matters approval 23/2566N) for the site comprises of a freestanding office building and row of warehouse/industrial. This has two approved access points from the spine road and these are to be retained, although the northern access point is now positioned further south. Both access points are priority junctions with sufficient visibility provided.

The internal roads are cul-de-sacs which are shared surface roads with turning heads at the end of each road. Given the limited number of houses which each road serves, it is considered that a shared surface access road is acceptable as traffic speeds will be low.

Parking

The proposed level of parking provision for the proposed dwellings and 1-bed flats, conforms with CEC parking standards.

Traffic Impact

The traffic generation of this proposal needs to be considered against the approved commercial development on the site. The consented commercial scheme produced much higher trip generation than this residential scheme. This will result in significantly less traffic generation on the local highway network which is considered beneficial by the Highway Authority

Summary

The site access design has been previously accepted to serve a much more HGV/Car intensive commercial development and as such is suitable to serve this proposed residential scheme.

The design of the internal road layout is acceptable, and refuse and servicing can be undertaken within the site. There is adequate parking provision for each of the dwellings proposed within the site.

The traffic impact of the wider site will reduce with as a result of this proposed residential development. No objections raised to the application by the CEC Highway Officer.

10.6 Housing

The Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPs) and the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document states that, the desired target percentage for affordable housing for all allocated sites will be a minimum of 30%, in accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out in 2013. This percentage relates to the provision of both social rented and/or intermediate housing, as appropriate. Normally the Council would expect a ratio of 65/35 between social rented and intermediate housing.

The scheme will provide 30% affordable housing (12 units) spread throughout the site. Provision comprises 8 No. one bedroom, cottage type flats and 4 No. two bedroom houses. The proposed tenure split of 8 rented and 4 intermediate units is acceptable.

Information from the Cheshire Homechoice currently shows that 917 applicants have indicated that Nantwich is their preferred area for social or affordable rented housing. These applicants require: 516 x 1 bed, 206 x 2 bed, 143 x 3 bed and 52 x 4 or more bedrooms

The Council's Housing Officer would prefer a broader mix for the affordable rented units than 1-bed flats than proposed, particularly given the lack of 4-bedroom affordable rental dwellings which have been delivered in Nantwich. Only four, 4-bedroom new build affordable rental properties have become available in Nantwich since 2017.

The Site Allocations and Development Policies (SADPD) states that housing developments should deliver a range and mix of house types, sizes, and tenures to reflect and respond to housing needs and demands. The affordable dwelling mix in Table 8.1 shown in policy HOU1 in the SADPD should however be used as a starting point when considering an appropriate mix for a site

The applicant's updated Affordable Housing Statement points out that CELPs Policy SC5 does not specify a particular dwelling mix by tenure and therefore considered that such matters are subject to negotiation in connection with a planning application. In addition, it is stated that where 4-bedroom affordable housing units are provided, this is predominantly for Shared Ownership, although overall numbers are still relatively low. In addition, demand from Registered Providers to acquire such dwellings is low, with concerns that rental levels for such larger properties would not be sustainable for tenants resulting in a higher rate of rent arrears in comparison to smaller dwelling types.

Furthermore, as this a relatively small development the inclusion of wider range of affordable housing would be difficult to justify in this case, particularly as it is acknowledged that higher demand for 1 and 2 bed units is being addressed here.

By way of comparison, the approved affordable housing secured in the adjoining Phase 1 development site (23/2566N) of 188 units only includes the provision of 2 No. 4 bedroom dwellings of intermediate tenure.

It is considered that the provision of affordable housing therefore complies with CELPS Policy SC5 and SNP Policies H2 (Housing to meet Local Housing Need) and H3 (Tenure Mix). The proposed provision of (30%) of affordable housing with a broadly compliant tenure split of 67/33 between rented (8 units) and intermediate housing (4 units) will be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

Residential Mix

CELPS Policy SC4 'Residential Mix' advises that new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. Policy H3 'Tenure Mix' of the Stapeley and Batherton Neighbourhood Plan (SBNP) states that proposals for affordable homes must be of a tenure, size and type to help meet locally identified need and contribute to a mixed, balanced and inclusive community where people can live independently longer.

SADPD Policy HOU1 'Housing Mix' advises that housing developments should deliver a range and mix of house types, sizes and tenures, which are spread throughout the site and that reflect and respond to identified housing needs and demands.

