

## **NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE 8<sup>th</sup> June 2011**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NOS:** 11/0533M

**LOCATION:** 2 – 4 Holly Road North, Wilmslow

**UPDATE PREPARED** 6<sup>th</sup> June 2011

It has been noted that the officers' committee report states that no comments have been received by the Strategic Highways Manager. This is a typing error and it is confirmed that the comments received formed part of the assessment.

#### **Additional Information**

A statement has been submitted by Howard and Seddon that seeks to rationalise the proposed level of parking on the site. A full copy of the report is available on the application file. The report outlines the context of the site, the relevance of Planning Policy Statement 13: Transport, and a justification statement. In summary the agent is in support of the conclusions drawn by the Strategic Highways Manager and the points outlined below.

Following detailed observations to distinguish the level of parking at Wilmslow High School, the Strategic Highways Manager concluded that there was sufficient parking within Wilmslow high School to avoid the likelihood of displaced parking onto Holly Road North.

There are a total of 19 parking spaces on the site which represents a total provision of 190% in relation to the number of apartments provided. The emerging standard of Cheshire East Council Highway Authority recommends a 200% provision in relation to residential housing units. Though this presents a 10% shortfall in relation to the current application it is recognised that contextually the development provides superfluous parking in relation to standards that were in force at the time the initial application was approved on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2011. The sustainable location of the site, close to local shops and services, means that there is no basis to insist on any more parking at this site.

A Sustainability Statement was also submitted which illustrates that local shops and amenity services are within half a mile of the application site.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The principle of the development has been discussed within the body of the Committee Report. It is considered that sufficient information is now available to

demonstrate that this application is acceptable in respect of car parking requirements. There is no change to the recommendation of approval.

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 8 JUNE 2011**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

APPLICATION NO: 10/3175M

**LOCATION: BUTLEY HALL, SCOTT ROAD, PRESTBURY, SK10 4DN**

**PROPOSAL: REFURBISHMENT, CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF BUTLEY HALL TO PROVIDE SEVEN APARTMENTMENTS: THIS WORK INCLUDES PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF LATER PARTS OF THE LISTED BUILDING. CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW THREE STOREY TOWNHOUSES TO THE REAR OF BUTLEY HALL. EXTERNAL WORKS TO CREATE NEW RAMPED ACCESS DRIVE TO NEW CAR PARKING AREA BETWEEN BUTLEY HALL AND THE NEW TOWNHOUSES TOGETHER WITH CONSTRUCTION OF TEN GARAGE SPACES AND A BIN STORAGE ROOM BUILT BELOW THE EXISTING GARDEN LEVEL AT THE REAR OF THE EXISTING BUILDING. CREATION OF A FOOTPATH LINK FROM THE SITE TO SPRINGFIELDS. SOFT LANDSCAPING TO THE REMAINING AREAS OF THE SITE (FULL PLANNING).**

**UPDATE PREPARED: 6 JUNE 2011**

**ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

Two additional letters of objection have been received, the first from Pannone LLP, on behalf of the owner of Beverley Cottage (including a Heritage Assessment by Mr. Wools B.Arch., Ph.D, Dip Cons (York) RIBA IHBC) and the second from the occupiers of The Gate House.

The following additional concerns were raised:

- As a Grade II Listed Building [Butley Hall] is important within Prestbury as one of only a few listed buildings within the Village
- The proposal presents a major and radical intervention in terms of the historic fabric of the Grade II Listed Building and its site. The garaging accommodation and parking, along with the new townhouses, introduce a major impact within the setting of the listed building
- Special interest is subsumed by the proposals such that it would cause significant harm

- The degree of alterations and extent of the additional footprint would dominate the plan form of the building and reduce the remaining historic fabric to a minor role. The proposal would therefore not comply with planning policy
- The proposals have been reviewed against local planning policies, and there is significant and substantial conflict with those policies, sufficient for the applications to be refused
- 10 households may be expected to generate is no less than 80 vehicle movements per day. This norm is likely to be exceeded since, for occupants of the quality of these apartments, (a) two cars per household can be expected and (b) deliveries and other services to these households will tend to be above the norm.
- The significantly increased volume of traffic would result in a major loss of amenity, primarily to The Gate House, with emissions, noise and turning traffic in the closest of proximity to The Gate House, exacerbated by the effect of the subway ramp on vehicles climbing from the parking areas. The point is proximity which is not the cul-de-sac argument.
- As far as traffic generation is concerned, any comparison between a present Hall of 2x1, 3x2 and 2x3 bedroom apartments with a Hall of 7x3bedroom substantial apartments is clearly invalid. Further the change in quality and size of the proposed apartments will assuredly generate more then 80 vehicle movements per day.

