

## **STRETEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 10 July 2014**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

#### **APPLICATION NO.**

13/4640M

#### **LOCATION**

Eddie Stobart Ltd., Knutsford Road, Chelford, Macclesfield SK11 9AS

#### **UPDATE PREPARED**

08 July 2014

#### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Further comments have been received from Chelford Parish Council, which relate to the following: -

##### **Affordable Housing Tenure Split**

The split of the affordable housing between rental and intermediate ownership has changed from the original 65% intermediate ownership and 35% rental to the reverse split. The Parish Council specifically wanted the original split as the Housing Needs Survey of 2008 showed that of those Chelford residents who still lived in the village, or who wished to return, nearly 60% wanted shared ownership.

The Parish Council are strongly opposed to the 35% intermediate allocation. Also, Chelford already have seven social rented, two bedroom houses and 40 rented one-bedroom old folks bungalows and flats which adds substantially to the rented accommodation available in Chelford.

The Parish Council are also concerned that the IPS indicates that *affordable needs are for the additional supply of 14% for older persons comprising one or two bedroom units 50% one or two bedroom properties for general needs. 23% three-bedroom and 13% four bedroom. The IPS also identifies property preferences for house 42.3%, flats 38.7% and bungalows 19%.* In Chelford, there are already 40 one bedroom flats and bungalows for older folk - the Parish do not need any more. The writer states that the community needs two and three bedroom houses for young families and possibly even four bedroom houses for larger families, but not one bedroom accommodation. If Chelford is to sustain the vitality and viability of its community, then Chelford needs to keep its young families in the village and attract others to live in Chelford.

##### **Allocation of affordable housing**

Another aspect of the affordable housing is that the Parish Council has been assured that such housing in a rural setting would be allocated by a set process, with the highest priority given to people with a direct connection to Chelford and then to people from the local area. Again, with several affordable rental houses having recently been built in the surrounding villages, this

diminishes the need for Chelford to supply this accommodation to the local area, so Chelford are concerned that this housing will not be taken up by local people. Confirmation of how the allocation will be made is requested.

#### Open Space – Amenity Open Space – Dixon Drive

The Parish are uncertain as to which location is referred to as *Amenity Open Space Dixon Drive*. As far as the Parish are aware, any open space in this area is Crown land. It is questioned as to whether this land be taken over by CEC?

#### Open Space – Pitch improvements

Chelford Village hall - pitch improvements and contribution towards football changing facilities. This is confusing. There are two legal entities on this site. One is the Village Hall which is run by Trustees for the benefit of the residents. The second is the sports field and play area which are owned by the Parish Council and should be referred to as the Chelford Parish Field. Clarify is requested as to which entity is being referred to in this section of the report and if it is the Chelford Parish Field then the name should be changed to that to avoid any legal difficulties at the time of allocation.

#### Schools allocation of money

The 106 monies school allocation is now to be split between Chelford and Peover Superior school. Clarification of why this money is not for Chelford School alone is requested? The Parish have always assumed that the money would go to the nearest school i.e. Chelford. The Parishes overriding reason for supporting new housing development in Chelford was to ensure sustainability of the community and its amenities and services and the most important one of these is the school. If the money is split between the two schools confirmation is requested that it will be allocated pro rata i.e the school with more pupils from the development will have more money?

### **AGENTS REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION OF THE MAIN AGENDA REPORT**

1. Page 27 of the report notes that the School Organisation and Capital Strategy Manager “confirmed that there is projected to be sufficient unfilled places at both the “local” primary school and also the “local” secondary school to accommodate the pupils generated by this development”. On this basis the Agent queries the justification to seek a contribution to new school places.
2. Page 35 – third paragraph refers to 25% affordable (correct references are made elsewhere).
3. Page 40 – fifth paragraph refers to Chelford Train Station being 1.8km from the site. It is actually around 150m from the site entrance and less than 400m from all parts of the site.