	Market housing	Intermediate housing	Affordable housing for rent
1 bedroom	5%	14%	26%
2 bedroom	23%	53%	42%
3 bedroom	53%	28%	20%
4 bedroom	15%	4%	10%
5+ bedroom	3%	1%	3%

The housing mix proposed would not be provided as per table 8.1 (above) of the supporting text of policy HOU1. However, the policy text makes it clear that this is to be used as a starting point for analysis and negotiation. The aim of this policy is to provide a mix of housing tenure and bedroom units to suit the needs of all and not to be dominated by larger 4 plus bedroom properties. In this case, the mix appears to be consistent with that aim. Overall, the proposed mix of 40-unit development is:

8 x 1-Bed (20%)

11 x 2- Bed (27.5%)

9 x 3- Bed (22.5%)

12 x 4- Bed (30%)

The proposed housing mix therefore provides a variety of accommodation for different household types and sizes spread throughout the development and accords with policy SC4 of the CELPS, Policy HOU 1 of the SADPD and SBNP Policy SNP H3.

Housing Standards

SADPD Policy HOU8 requires that new residential development should meet the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The submitted table below shows that the proposed house types comply with NDSS.

House type	Type (XbXp)	Storeys	No. of units	NDSS req. (sqm)	House type (sqm)	Compliance with NDSS
Market						
Cartmel	4B6P	2.5	7	112	144.18	
Stapeley	2B4P	2	1	79	114.80	
Charlton B	4B6P	2	2	106	122.07	
Hampton - M4[2]	4B6P	2	2	106	123.47	
Marford - M4[2]	4B6P	2	1	106	123.47	
Ainsdale - M4[2]	3B5P	2	6	93	103.03	
Snowdon	2B4P	2.5	5	79	98.48	
Dodleston B	3B4P	2	2	84	98.10	
Burton	2B3P	2	2	70	70.23	
Affordable						
Maxley - M4[3]	2B3P	2	3	70	80.45	
Maxley	2B3P	2	1	70	80.45	
Disley - M4(2)	1B2P	1	4	50	50.35	
Disley	1B2P	1	4	50	64.01	

Policy HOU8 requires that for major developments at least;

a. 30% of dwellings in housing developments should comply with requirement M4 (2) Category 2 of the Building Regulations regarding accessible and adaptable dwellings; and

b. at least 6% of dwellings in housing developments should comply with requirement M4 (3)(2)(a) Category 3 of the Building Regulations regarding wheelchair adaptable dwellings.

In this instance 3 units meet M4(3)(2)(a) (6% of the housing) and 12 units meet the requirements of M4(2) (30% of the housing). Therefore, the proposal complies with Policy HOU8 of the SADPD

10.7 Healthcare provision

The NHS Cheshire and Merseyside ICB request a financial contribution from the developments to offset the impact of the development on local health care provisions and help fund necessary improvements to GP Practices. Importantly, the NHS sets out that the current model of primary care provision generally focuses on a shift away from smaller GP practices to larger scale premises that accommodate a range of healthcare services. Consequently, an operationally efficient primary healthcare facility should accommodate a minimum of 7,000 registered patients.

This contribution equates to £904 per dwelling (total £36,120) and is calculated on the following basis.

- Population served by surgery = 7,000
- Equivalent number of dwellings (at an average of 2.3 persons per dwelling) = 3,043
- Total cost of required primary care floorspace = £2,752,367
- Contribution cost per dwelling = £904

This contribution per dwelling will contribute to the capital cost of primary healthcare provision. Further information has been provided identifying improvements to the following GP Practices;

- Nantwich Health Centre (Tudor Surgery, Kiltearn Medical Centre and Nantwich Health Centre)
 - optimisation of existing duplicated rooms (x3 practices in one building) and reception areas to create additional x4 clinical rooms of 1st floor and x3 clinical rooms on 2nd floor – associated costings indicated at £450,000
 - 3 storey extension to the rear of the practice – indicative cost circa £2.3 million (including installation of 3rd lift shaft for patient access)
- Wrenbury Medical Practice
 - Expansion into car park and creation of 2 storey extension – Landlord feasibility costings advised at £780,000

