

Application No: 19/2202M

Location: Land Between Clay Lane and Sagars Road, Handforth SK9 3HF

Proposal: Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 217 dwellings, landscaping, public open space, internal access roads, garages, car parking, and associated infrastructure.

Applicant: Alex Wigfield, Anwyl Homes

Expiry Date: 25-Oct-2019

SUMMARY

The proposed development seeks to provide a residential development of 217 dwellings on a site allocated for around 250 dwellings in the CELPS. The submission relates to the detail of the proposal in terms of its scale, layout, appearance and landscaping, however a range of concerns are raised in terms of this submission.

The proposed affordable housing is not considered to be adequately pepper potted around the site. These units could be further dispersed in the western and eastern sections of the site, with an associated reduction in the existing clusters. Whilst an updated plan is awaited to show the affordable units, with reference to the previous iteration of the layout plan to identify their positioning within the site, it is concluded that the proposal does not comply with policy SC5 of the CELPS.

The proposed housing does not provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. In terms of open market housing, there is considered to be an over provision of larger 4 bed detached dwellings, and an under provision of smaller units for single people, first time buyers and the elderly. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy SC4 of the CELPS.

Assessment of the proposals against the CEC Design Guide and Building for Life 12 indicates that there are issues in several fundamental areas. As a consequence, the proposal is not considered to be good enough to approve in its current form. The proposal is contrary to policies LPS 34, SD2 and SE1 of the CELPS, and the CEC Design Guide.

The level of parking for some 4 bed properties does not meet the parking standards within the CELPS. A number of the proposed parking spaces also fall short of the dimensions stated for parking spaces and garages set out in the CELPS. This would force vehicles to park on the road and would thereby be harmful to the visual amenity of the area and highway safety.

Clarification is required on matters relating to encroachment within the RPA of a protected tree, the removal of hedgerows and landscaping and further details on these matters will be provided as an update. Similarly an amendments are required to ensure plots 205 and 206 are located outside of the 10m undeveloped buffer to the Brook, as required by condition 15 of the outline permission. Each of these issues has the potential to be an additional reason for refusal.

The provision of 217 new dwellings is clearly a benefit of the proposal, which will make a valuable contribution to the delivery of the Council's 5 year housing land supply. However, it should be noted that 217 dwellings is still a significant shortfall from the allocated 250, and the proposal still does not provide a design that adequately reflects the requirements of the Local Plan or the design guide even at this lower density, which does make it harder to accept.

Other benefits relating to the development were secured at the outline stage, including 30% affordable housing, and contributions towards improvements to local footpaths / leisure routes, towards recreation and outdoor sports provision, towards healthcare and towards education.

The applicants have worked with officers over several months in an attempt to achieve a mutually acceptable scheme, which to date has not been realized. It is expected that the applicant will seek to address the outstanding issues in the coming days and further details will be provided as an update.

As it currently stands, there is clear conflict with the development plan and supplementary planning documents. The conflict with the development plan identified above is not considered to be outweighed by other material considerations in this case. The proposal is therefore not considered to be a sustainable form of development.

Summary Recommendation:
Refuse

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site is an area of agricultural land that is enclosed by Sagars Road to the south, Clay Lane to the west, residential properties on Windermere Road and Ullswater Road to the north and Hampson Crescent to the east. Much of the site boundary consists of mature trees and hedgerows, with additional hedgerows within the site dividing fields. A small wooded area to the north east of the site separates the application site from the adjacent open space at Meriton Park. Dobbin Brook runs along the rear of the existing properties on Hampson Crescent, along the eastern boundary. Also included within the application site boundary is 15 Hampson Crescent, which is a two-storey, detached dwelling. The site is identified as site LPS 34 in the CELPS, which is allocated for residential development. The majority of the site lies within the Parish of Styal, with just the access from Hampson Crescent located within Handforth Parish.

Some work has commenced on site following the full planning permission for the access, which was approved at the July SPB meeting.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This application seeks approval for the reserved matters following the outline approval 17/3894M, which granted outline planning permission for the erection of up to 250 dwellings with associated works including the demolition of 15 Hampson Crescent. Access was approved at the outline stage, and the current proposal seeks reserved matters approval for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 217 dwellings.