## **HIGHWAYS**

In response to the concerns raised by the occupiers of The Gate House, the Highway Engineer advises:

*“The 10 units are likely to generate some 80 trips in total in a 24hr period and this number does include service vehicles. The actual traffic impact is negligible because when you consider the traditional peak hours in the AM and PM there will only be 7-8 trips in an hour and this works out as a trip every 8 minutes or so. In reality, traffic is not evenly spread out, but even if 8 trips all happened at once the access could quite easily cope with the traffic movements.*

*Therefore, this development is no different to a traditional residential cul-de-sac street serving 20 or so units where traffic levels are quite easily dealt with and do not cause a problem”.*

## **AMENITY**

Members need to carefully consider the impact of the development on the amenity of the occupiers of The Gate House.

As discussed within the main committee report, the proposal will increase the number of units on this site from 7 apartments to 7 apartments plus 3 mews houses, however, planning permission was granted for 12 units in the 2009 consent.

It is considered that the additional traffic movements will generate emissions and noise, however, with limited traffic movements per hour (7-8) this is not considered to raise a significant amenity issue.

### **CONSERVATION CONSIDERATIONS**

The Conservation Officer has been re-consulted in respect of the Heritage Statement prepared by Mr. Wools, on behalf of the occupiers of Beverley Cottage. As the Conservation Officer is on Annual Leave at present, his views will be provided verbally at Committee.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The principle of the development has been discussed within the body of the Committee Report. The additional representations are noted. Members will need to carefully consider the additional comments/objections raised; it is considered that these issues relate to matters already set out in the Committee Report.

There is no change to the recommendation of approval, subject to the views of the Conservation Officer on the Heritage Assessment.

### **CONDITIONS**

A full summary of conditions is listed below.

1. A03FP - Commencement of development (3 years)
2. A04AP - Development in accord with revised plans (numbered)
3. A05EX - Details of materials to be submitted
4. A10EX - Rainwater goods
5. A22EX - Roofing material
6. A16EX - Specification of window design / style
7. A20EX - Submission of details of windows
8. A19EX - Garage doors - timber
9. A03LB - Protection of features - Jacobean staircase

- 10. A05LB\_1 - Protection of features - No additional fixtures
- 11. A22GR - Protection from noise during construction (hours of construction)
- 12. A01MC - Submission of soundproofing measures to protect residential amenity of future occupiers
- 13. A25GR - Obscure glazing requirement – side windows
- 14. A06GR - No windows to be inserted
- 15. A01GR - Removal of permitted development rights - dwellings
- 16. A23MC - Details of ground levels to be submitted
- 17. A17MC - Decontamination of land
- 18. A02LS - Submission of amended landscaping scheme
- 19. A04LS - Landscaping (implementation)
- 20. A12LS - Landscaping to include details of boundary treatment
- 21. A17LS - Submission of landscape management plan
- 22. A01TR - Tree retention
- 23. A02TR - Tree protection
- 24. A14TR - Protection of existing hedges shown on the plan
- 25. A19MC - Refuse storage facilities to be approved
- 26. A04HP - Provision of cycle parking
- 27. A01HP\_1 - Provision of car parking - 10 garages and 9 spaces
- 28. A06HP\_1 - Use of garage - for parking of cars
- 29. A08MC - Lighting details to be approved
- 30. A03TR - Construction specification/method statement
- 31. A32HA - Submission of construction method statement
- 32. Submission of archaeological methodology
- 33. No pile driving permitted
- 34. Details of privacy screens to balconies/terraces be submitted

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 8 JUNE 2011**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

APPLICATION NO: 10/3214M

**LOCATION: BUTLEY HALL, SCOTT ROAD, PRESTBURY, SK10 4DN**

**PROPOSAL: REFURBISHMENT, CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF BUTLEY HALL TO PROVIDE SEVEN APARTMENTS: THIS WORK INCLUDES PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF LATER PARTS OF THE LISTED BUILDING. CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW THREE STOREY TOWNHOUSES TO THE REAR OF BUTLEY HALL. EXTERNAL WORKS TO CREATE NEW RAMPED ACCESS DRIVE TO NEW CAR PARKING AREA BETWEEN BUTLEY HALL AND THE NEW TOWNHOUSES TOGETHER WITH CONSTRUCTION OF TEN GARAGE SPACES AND A BIN STORAGE ROOM BUILT BELOW THE EXISTING GARDEN LEVEL AT THE REAR OF THE EXISTING BUILDING. CREATION OF A FOOTPATH LINK FROM THE SITE TO SPRINGFIELDS. SOFT LANDSCAPING TO THE REMAINING AREAS OF THE SITE (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT).**

**UPDATE PREPARED: 6 JUNE 2011**

**ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

One additional letter of objection has been received, from Pannone LLP, on behalf of the owner of Beverley Cottage (including a Heritage Assessment by Mr. Wools B.Arch., Ph.D, Dip Cons (York) RIBA IHBC).

