

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 November 2012

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

12/0127M

LOCATION

Land at a Park Green, Macclesfield

UPDATE PREPARED

05 November 2012

REPRESENTATIONS

By way of clarification, the comments received in representation are summarised in the original report, but the numbers of letters received has been 6 in total (not 1 as stated in the original report). 5 letters have been received from local residents and 1 from the Civic Society.

Plans

The original report refers to revised plans being awaited. These were received between the report being written and the key plans being issued to Members. Therefore the plans that Members have in their packs are the correct ones.

Highways

Parking provision within the proposed development is limited. 20 spaces will be provided for the development as a whole, 13 spaces for residents and 7 for staff. As outlined in the original report, the Strategic Highways Manager raises no objections to the proposal having regard to other similar developments where residents do not tend to have a high car ownership rate especially when the site is located in a town centre. However, this low level of parking provision applies only to this specific form of residential accommodation (sheltered housing). If the development was not a sheltered housing scheme, a higher amount of parking provision would be required. The Heads of Terms for the legal agreement therefore need to include a clause to ensure it remains as genuine sheltered housing for persons over 60 years old.

In addition, it is recommended that all 20 spaces are reserved for residents, this would bring the proposal more into line with parking provision set out in other similar schemes in less sustainable locations within the Borough. It is not unreasonable for town centre workers to make their own arrangements for car parking.

Affordable housing

The Council's independent appraisal of the applicant's viability assessment has now been received and shows that there is scope within the scheme to provide affordable housing. The fundamental difference between the applicant's appraisal and the Council's is in respect of the potential market value for one and two bedroom apartments within an assisted living retirement scheme.

The applicant's appraisal relies on a comparison with the values achievable for older, previously owned and occupied apartments and makes no reference to the values and prices being achieved on similar new build schemes in neighbouring areas. The applicants estimate sales values to be £90,000 for the one bedroom apartments and £125,000 for the two bedroom apartments.

The Council appraisal takes new build schemes into consideration and produces a substantially increased gross development value for the proposed scheme. The Council's appraisal estimates sales values to be £125,000 for the one bedroom apartments and £160,000 for the two bedroom apartments.

The appraisal prepared on behalf of the applicants produces a nominally negative site value (-£14,164) without any affordable housing provision, which would suggest that the scheme is not viable. But this is the basis on which the applicants are willing to proceed.

The Council's appraisal indicates a potential residual site value excluding any provision for affordable housing of approximately £1,455,000. This would be reduced to a residual site value of £485,000 if eighteen of the units are to be provided as affordable housing.

On the basis of this information, the provision of affordable housing would appear to be feasible, despite the consequential reductions in the potential gross development value and therefore the residual site value.

CONCLUSIONS

The Council's independent appraisal of the applicant's viability assessment suggests that the applicants have under estimated the potential end value of the apartments. Taking account of the higher levels of value that can be achieved in new developments of this nature, it is considered that the provision of affordable housing is feasible.

As in the original report a recommendation of approval is made subject to the s106 Heads of Terms and conditions outlined in the original report and those listed below:

Additional Heads of Terms

- Occupation of apartments restricted to persons aged over 60

Additional Conditions

16. Provision of residents car parking (20 spaces)

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE – 7th November 2012

APPLICATION NO: 12/3481M

PROPOSAL: Removal of conditions 1 and 2 of planning consent 5/5/08863 to allow 12 month holiday season

ADDRESS: Eastwood Caravan Park, Schoolfold Lane,
Adlington SK10 4PL

UPDATE PREPARED: 5th November 2012

A further letter of representation has been received. The letter provides some basic observations in relation to the application. It has been submitted by a frequent visitor to the park. The letter cites a number of environmental and landscape improvements that have been made on the site and the improvement of the facilities.

No planning matters are raised that alter the recommendation of approval.