Revised plans have been received during the course of the application, and have been subject to a period of re-consultation.

RELEVANT HISTORY

17/3894M - Outline planning application (access to be considered) for erection of up to 250 dwellings with associated works including the demolition of 15 Hampson Crescent – Approved 02.08.2018

19/1797M - Demolition of 15 Hampson Crescent, diversion and culverting of Dobbin Brook and formation of both vehicular and pedestrian access from Meriton Road / Hampson Crescent including associated infrastructure and landscaping works, and creation of temporary construction haul road and compound from Sagars Road – Approved 09.08.2019

POLICIES

Development Plan

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS)

MP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

PG1 Overall Development Strategy

PG2 Settlement hierarchy

PG4 Safeguarded Land

PG6 Open Countryside

PG7 Spatial Distribution of Development

SD1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East

SD2 Sustainable Development Principles

IN1 Infrastructure

IN2 Developer Contributions

SC1 Leisure and Recreation

SC2 Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities

SC3 Health and wellbeing

SC4 Residential Mix

SC5 Affordable Homes

SE1 Design

SE2 Efficient use of land

SE3 Biodiversity and geodiversity

SE4 The Landscape

SE5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

SE6 Green Infrastructure
SE7 The Historic Environment
SE9 Energy Efficient development
SE12 Pollution, land contamination and land stability
SE13 Flood risk and water management
CO1 Sustainable travel and transport
CO3 Digital connections
CO4 Travel plans and transport assessments

LPS 34 Land Between Clay Lane and Sagars Road, Handforth

Macclesfield Borough Local Plan saved policies (MBLP)

NE9 Protection of River Corridors
NE11 Nature conservation
NE17 Nature conservation in major developments
NE18 Accessibility to nature conservation
RT5 Open space standards
H9 Occupation of affordable housing
DC3 Residential Amenity
DC6 Circulation and Access
DC8 Landscaping
DC9 Tree Protection
DC14 Noise
DC17 Water resources
DC35 Materials and finishes
DC36 Road layouts and circulation
DC37 Landscaping
DC38 Space, light and privacy
DC40 Children's play / amenity space
DC63 Contaminated land

Handforth Neighbourhood Plan (HNP)

H8 Landscape and Biodiversity
H9 Trees and Hedgerows
H11 Encouraging High Quality Design
H12 Surface water management
H16 Congestion and Highway Safety
H18 Promoting sustainable transport
H19 Improving access to the countryside in Handforth and the surrounding area

Given that the majority of the site is located within Styal, the HNP can only be applied to a very small section of the site around the site access.

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)
National Planning Practice Guidance
Cheshire East Design Guide

Styal Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 7 stage reached – Neighbourhood Area Designation
No policies to give weight to at the present time

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

There have been two rounds of public consultation and the comments below are the most recent comments from each consultee.

Environment Agency – No objections

United Utilities – Proposals unacceptable

Manchester Airport – Comments not received at time of report preparation.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) – No objections

Environmental Health – Raise concerns regarding impact of use of access road upon neighbouring properties on Hampson Crescent. Recommend conditions relating to hours of construction, piled foundations, dust management and floor floating (polishing of large surface, wet concrete floors)

Housing Strategy & Needs Manager – No objections

Education – No comments received

Public Rights of Way – Existing track in the western corner of the site adjacent to Spurs Lodge should be upgraded.

Head of Strategic Infrastructure – No objections

ANSA – No objections

Handforth Parish Council – No objection, but reiterate strong objection over proposals to allow construction traffic to use Sagars Road for site access.

