

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7th September 2016

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

16/3798M

**LAND ADJ TO HIGHLANDS, CONGLETON ROAD, ALDERLEY EDGE,
CHESHIRE, SK9 7AD**

UPDATE PREPARED

05 September 2016

CONSULTATIONS

Further comments have been received from interested parties since the committee report was written. Below is a summary of the additional comments not already covered within the main body of the report:

Highlands (adjacent neighbour): Two letters have been received from this property. There are many comments that are similar to the previous application and are noted in the main body of the report. Additional comments are summarised below:

The site differs from the site within the recent appeal at Alstonfield and should not be used as a 'precedent'. *'The Inspector... refers to the 30mph speed limit that extends from Prestbury village out beyond Alstonfield.'*

There is a clear break between Alderley Edge Village and the rural Nether Alderley. This break is the change in speed limit at the Parish / Settlement boundary where the speed increases from the village 30mph to the rural 40mph limit. The village street lighting also stops at this point. The road surface quality changes.

Cheshire East Council recently reviewed the case for extending the 30mph limit into Nether Alderley but concluded that the 40mph speed limit was appropriate because of the rural nature of Nether Alderley. The site itself (and the land on the opposite side of the road) also represents a clear break with a noticeable difference in the properties located north and south of it. Permitting development at the site will eliminate the break and open up a string of developments south of the site.

The proposed Development has a footprint 400 sq metres and a accommodation space of 10,000 sq feet. The adjacent houses' footprints are just 300 and 235 sq metres. The accommodation space of Highlands is 4000 sq feet. Consequently the proposed development is up to 70% (footprint) and 2.5 times (accommodation space) larger than the adjacent houses.'

Highways: no objections subject to a condition relating to a visibility splay.

Nether Alderley Parish Council: same comments as previous application, however additional comments mention design is out of keeping, size is significantly larger than neighbouring properties and the proposal is contrary to the characteristics and style of the conservation area.

REPORT

The comments from the neighbour are noted. It is acknowledged that there is a difference in speed limits from 30mph to 40mph between the parish boundaries of Alderley Edge and Nether Alderley and the street lighting ends. As mentioned in the report the development extends along Congleton Road from Alderley Edge centre and there is no clear break between this built up area and that within the main body of the village. This same reason was included in the reasons for allowing the appeal at Alstonfield.

It has been mentioned by the neighbour at Highlands that the Inspector for the Alstonfield application referred to the 30mph limit continuing from the centre of Prestbury all the way to the site. However, this was not used by the inspector as a reason to define the site as 'within a village'. The reference to the 30mph limit was in connection with whether the site was sustainable and not whether it was linked to the village centre. There was no footpath along large parts of the road between the Alstonfield site and Prestbury village centre and the Inspector concluded that due to the 30mph limit cycling could *'be a viable transport option as an alternative to the car.'*

It is considered that there are more reasons to link the application site with the village than the Alstonfield appeal site. There is a footpath all the way from the site into the village centre, the site is actually located within the Alderley Edge Conservation Area and the distance to the village centre is less. It is acknowledged that the street lights stop before the site, however, this is the same for the Alstonfield site. The change in speed limit is also not considered to be significant.

As mentioned in the neighbour comments the appeal at Alstonfield does not form a precedent, as each site must be assessed on its own merits, however the similarities are such that it does form a material consideration in the determination of the current application.

The comments from the Highways Officer are noted, and it is considered appropriate to add a condition ensuring that an appropriate visibility splay is included in the development. This is recommended under condition number 11 on page 19 of Agenda Reports Pack.

The comments from the Parish Council are noted; however the issues are covered within the main body of the report.

CONCLUSION

The recommendation remains as per the main agenda report as approval subject to conditions.