However, Muller Property Group disputes the justification for this financial contribution and include a legal opinion to that effect, notwithstanding the additional information provided by the NHS above. It is considered that the approach used is “imposing a blanket per dwelling contribution on new housing development” without specific evidence that justifies the contribution, such as in addressing the existing capacity at the health centres above, nor evidence for why they would be unable to cater for any additional demand on their services resulting from the proposed development. It concludes that they are “adopting an approach that is unsupported by law, policy or evidence and is fundamentally flawed”

Further comments are awaited from the NHS in response to the issues raised by the legal opinion. It is noted that the initial response from the NHS was not very detailed or specific in its ask. However, following further information submitted by the NHS Officers have continued discussions with the applicants given that similar principles for contributions from the NHS have been secured on many other similar applications. As it currently stands, it is considered that the requested healthcare contribution is fair and reasonable in addressing the impact of the proposed residential development on local healthcare provision.

10.8 Education

The Council's Education team advises that the proposed development of 40 dwellings are expected to generate:

- 11 - Primary children (40 x 0.29)
- 6 - Secondary children (40 x 0.14)
- 1 - SEN children (40 x 0.60 x 0.047%)

The development is expected to impact on secondary school places in the locality. Contributions which have been negotiated on other developments are factored into the forecasts both in terms of the increased pupil numbers and the increased capacity at primary and secondary schools in the area because of agreed financial contributions.

Special Education provision within Cheshire East Council currently has a shortage of places available with at present over 47% of pupils educated outside of the Borough. The 1 child expected from the proposed development will exacerbate the shortfall.

To alleviate forecast pressures, the following contributions would be required:

- 6 x £27,492.00 = £164,952.00 (Secondary)
- 1 x £74,920.00 = £74,920.00 (SEN)

Total education contribution: £239,872.00

This will be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.

Provision of school site

The main areas of POS serving this development will occupy part of the area indicated within the mixed-use scheme for the site of a primary school in conformity with outline approval 12/3747N. However, the Outline Permission simply required the part of the site to be reserved to accommodate a primary school. It is not subject to any detailed planning approval and nor does the S106 agreement require its provision to be funded through the mixed-use development.

In addition, the Council's Education Team have not identified that a new school is required to be provided on this site to meet a forecasted need for primary pupil places in Nantwich since outline approval was granted in 2020.

In these circumstances, there is no justification to prevent alternative use or development of this land including the provision of additional POS as set out below within the wider Mayland Park development for use by the community which in its own right will deliver social benefits.

10.9 Public Open Space

The Council's Leisure Officer is satisfied that the overall quantum of public open space (3,725 sqm) proposed to serve the residential development is acceptable and this also significantly exceeds the requirements set out by with CELPS Policy SE6 (Table 13.1). The main area of POS is located at the heart of the wider development adjoining that serving the David Wilson Development (Phase 1) and located about 200m from the application site.

The Leisure Officer advises that the detailed design of the area should complement that of the adjoining POS to the west and also blend with the further adjoining POS to proposed to the east being as part of application 24/4228/OUT (Care Home).

It is advised that footpaths should join and appear seamless from David Wilson Homes POS. Three items of green gym equipment are required to promote active and healthy lifestyle and also some play elements for 8 –11 year olds. It is recommended that an area of approximately 200m² within the POS should accommodate a small orchard.

Amended plans have included a small play area (LAP) within the confines of the residential development itself which is welcomed, although specific details of its equipment and layout are required.

Details of arrangements for the management and maintenance of POS and play space will need to be secured through a S106 Agreement.

In terms of Policy SE6 requirement for outdoor sports contributions, the proposal will increase demand on existing facilities and as such a financial contribution towards off site provision is required. The financial contribution is £1,564 per family dwelling or £782.27 per bed space in apartments (to a maximum of £1,564.54 per apartment). The funds would be required on commencement of development and used in line with the Council's adopted Playing Pitch and outdoor Sports Strategy.

It is recommended that conditions requiring the following are attached:

- Submission of details of the design of the proposed LAP
- Submission of details of the main POS which should include but not be limited to an orchard, play and green gym items, short mown area for informal games, paths and seating.

The Council's Leisure Officer raises no objections to the overall provision of public open space and associated recreational facilities proposed within the scheme, subject to the conditions recommended above. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with the open space requirements of policies SE 6 of the CELPS and Policy REC 3 of the SADPD.