Styal Parish Council - No objections in principle but objects to the current allocation of the S106 monies associated with the development

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

During the two rounds of public consultation, 16 letters of representation have been received from interested parties objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Meriton Rd, Sagars Rd, Hampson Crescent, The Link and Bulkeley Rd all unsuitable for access
- Additional traffic
- Weight restriction of Sagars Rd
- Increased risk to highway safety
- Impact on wildlife and trees

- Impact on already stretched local services, infrastructure, schools, doctors, etc.
- Access should be from Styal
- Brownfield land should be used, not Green Belt
- Suitable site for houses where Knowle House used to be
- Reports used to support outline application were wrong and misleading
- Surface water drainage proposals not achievable (condition 4)
- Impact of construction on Dobbin Brook
- Diversion of Dobbin Brook will be detrimental to ecology
- Construction management plan inadequate (condition 11)
- Health & safety of local residents
- Impact on air quality
- Noise, disturbance and dust
- No mention how the habitat will be temporarily homed during works, and not enough focus on Dobbin Brook and the wildlife/ecology beyond the site (condition 14)
- Temporary parking restriction not acceptable
- Dust control measures not sufficient (condition 16)
- No remediation strategy provided (condition 18)
- Not enough detail to assess external materials properly (condition 25)
- Bridge will cause problems
- Increased risk of flooding
- Impact on visual amenity of the area
- Site compound results in loss of privacy, increased noise, increased artificial light and dust.
- Impact of construction traffic on parking, congestion, noise levels, damage to property, safety, flood risk and weight loading on Sagars Rd
- Working hours should be weekends only
- A proper Stakeholder Management Strategy should be produced by the developer
- Devaluation of property
- Village is already overloaded with cars that parking in the village is scarce
- Previous planning applications to build in this area have been rejected. (Knowle House).
- Site is protected Green Belt land
- Appears that consulting the public is simply a box-ticking exercise because the comments go completely ignored
- It is unsurprising that the reputation of CEC is in the gutter
- Housing requirement figures do not reflect predicted population growth
- Addition of 217 dwellings virtually doubles the housing stock in Styal
- Perimeter of site used by many people enjoying the Green Belt, and its loss will have significant negative impact on amenity and health of general public
- Low water pressure will be exacerbated
- Japanese Knotweed is present on the site
- Unnecessary development given plans for North Cheshire Garden Village
- Loss of privacy
- Proximity of access road to immediately adjacent properties and associated impact on living conditions
- Bridge structure will dominate adjoining gardens and result in overlooking
- Potential to affect structural integrity of adjoining property

- HGVs will not be able to enter the site or manoeuvre safely
- Recording of existing traffic conditions inadequate
- Increased run off into Dobbing Brook and associated impacts on River Dean and River Bollin.
- Not all residents have been notified of the application
- Separate applications are confusing
- Little discussion and liaison with the residents of Handforth
- Flood risk to properties in close proximity of proposed ponds
- Loss of privacy arising from footpath to rear of Hamp[son Crescent/Sagars Rd properties and increased security risk
- Proximity of properties to rear of Hampson Crescent / Sagars Rd creates noise, light and privacy issues

One letter has been received making the following general observations:

- Every house should be fitted with electric charging point for cars
- For every one tree that is removed at least five should be planted
- Strange that the s106 monies include no reference to Styal, even though all the houses proposed are within the boundaries of Styal, but there is a substantial amount proposed for sports facilities in Wilmslow.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of development

The application site is an allocated Strategic Site for housing in the CELPS. Site LPS 34 states that the development of the land between Clay Lane and Sagars Road over the Local Plan Strategy period will be achieved through:

- The delivery of around 250 dwellings;
- Provision of a direct cycle and pedestrian link from the site to the west to improve connectivity. A link to the open space to the east should also be provided as part of any development; and
- Retention of trees and woodlands on the edges of the site, with new planting to re-enforce important landscape features and to properly define a new Green Belt boundary.

The outline planning permission approved the development of the site for up to 250 dwellings, in accordance with the allocation in the CELPS. The current reserved matters application proposes 217 dwellings, which is a 13.2% shortfall from the approved 250 dwelling maximum. However, for the purposes of the policy, 217 is considered to meet the requirement for “around 250 dwellings” in LPS 34. This is of course subject to other policies within the development plan including those related to the efficient use of land and the residential mix of housing developments. The delivery of the site for residential development will contribute towards the Council’s housing land supply and assist in meeting the development requirements of Handforth / Styal and the wider Borough. The further requirements of policy LPS 34, and other relevant policies, are considered below.