The following additional concerns were raised:

- As a Grade II Listed Building [Butley Hall] is important within Prestbury as one of only a few listed buildings within the Village
- The proposal presents a major and radical intervention in terms of the historic fabric of the Grade II Listed Building and its site. The garaging accommodation and parking, along with the new townhouses, introduce a major impact within the setting of the listed building
- Special interest is subsumed by the proposals such that it would cause significant harm
- The degree of alterations and extent of the additional footprint would dominate the plan form of the building and reduce the remaining historic

fabric to a minor role. The proposal would therefore not comply with planning policy

- The proposals have been reviewed against local planning policies, and there is significant and substantial conflict with those policies, sufficient for the applications to be refused

### **CONSERVATION CONSIDERATIONS**

The Conservation Officer has been re-consulted in respect of the Heritage Statement prepared by Mr. Wools, on behalf of the occupiers of Beverley Cottage. These views will be provided verbally at Committee.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The principle of the development has been discussed within the body of the Committee Report. The additional representation is noted. Members will need to carefully consider the additional comments/objections raised. These objections relate to issues already set out in the Committee Report.

There is no change to the recommendation of approval, subject to the views of the Conservation Officer on the Heritage Assessment.

### **CONDITIONS**

A full summary is listed below.

- 35. A07LB - Standard Time Limit
- 36. A04AP\_1 - Development in accord with revised plans (numbered)
- 37. A05EX - Details of materials to be submitted
- 38. A10EX - Rainwater goods
- 39. A22EX - Roofing material
- 40. A16EX - Specification of window design / style
- 41. A20EX - Submission of details of windows
- 42. A19EX - Garage doors
- 43. A03LB - Protection of features - Jacobean staircase
- 44. A05LB - Protection of features - no additional fixtures
- 45. A02LB - Method statement
- 46. Submission of archaeological methodology



**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 08 JUNE 2011**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

APPLICATION NO: 11-0131M

**LOCATION: LAND TO THE REAR OF CHERRY WOOD, SPARROW LANE, KNUTSFORD**

**PROPOSAL: DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT SQUASH CLUB BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-STOREY 5 BEDROOM HOUSE**  
**UPDATE PREPARED: 06 JUNE 2011**

**REGARDING FURTHER QUESTIONS ASKED AT THE COMMITTEE SITE VISIT**

1. Following some level of uncertainty, in addition to the proposed site plan originally submitted, a plan has been submitted on 06/06/11 clearly showing the extent of the demolition proposed in red and the walls that are to remain in blue. This shows that additional boundary treatment to the rear is not required to be conditioned as the existing walls, including the rear wall of the outbuilding owned by the adjacent property, would remain.
2. Questions have been raised regarding the definition and ownership of this section of Sparrow Lane and the legality of having a private vehicular access on this public right of way.

The Highways Engineer has clarified that the first 20m of Sparrow Lane from Aylesby Close is adopted highway and the remainder leading up to the site is unadopted highway; the owner of this section is however unknown, as verified by a land registry search 03/06/11.

As also confirmed by the Highways Engineer 06/06/11, the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Act and Right of Way Act state that it is not an offence for someone with a right of access to drive on a public footpath to park a vehicle on private land up to 15 yards from the highway.

3. To clarify, this section of Sparrow Lane extends from Aylesby Close circa 100m East up to the second pedestrian/ vehicular entrance to the allotments, with bollards blocking the lane to vehicles just after this second entrance.
4. According to the original owner the squash club was built in 1935; we have no planning records of this or any conditions relating to the hours of

use of the building. The owner of the site from 1964 has evidence of time sheets that show the use of the club in the evening.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The principle of the development has been discussed within the body of the Committee Report. The additional representations are noted. Members will need to carefully consider the additional points raised.

There is no change to the recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

## **CONDITIONS**

The relevant conditions attached to this recommendation have not been automatically attached to the committee report. The relevant conditions are therefore stated below:

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to following conditions

1. AD02 - Complies objections considered
2. AD14 - Acceptable relationship adjacent and wider
3. AD15 - Acceptable impact on amenity
4. AD20 - visual impact
5. POL01 - Policies
6. A03FP - Commencement of development (3 years)
7. A03AP - Development in accord with revised plans (unnumbered)
8. A05EX - Materials
9. A01TR - Tree retention
10. A02TR - Tree protection
11. A05LS - Landscaping - implementation
12. A04LS - Landscaping (implementation)
13. A25GR - Obscure glazing requirement
14. IF02 - Noise
15. A32HA - Submission of construction method statement
16. A23GR - Pile Driving
17. A08HA - Gates set back from footway/carriageway

18. Contaminated Land (Informative)

19. Public Right of Way (Informative)



**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 8 June 2011**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

11/0366M

**LOCATION**

Land South of the Junction of Mill Lane and London Road, Adlington

**UPDATE PREPARED**

6 June 2011

**CONSULTATIONS**

Environment Agency – No objections subject to conditions

English Heritage – No objections

**REPRESENTATIONS**

To date, one further letter of representation has been received from a local resident objecting to the proposal on the grounds that the proposal will ruin the visual amenity of the area and significantly devalue their property.