10.11 Amenity

SADPD Policy HOU 12 (Amenity) requires that new development should not be permitted if it is deemed to cause unacceptable harm upon neighbouring amenity such as from overlooking, visual intrusion or noise and disturbance. In addition, Policy HOU13 of the SADPD identifies the following separation distances;

- 21 metres for typical rear separation distance (24m plus 2.5m per additional storey)
- 18 metres for typical frontage separation distance (20m for three-storey buildings)
- 14 metres for a habitable room facing a non-habitable room (the addition of 2.5m per additional storey).

There are no existing residential properties adjacent to the site with those of Phase 1 sited some distance to the west separated by the Spine Road and intervening open space and landscaping. Consequently, the siting and design of the development will have no adverse impact on the residential amenities of existing dwellings.

In consideration of amenity for future occupiers of the proposed development, the layout adheres with the recommended separation standards within CEC Design Guide to ensure the future occupiers of the proposed development are not detrimentally impacted in terms of loss of light, or privacy, or an overbearing impact from each other.

Policy HOU13 of the SADPD states that proposals for housing development should 'include an appropriate quantity and quality of outdoor private amenity space, having regard to the type and size of the proposed development'. Although some of the proposed gardens are a little small in size, notwithstanding this, it is deemed that they are sufficient in order for the future occupiers to enjoy normal activities e.g. sitting out, hanging washing, BBQs etc. Furthermore, large areas of shared public green space are provided within the wider development.

10.12 Ecology

There are various ecology matters to consider. These are broken down into the following subsections and assessed accordingly. Additional information in respect of ecological issues and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has been provided during the course of the application.

Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain

The application is subject to Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain. The BNG metric submitted in support of the application indicates that the proposed development would result in a net gain of 13.59% in respect of Area Based habitats and 31.38% in respect of Hedgerows. However, the Council's Ecologist considers that the submitted BNG information is insufficient to inform the determination of the application and further supporting information is required.

Updated BNG documents have since been submitted and these are currently being assessed by the Council's Ecologist

Ecological Network

The application site falls within a Restoration Area of the CEC ecological network. Policy ENV1 therefore applies to the determination of this application. Whether the development would result in an enhancement of the ecological network can be determined through the use of the BNG metric. However, it is recommended that a condition is attached to secure the incorporation of features for the benefit of wildlife.

Great Crested Newts

This protected species is known to breed at a number of ponds within close proximity of the proposed development. In the absence of mitigation, the proposed development would result in the loss of lower value terrestrial habitat in the form of grassland habitats and moderate value habitat in the form of hedgerows and would pose the risk of injuring and killing any newts present on site during site clearance works.

It should be noted that since a European Protected Species has been recorded on site and is likely to be adversely affected the proposed development the planning authority must have regard to the Habitat Regulations when determining this application. The Habitats Regulations only allow planning to consent to be granted when:

- the development is of overriding public interest,
- there are no suitable alternatives and
- the favourable conservation status of the species will be maintained.

In this case, the Council's Ecologist advises that the applicant's ecological consultant has confirmed that the site is covered by an extant Natural England protected species licence. However, confirmation is awaited from the applicant as to whether newts are currently excluded from the footprint of the currently proposed development by means of an intact amphibian fence.

Common Toad

This priority amphibian species is also likely to be present on site. The proposed development would also result in an adverse impact upon this species. However, mitigation and compensation measures to address the impacts of the proposed development upon great crested newts would also minimise the risk to this species.

Badgers

The submitted Badger report recorded evidence of badger activity throughout the site, but no active setts are present. It is advised that the proposed development would result in a low magnitude adverse impact upon badgers as a result of the loss of suitable foraging habitat.

Bats

Three trees on site have been identified as having bat roost potential. These trees would all be retained as part of the proposed development. Works are however likely to occur within close proximity to the trees. The submitted Ecological Assessment (ecus, November 2024) advises that further bat surveys should be undertaken if any works are within 10m of the tree. The Council's Ecologist has advised that further surveys/impacts assessment in respect of these trees are therefore required. Further information (Bat Technical Note) has been submitted and is being assessed.

The application site was assessed as having Moderate potential for foraging/commuting bats. Consequently, two bat activity surveys were undertaken. These were completed in September and October, meaning only a limited range of seasonal activity was assessed during the surveys. A low level of bat activity was recorded in September and a moderate level of bat activity was in October focussed around hedgerow 1 and 2.