Housing

Affordable Housing

30% of the dwellings on site were secured as affordable housing as part of the outline permission, in accordance with policy SC5 of the CELPS. As a development of 217

dwellings, 65 dwellings are required to be provided as affordable dwellings. 42 units should be provided as Affordable/Social rent and 25 units as Intermediate tenure.

The current number of those people on the Cheshire Homechoice waiting list with Handforth as their first choice is 318. This can be broken down to 142x 1 bedroom, 105x 2 bedroom, 42x 3 bedroom, 15x 4 bedroom and 14x 5 bedroom dwellings. There is no information for Styal.

The SHMA 2013 showed the majority of the demand annually up to and including 2018 in Handforth and Wilmslow was for 49x 3 and 5x 5 bedroom dwellings. The SHMA also showed an annual requirement for 13x 1 bedroom and 3x 2 bedroom dwellings for older persons. These can be provided by Bungalows, Ground Floor Flats, Cottage Style Flats or Lifetime Standard homes.

An affordable housing scheme has been submitted with this reserved matters application, in accordance with the requirements of the s106 agreement on the outline permission. The submitted details do indicate that 65 dwellings will be provided as affordable units. These are to be provided as:

- 13 x 1 bed ground floor apartments (2-storey building)
- 14 x 1 bed first floor apartments (2-storey building)
- 17 x 2 bed mews / semi-detached (2-storey)
- 20 x 3 bed mews / semi-detached (2-storey)
- 1 x 4 bed detached (2-storey)

The revised plans that have been submitted do not confirm the position of the affordable properties. Previous versions of the plans do, and these have indicated some pepper potting, but no affordable units have been provided in the western and eastern areas of the site. Whilst a lower density of development is sought in some areas, particularly in the western section of the site, this does not necessarily prevent affordable units being provided in this area. It is considered that in order to ensure compliance with policies SC5 and LPS 37 of the CELPS, and the Design Guide further pepper potting is required.

Residential Mix

Policy SC4 of the CELPS states 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. In addition, to meet the needs arising from the increasing longevity of the borough's older residents, the council will require developers to demonstrate how their proposal will be capable of meeting, and adapting to, the long term needs of this specific group of people.

Including the affordable units, the proposal provides the following mix of dwellings (all 2-storey or 2.5 storeys):

- 27 x 1 bed apartments (12%)
- 31 x 2 bed dwellings (mews / semi-detached) (14%)
- 67 x 3 bed dwellings (semi-detached / detached) (31%)
- 87 x 4 bed dwellings (detached) (40%)
- 5 x 5 bed dwellings (detached) (2%)

Whilst there is clearly a predominance of 3 and 4 bed dwellings, the above information suggests a broad mix of dwelling types and sizes is provided within the development. However, when the open market dwellings are extracted from this, a slightly different picture emerges.

The proposed development comprises the following open market dwellings:

14 x 2 bed semi-detached (2-storey)
36 x 3 bed semi-detached (24 x 2-storey and 12 x 2.5 storey)
11 x 3 bed detached (2-storey)
86 x 4 bed detached (73 x 2-storey and 13 x 2.5 storey)
5 x 5 bed detached (2-storey)

The above breakdown demonstrates that:

- 57% of the open market units are 4 bed detached dwellings
- 91% of open market dwellings are 3, 4 and 5 bed family dwellings
- No 1 bed units are provided for open market sale
- No apartments provided for open market sale
- No specific provision for older residents within open market units

The applicant has submitted a supporting statement to justify the proposed market housing mix, which states that the following resources were used to establish the proposed mix:

- Analysis of data sets provided by Rightmove Plus and NetHouseprice.com
- Discussions with local estate agents and other new build housing developments within the local area – which confirmed most purchasers are seeking a 3 or 4 bedroom property; lower level of demand for very large properties
- Anwyl's own experience of housing delivery within Cheshire East
- Anwyl analysed a 3 month period of Rightmove Plus property searches within a 2 mile radius and 49% of all searches correlated with dwellings proposed at the application site.
- Initial marketing activity has commenced on Anwyl's own website in relation to the application site, which is to be known as 'The Fairways'. To date, a total of 41 enquiries have been submitted. Of those enquiries which have been specific about the required property size, 78% have been for either 3 bedroom or 4 bedroom properties