4. Page 44 – refers to proposed conditions for height parameters of 8.5m for 2 storey and 11.0m for 3 storey. As matters of scale and design are reserved the Agent considers there is no justification for such a condition – especially when the height of the current buildings on part of the site is factored in. The Agent requests that no such condition be applied. If such a condition is to be imposed, 8.5m is an insufficient height to accommodate a 2 storey dwelling with a traditional (steep) roof pitch. 10.5m is more typical as a maximum height and the height which was accepted in relation to the previous application on the site.
5. The Agent requests a comprehensive list and clarity for the Heads of Terms for the S106.
6. Page 51 The Agent considers that as this scheme is not of a high density and all matters of scale and layout will be determined through reserved matters, that that is the time to assess whether removal of permitted development rights is justified. Therefore, there is little justification for condition 11.
7. The Agent requests clarity over the suggested wording for condition 13 *is not clear from the summary wording but in view of condition 7 and the agreed access drawing, this condition appears unnecessary and should be removed.*
8. The Agent considers that the matters addressed by suggested conditions 30, 33 and 35 appear to overlap and assumes that they can be addressed in one suitably worded condition.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

A consultation response has been received from the Schools Organisation and Capital Strategy Manager and confirmation has been provided that the 2 primary schools are forecast to be oversubscribed and therefore, a contribution will be required for every primary aged pupil generated. The money is not necessarily to be split between the 2 primary schools which are within a 2 mile radius (i.e. Chelford and Peover Superior), however, it is duly noted that this is the distance, which is considered when assessing capacity in local schools. The service will consider in due course where best to spend the money (within 2 miles of the site), based on consultation with the schools and a detailed site assessment of both schools.

A consultation response has been received from the Housing Strategy and Needs Manager as follows: -

### Affordable Housing Tenure Split

The rented older persons accommodation will more than likely have an over 55's designation attached to all lets, so this won't contribute to the general needs lettings and the need for general needs rented accommodation in Chelford. It is understood that at the meeting with the Parish Council, Vikki

Jeffrey asked for more evidence to support any change in tenure split. Whilst the rural needs survey shows there is a need for intermediate, there does not appear to be a strong justification to depart from the IPS based on the needs information, especially considering the needs survey is 6 years old. The HNS2008 includes information on the incomes of households who responded and were in housing need. The majority of these households earn under £25,000 per annum, therefore the information does not seem to support that an increase in intermediate in this location could be supported, or would be affordable. In addition, information taken from the SHMA 2010 shows the ratio of lower quartile incomes to house prices in Cheshire East is 6.7 and Chelford is a high value area. This coupled with the Mortgage Market Review and more cautious lending patterns and restrictions on mortgage products available, means an increase in intermediate tenure at this site would not be appropriate.

Current information from Cheshire Homechoice shows there are 15 applicants who have selected the Chelford lettings area as their first choice. Therefore, the tenure requirement in line with the IPS seems more appropriate here.

Whilst the IPS does propose a residential mix for sites, each site is very much based on local need, circumstances and the development itself. This is an outline application and the Housing section would look at the residential mix at detailed reserved matters stage and at which point the Housing section would take into consideration local need, including that for family houses and the needs at the time the development comes forward.

#### Allocation of affordable housing

The Housing section would only usually include a cascade provision on rural exception sites, as these have been allowed based on local housing need. This site is not a rural exception site and therefore we would not ordinarily ask for cascade provision on a site such as this.

A consultation response has been received from the Open Space Development Officer / Landscape Officer, who has commented on the queries raised by the Parish Council as follows: -

#### Open Space – Amenity Open Space – Dixon Drive

The location which is referred to as *Amenity Open Space Dixon Drive* is the area of Crown Land referred to by the Parish Council. However, it should be noted that it is maintained by CEC. It is provided as POS / amenity land and is therefore a community asset.

#### Open Space – Pitch improvements

It is suggested that both Chelford Village hall and Chelford Parish Field are used as references for pitch improvements. The term Chelford Village hall has been used to describe the general location, if sports changing facilities are required alongside the sports field then it should be provided wherever possible at that location. If there are different ownership parcels here with different names, then it is useful highlighting this. Whether the changing facilities are

new build, or an extension to existing / conversion, is all to be decided in due course, as is the precise location, specifications, ownership etc etc.