The proposed development will result in the loss of existing hedgerows on site and so based upon the available survey information is likely to result in a localised adverse impact upon foraging bats. This impact could potentially be compensated for through the creation of replacement hedgerows as part of the landscaping of the scheme. Whether sufficient hedgerow planting is being provided to compensate for that lost can be assessed through the use of the BNG metric.

Lighting

To avoid any adverse impacts on bats resulting from any lighting associated with the Development. The Council's Ecologist recommends that a condition should be attached requiring any additional lighting to be agreed with the LPA.

Barn Owls

The grassland habitats on site may offer potential for foraging barn owls and evidence of barn owl presence was recorded incidentally during the ecological surveys on site. No evidence of this species roosting on site was recorded during the surveys of the trees on

site. The Council's Ecologist advises that the proposed development may potentially have a minor impact upon barn owls due to the loss of potential foraging habitat.

Reptiles

Reptile species are not reasonable likely to be present or affected by the proposed development.

Hedgehogs and Brown Hare

Hedgehogs and Brown Hare are a priority species and hence a material consideration. No evidence of these species was recorded onsite, but the species may occur on site on a transitory basis. The Council's Ecologist considers that the proposed development poses a low risk to this species. To minimise the risk of these species being harmed during works on site, a condition is recommended to be attached to secure the implementation of measures in accordance with the Hedgehog and Brown Hare Mitigation measures detailed in paragraph 4.2.24 of the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment prepared by ECUS dated September 2024.

Hedgerows

Hedgerows are a priority habitat and hence a material consideration. The proposed development will result in the loss of the existing hedgerows on site with a corresponding loss of biodiversity. Whether sufficient planting is being proposed to compensate for their loss can be assessed by means of the BNG metric discussed above.

Nesting Birds

If planning consent is granted standard conditions would be required to safeguard nesting birds.

10.13 Flood Risk/Drainage

The site is located in Flood Zone 1 (lowest area of flood risk), nor are there extensive areas of surface water flood risk. There are one or two locations with potential for surface water flood risk but this is associated with natural depressions in the landform.

The submitted surface water drainage strategy proposes to capture surface water within each parcel and discharge it into the drainage system which was approved to serve phases 1 and 2 of the mixed-use development. The LLFA and United utilities raised no objections in principle to the and the proposed Drainage Strategy supporting Reserved Matters Approvals.

The LLFA acknowledge this site is part of a larger scheme at Maylands Park and elements of SuDS provision are included elsewhere within the designed scheme. However, it is considered that SuDS features should be provided within this residential site as part of the drainage system and could include rain gardens or tree pit planters in addition to all private parking spaces being permeable.

In addition, the LLFA have requested full hydraulic calculations for the drainage scheme and further information has been submitted by the applicant which is currently being considered. It is also noted that some Finished Floor levels (FFLs) shown for dwellings are not 150mm above all AOD as required. A planning condition is recommended to require the submission and approval of ground and first floor levels.

10.14 Air Quality

Policy SE12 of the CELPS 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.

SNP Policy T5 (Improving Air Quality) echoes these objectives and also set out the required details of Air Quality Assessments.

Air quality impacts have been considered within the air quality assessment submitted in support of the application. This also relates to the wider development on the site which includes the proposals for an 80-bed care home and retirement living development of 49 apartments.

The report concludes that a detailed assessment into the impacts of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} during the operational phase is not required in accordance with EPUK and IAQM criteria based on the predicted development flows, and overall, the impact on local air quality will be not significant.

The Council's Environmental Protection Officer accepts the findings of the air quality assessment, but to ensure that local air quality is not adversely impacted for existing and future residents, conditions are recommended requiring the implementation of the residents travel plan and use of ultra-low emission boilers. In addition, electric vehicle infrastructure will be required to be provided on site in accordance with the specifications set out in The Building Regulations.

11. CIL REGULATIONS

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, it is necessary for planning applications with legal agreements 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) Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

It is considered that the contributions required as part of the application are justified meet the Council's requirement for policy compliance. All elements are necessary, directly relate to the development and are fair and reasonable in relation to the scale and kind of development. On this basis the scheme is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

12. PLANNING BALANCE/CONCLUSION

The proposed development would result in residential development located beyond the Nantwich Sandbach Settlement Boundary in conflict with policies PG6 of the CELPS and GS1 and H5 of the SBNP and the development plan as a whole . However, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing and paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged.

The NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is with particular regard to directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

Disbenefits

- The proposed development would result in residential development with the open countryside located beyond the Nantwich Settlement Boundary
- loss of approved mixed-uses including employment within the Maylands Park development

Benefits

- The proposal would result in the creation of 40 dwellings (30 % affordable) which will significantly contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply.
- The proposed development will have indirect economic benefits including additional trade for local shops and businesses, jobs in construction and economic benefits to the construction industry supply chain.
- The site is sustainably located given its location on the edge of a Key Service Centre with good accessibility to local services and facilities
- The development incorporates components and features of good design, although it is expected that further improvements will be made to southern part of site to address issues raised by the Design Officer. Given the urbanised context of the site in this edge of settlement location, this scheme would not be out of character with recent development in locality and at Maylands Park.
- Reduction of vehicle movements from those generated by commercial mixed uses of the approved “fallback position” (Maylands Park Phase 2 – mixed uses)
- Provision of an above-policy compliant level of POS provision resulting in additional social benefits
- the application site benefits from full consent for commercial development which remains extant and constitutes a fall-back position which should be given significant weight. The alternative development of the site for housing represents an effective use of land.

Neutral

- The layout and design of the scheme would not harm residential amenity
- The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the highway network.
- The proposals do not result in any significant ecological impacts and is acceptable subject to the imposition of planning conditions
- The proposal would not result in any significant flood risk/drainage issues
- The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on air quality with mitigation secured through planning conditions.

To satisfactorily address the impact on local services/facilities, contributions towards education, healthcare provision and off-site sport/recreation will be secured through a S106 Agreement.

In summary, the development would significantly contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply and the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals when assessed against the policies within the NPPF. The proposed development would benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development which weighs heavily in support of the proposed development. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval.

13. RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

S106	Amount	Trigger
Education (primary/secondary/SEN)	£239,872.00	50% prior to Commencement of a dwelling, then 50% Prior to occupation 20 th dwelling (or 50% percentile dwelling)
Affordable Housing	30% (tenure split of 8 rented units and 4 intermediate housing units).	Not more than of 50% of open market dwellings (sale/rent) shall be occupied until all affordable units within have completed and made ready for immediate occupation and use.
Arrangements for transfer to management company of all areas of planting /landscaping, POS/incidental open space Childrens play space, allotments/orchards and ecological areas		Prior to first occupation of the development
Contribution to outdoor sports facilities	£56,316 The financial contribution is £1,564 per family dwelling or £782.27 per bed space in apartments (to a maximum of £1,564.54 per apartment). The funds would be required on commencement of development and used in line with the Council's adopted Playing Pitch and outdoor Sports Strategy.	50% prior to Commencement of a dwelling, then 50% Prior to occupation 20 th dwelling

NHS Healthcare	<p>Financial contribution of £36,160 (£904 per dwelling/ apartment)</p> <p>Calculated on following basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population served by surgery = 7,000 - Equivalent number of dwellings (at an average of 2.3 persons per dwelling) = 3,043 - Total cost of required primary care floorspace = £2,752,367 - Contribution cost per dwelling = £904 	Prior to occupation 20 th dwelling
----------------	--	---

And the following conditions.

1. Commencement of development (3 years)
2. Development in accordance with approved plans
3. Details of facing materials
4. Details of hard surfacing treatments
5. Details of ground levels and finished floor levels
6. Submission of landscaping scheme
7. Implementation of landscaping
8. Details of Boundary treatment
9. Details for the provision of cycle storage and bin storage
10. Submission of Details for design of LAP
11. Submission of details of the main POS to include orchard, play and green gym items, short mown area for informal games, paths and seating.
12. Details for the provision of SuDS features to form part of drainage system
13. Provision of Ultra Low Emission Boilers
14. Implementation of Residents travel plan
15. Contaminated land – soil testing
16. Measures to deal with unexpected contamination
17. Implementation of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
18. Implementation of measures to minimise the risk of harm to Hedgehog and Brown Hare during works on site
19. Safeguarding of nesting birds
20. Details of lighting to safeguard bats
21. Provision of ecological enhancement features

In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions / informatives / planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Planning has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Strategic Planning Board, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