There is currently no Neighbourhood Plan for Styal, and whilst the provisions of the Handforth Neighbourhood Plan only apply to its designated area (i.e. the area to the east of Dobbin Brook, and not the entire application site), there is some helpful commentary within the justification for HNP policy H2. This policy justification highlights the fact that the proportion of the population in Cheshire East of pensionable age and above will continue to grow (the SHMA 2013 stated that it would *"increase from 83,521 in 2010 to 124,544 by 2030."*). The justification for this policy also explains that it is essential that a greater balance of house types is introduced to cater for a wider section of the community, and ensure that suitable accommodation is included to allow younger residents to reside in the local area alongside older residents who wish to move to smaller homes but remain in the area. This is considered to reflect the requirements of policy SC4 of the CELPS, where it requires a mix of housing to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. The predominance of 3 and 4 bed units as proposed is not considered to cater for these wider sections of the community. It is also noted that on the Rightmove website, there are currently

no 1 bedroom units for sale in Handforth and only one such property for sale in Styal, compared to a much wider availability of 3 and 4 bed properties.

Whilst not a specific requirement, policy SC4 also states that the housing mix could include Key Worker Housing and provision for people wishing to build or commission their own home. No such proposals are provided as part of the development, which could help to broaden the mix proposed.

For the reasons stated above, the proposal is considered to conflict with the requirements of policy SE4 of the CELPS.

Open Space

One of the site specific principles of development of this site listed within the local plan allocation (LPS 34) is that *“Provision should be made for public open space, possibly utilising Dobbin Brook as a focus for green infrastructure.”*

Policy SE6 of the CELPS sets out the open space requirements for housing development which are (per dwelling):

- Children’s play space – 20sqm
- Amenity Green Space – 20sqm
- Allotments – 5sqm
- Green Infrastructure connectivity 20sqm

This policy states that it is likely that the total amount of 65sqm per home (plus developer contributions for outdoor sports) would be required on major greenfield and brownfield development sites. Contributions towards outdoor sports provision was secured as part of the outline planning permission.

The proposal for 217 dwellings triggers a requirement for 4,340sqm of formal and informal play provision in line with policy SE6 of the CELPS. Two equipped play areas are now proposed – one to the eastern side of the site close to Dobbin Brook and another, smaller facility, within the centre of the site. The two play areas combine to amount to a maximum of 2,000sqm of formal and informal play provision, which is a significant shortfall from the policy compliant amount of over 4,000sqm.

4,340sqm of amenity greenspace is also required, and the site plan is not clear on what areas would be classed as amenity greenspace. The applicant suggests that the peripheral areas to the south and west could be classed as amenity greenspace. These areas are largely the root protection areas for the retained trees along these boundaries and will be grassed areas extending up to 10m in width in some areas. In addition to this the proposal provides a 3m wide shared footway / cycleway which runs in a north south direction providing a link from Meriton Road Park to Sagars Road within landscaped / POS areas to the east of the site, close to Dobbin Brook. The shared footway / cycleway is also provided on a east west trajectory through the centre of the site, again within landscaped / POS areas, and is a very positive feature of the proposal.

The same amount (4,340sqm) is required for green infrastructure (GI), and in this case, the provision of this type of open space exceeds the amount required by policy SE6, with over 9,000sqm being provided across the site, predominantly by the retention of an undeveloped

buffer zone to Dobbin Brook. Overall, from the above details it is clear that there is a substantial amount of GI provided and an under provision in play and amenity areas in terms of the amounts provided on site.

That being said, the GI includes the requirements of LPS 34, new Green Belt boundary, retained tree belts, buffer to Dobbin Brook, retained and enhanced ponds and ecological mitigation. In addition it should be acknowledged that the applicant has made a number of significant and positive changes to the layout to give better clarity to the perimeter GI and subsequent maintenance issues in response to previous concerns raised by ANSA. The applicant has also focused on the quality of features at the request of officers, including the surfacing of the footpath / cycleway, pond fencing and entrance features.