## **REPORT**

For clarification, this application is for 100 dwellings with all matters reserved. The description of development should therefore read as follows: -

Outline planning application for demolition of existing cold storage depot and development of site and adjacent car park land for a mixed use scheme comprising up to 100 dwellings with associated public open space, pedestrian crossing and relocation of bus stops on Knutsford Road and either up to 603 sqm of B1a business space and or car parking with all matters reserved.

The comments from the Parish Council and Agent are noted, and it considered largely that there comments have been addressed by way of the comments of the Housing Strategy and Needs Manager, The School Organisation and Capital Strategy Manager and Open Space Development Officer / Landscape Officer. Further clarification/comments are made below.

### Education allocation

It is noted that there is an error on page 27 of the report. The first paragraph under the heading "The School Organisation and Capital Strategy Manager" can be ignored. The comments from the School Organisation and Capital Strategy Manager are noted and the schools are forecast to be oversubscribed and therefore there is considered to be justification for the contribution as per the report.

### Affordable Housing

It is confirmed that on page 35, the reference in the third paragraph should read:-

"The proposal was revised and now seeks permission for 100 dwellings, **30%** of which would be affordable".

### Distance from train station

It is confirmed that on page 40 (fifth paragraph) the reference to Chelford Train Station being 1.8km from the site is incorrect. The Train Station is approximately 150m from the site entrance.

### Scaled parameters

It is noted that under the previous scheme 10/3239M, provision was made for 2 storey dwellings of up to 8m in height and 3 storey up to 9.0m in height. Therefore, as scaled parameters are required to be set at Outline stage, it is considered that the parameters put forward in the main Agenda report (of 8.5m for 2 storey dwellings and 11.0m for 3 storey dwellings) are appropriate in the context of this location.

## Heads of Terms

For clarity the Heads of Terms are as follows: -

- 30% Affordable Housing = 30 units to be 65% social or affordable rent, and 35% intermediate tenure.
- A commuted sum would be required for offsite provision for use towards play (formal and informal) at Mere Court, Dixon Drive and Chelford Village Hall and Chelford Parish Field. The commuted sum total is £250 000.
- £195 233 towards Educational Facilities at Chelford and Peover Primary schools.
- A 15 year sum for maintenance of the open space will be required IF the council agrees to the transfer of the open space to CEC on completion. Alternatively, arrangements for the open space to be maintained in perpetuity will need to be made by the developer, subject to a detailed maintenance schedule to be agreed with the council, prior to commencement
- £75 000 towards community facilities – to include, the Astle Court Community Room (a CPP facility) a village centre location, the Chelford School (community uses only), village scouts and youth services / clubs and the Station House

The pedestrian crossing on Knutsford Road and relocated bus stops would be delivered by way of a section 278 Agreement. The developer will pay for these items and therefore, it is not required to seek a contribution at this stage.

## Issues 6, 7 and 8 raised by the Agent

### *Permitted Development Rights*

Officers have considered the point raised by the Agent with regard to the removal of permitted development rights and agree with the Agent that as the scheme is of a relatively low density, that it may be more appropriate to leave this assessment to the time of the Reserved Matters application.

### *Conditions 7 and 13.*

This condition refers to vehicular access to be approved. Although access is to be a reserved matter, (due to the details of access ways (roads etc) not being included within the proposed scheme), the Agent has requested clarity that the points of access will be in the location as shown on the approved plan. The Highways Engineer supports the location of these access points from a highways safety perspective, and therefore, condition 7 is considered to be appropriate and can be attached. Condition 13 will ensure that the visibility splays are adhered to when the Reserved Matters application is submitted.

*Conditions 30, 33 and 35*

These conditions have been provided to address different concerns of the Environment Agency and United Utilities. If it is possible to condense them into one condition and achieve the same end result, then this will be given due consideration following consultation with the EA and UU.

**CONCLUSION**

The views of the Parish Council and Agent are noted and clarity has been provided on the issues raised above.

The recommendation remains as per the main agenda report as approval subject to a S106 Agreement.