**KEY ISSUES**

Following the receipt of the additional information, specifically a revised landscape masterplan (plan number 641.1D), the Environment Agency are now able to remove their objection to the application subject to the following conditions:

- 1 Green burials shall only take place in the part of the site that is to the North and West of the watercourse running through the site, as indicated on the submitted revised Landscape Masterplan (plan number 641.1D). The part of the site to the south and east of the watercourse may only be used for the interment of cremated remains or for scattering of ashes in accordance with revised masterplan (plan number 641.1D).
- 2 Burials must not take place within 250 metres of any well, spring or borehole from which a drinking water supply is drawn.
- 3 The place of interment should be at least 30 metres away from any other spring or watercourse, and at least 10 metres away from any field drain.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of green burials in the North West area of the site (as outlined in the revised landscape masterplan reference 641.1.D), groundwater levels shall be monitored on a monthly basis for a period of 12 months. After this 12 month period, monitoring of groundwater in the five window sample boreholes, shall continue to take place on a monthly basis for a 3 year period. The results shall be submitted to the LPA on an annual basis, in consultation with the Environment Agency, for approval.
- 5 The base of all burial pits on the site must maintain a minimum 1 metre clearance above the highest natural water table as identified in the groundwater monitoring on the site.

English Heritage has also confirmed that the proposals are now acceptable to them.

The additional comments received in representation are noted, but the impact upon the visual amenity of the area was addressed in the original report, and the loss of property value is not a material planning consideration, and therefore cannot be afforded any weight in the determination of this application.

## **CONCLUSION**

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

## **NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 8 June 2011**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

#### **APPLICATION NO.**

11/1115M

#### **LOCATION**

Windmill Wood, Chelford Road, Ollerton, WA16 8RX

#### **UPDATE PREPARED**

6 June 2011

#### **CONSULTATIONS**

Strategic Highways Manager – No objections

#### **REPRESENTATIONS**

To date, 14 further letters of representation have been received from a local residents and interested parties. 12 of these letters object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Nothing gained for the community as a whole by building a large house.
- The development would set a precedent.
- Impact upon highway safety.
- Detrimental to natural habitat, wildlife and trees
- Contrary to Green Belt policies
- Any increase in number of septic tanks in the area is likely to exacerbate existing problems.
- No benefit to openness or from loss of commercial use if more larger buildings are proposed, and another business is created.
- Local Home Watch and Rural Watch reports supplied by the police have not identified any crimes taking place in the area of the woodland in recent times.
- Horses in neighbouring field are often affected by the noise from machinery.
- Applicants lived in neighbouring property (Kerfield Lodge) for over 30 years and during this time did the minimum of woodland management so that it has progressively deteriorated.
- Kerfield Lodge is now back on the market, and if purchased would avoid the need for a new dwelling in the Green Belt.

2 of the letters support the proposal noting that:

- The application will allow the forest to be continually maintained, to the benefit of the woodland and wildlife.
- Toft Church has received considerable cost saving support and assistance from the applicant in maintaining the grounds.
- Toft (Windmill) Wood is part of Knutsford's history.
- Present owner has managed the forest very successfully for 33 years.

## **KEY ISSUES**

Comments from the Council's Officer for Arboriculture have recently been received. The officer sets out the local importance of this woodland and the benefits that would arise from the proposed management of the woodland, which will otherwise continue to deteriorate. For this reason, it is recommended that the application is deferred to a later meeting of the Northern Planning Committee to allow officers further time to consider the merits of the applicant's proposal and whether very special circumstances may exist to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

## **CONCLUSION**

As outlined above, a recommendation of deferral is now made.

**NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 8<sup>th</sup> June 2011**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO: 11/0648M**

**LOCATION: JUBILEE FOUNTAIN OUTSIDE 11-13 FOUNTAIN  
PLACE, CHESTER ROAD, POYNTON**

**UPDATE PREPARED: 6<sup>th</sup> June 2011**

**OTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

A further two letters were received that also objected to the removal and relocation of the listed fountain. These comments were taken into consideration when the original report to committee was written.