With regard to play provision the applicant has introduced a central LAP in addition to a LEAP, which is situated close to the proposed bridge into Meriton Road Park and made several changes to the equipment as requested by ANSA. This has resulted in two attractive, inclusive play areas with a key climbing unit that will provide a focus for play and provide a challenging play environment. This will also complement the facilities available in Meriton Road Park. The applicant has focused on the quality of these areas and the play value they offer. Both areas are fenced as they sit adjacent to footpaths through the site but both also sit with amenity green space for social and more active play adjacent to them. Although some concern is still raised with regard to the proximity and relationship of some of the dwellings to the open space along the central core (notably plots 211 and 212 and plots 171 and 172).

Amenity green space is more limited and is focused around the pedestrian and cycleway routes around the site and some smaller pockets of incidental open space.

In terms of allotments, the requirement is 5sqm per family dwelling. For 217 dwellings this would amount to 1,085sqm of allotment space. No financial contributions were secured for allotments at the time of the outline planning permission. Therefore, there should be a requirement for them to be provided on site. However, if they were provided on site it would result in an inevitable reduction the number of dwellings, which is not wanted from a housing supply point of view, given that the 217 dwellings currently proposed are well below the allocation for this site. It has therefore been suggested that areas of productive planting are provided with fruit trees, etc. to compensate for the absence of allotments. Whilst the principle of this idea can be supported, due to the proximity to Manchester Airport, and the potential for such planting to attract birds, which would conflict with the safeguarding requirements of the airport, confirmation is awaited from Manchester Airport on this matter.

Further amendments are considered to be necessary to address the relationships with the properties referred to above. If this matter is resolved in a satisfactory way then, whilst there is an under provision of play and amenity space in terms of areas on a plan, what is proposed is considered to be of quality, is well located and will be a real asset of the site. The substantial over provision of GI is acknowledged and whilst it will not replace play or amenity space, it does bring a different offer to future residents, bringing more natural environments close to home and opportunities for more informal enjoyment. In this case, it can be accepted that whilst the GI will not replace the play and amenity space, it is considered to be sufficient to mitigate for the shortfall, particularly give the proximity of other facilities at Meriton Road Park.

Living conditions

Saved policy DC3 of the MBLP seeks to protect the living conditions neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, overbearing effect, loss of light, noise, smells, fumes, dust etc. Policy DC38 of the MBLP set out guidelines for space between dwellings, and states that new residential developments should generally achieve a distance of between 21m and 25m between principal windows and 14m between a principal window and a blank elevation. This is required to maintain an adequate standard of privacy and amenity between residential properties, unless the design and layout of the scheme and its relationship to the site and its characteristics provide a commensurate degree of light and privacy between buildings.

However the CEC Design Guide states separation distances should be seen as guide rather than a hard and fast rule. The Design Guide does however acknowledge that the distance between rear facing habitable room windows should not drop below 21m. 18m front to front will also provide a good level of privacy, but if this applied too rigidly it will lead to uniformity and limit the potential to create strong streetscenes and variety, and so this distance could go down as low as 12m in some cases.

The nearest existing properties to the north of the application on Windermere Road and Ullswater Road meet the above distance guidelines. Similarly, the existing properties to the east, on Hampson Crescent, are over 50 metres away from the nearest of the proposed dwellings. Number 58 Sagars Road is slightly closer with a 37 metre separation distance to the nearest dwelling at plot 16 of the development, which is still well in excess of the recommended distances. Finally, Spurs Lodge, adjacent to the north west site boundary is approximately 50 metres from plot 82.

The layout within the site ensures the relationships between the new dwellings result in acceptable standards of space, light and privacy for future occupants, having regard to the distance guidelines set out above.

Environmental Health has raised concern regarding the potential impact upon the occupiers of existing, neighbouring residential dwellings on Hampson Crescent and their very close proximity to the proposed vehicular and pedestrian access. Whilst there will be some impact upon neighbouring properties arising from construction activities and the use of the access road, the proposed access has already been approved under outline application 17/3894M and the separate full planning application for the access (19/1797M). Accordingly, the Council has previously found the access to be acceptable, and there has not been any material change in planning policy, site circumstances or the proposal itself, and in these circumstances, an alternative view now would not be justified.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policies DC3 and DC38 of the MBLP.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts were also addressed at the outline stage, and mitigation measures were secured as part of that consent, and will need to be complied with. The mitigation included requirements for a travel plan, a dust management plan and electric vehicle charging points.

Accessibility / Public Rights of Way

The application site is adjacent to a Public Right of Way, namely Restricted Byway no. 87, Wilmslow. It appears unlikely however, that the proposal would affect the Public Right of

Way, although the PROW team has requested that any approval of planning permission includes an informative to ensure that developers are aware of their obligations with regard to the right of way.

Policy LPS 34 in the CELPS requires the *“Provision of a direct cycle and pedestrian link from the site to the west to improve connectivity. A link to the open space to the east should also be provided as part of any development”* and one of the site specific principles of development for the site is to *“Improve the connectivity and accessibility into and out of the site to Handforth town centre and the wider local area with the provision of cycle paths and pedestrian linkages”*.

Policy CO1 of the CELPS seeks to encourage a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking.

As noted above the proposed footway / cycleway provides really good permeability through the site north to south and east to west. This path provides the required links to the west and the open space to the east, where a bridge is proposed, and a financial contribution was secured as part of the outline permission towards a hard surfaced path from the proposed bridge crossing through the adjacent park. Further linkages are provided to the north / west onto Clay Lane and Sagars Road (towards Styall) and to the south onto Sagars Road.

However, as part of the Section 106 agreement, £18,000 was secured for the improvement of the surface of Restricted Byway no.87, which runs along Clay Lane to the north / west of the site, up to where it meets Sagars Road. There is an existing track identified on the Landscape masterplan within the western corner of the application site adjacent to Spurs Lodge, which is shown to be retained in its current form. Given the improvement works being carried out to the restricted byway, outside of the site, it is considered that this should also be upgraded to a standard suitable for accommodating cyclists and horseriders currently using this route to link Sagars Road to Clay Lane. This would require retaining a width of at least 3 metres and providing a suitable surface other than compacted gravel as suggested. This principle should also be applied to the linking spur from the internal road network.

Subject to these amendments the proposal is considered to comply with the connectivity and accessibility requirements of policy LPS 34 in the CELPS and policy CO1 of the CELPS.

Highways

Whilst access was approved as part of the outline permission, this reserved matters submission seeks approval for the internal road layout of the site. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure has commented on the application and noted that the main routes within the site are 5.5m wide and have either one or two footways and the cul-de-sacs are typically 4.8m wide shared surface roads, thereby meeting relevant Highways design standards.

In terms of car parking, the CELPS advises that parking bays should be 4.8m x 2.5m in size, and it is noted that some of the parking bays within the site appear to fall short of these dimensions and will need increasing in size. No specific cycle parking is identified in the submission.

In addition, the site is located within Styal, and as such the relevant parking standards are those for the remainder of the Borough outside of Principal Towns and Key Service Centres. Parking standards within the CELPS are:

Principal Towns and Key Service Centres

1 bedroom - 1 space per dwelling;
2 bedrooms - 2 spaces per dwelling;
3+ bedrooms - 2 spaces per dwelling

Remainder of borough

1 bedroom - 1 space per dwelling;
2/3 bedrooms - 2 spaces per dwelling;
4/5+ bedrooms - 3 spaces per dwelling

The key difference between the two standards is that 4 and 5+ bed properties should have 3 spaces rather than 2 spaces in areas outside of Principal Towns and Key Service Centres. The 5 bed units appear to be able to accommodate the required 3 spaces, but some of the 4 bed dwellings cannot. In this regard, and due to the size of some of the parking bays being too small, inadequate car parking is shown to be provided.

Trees / Landscape

Policy LPS 34 in the CELPS requires the *“Retention of trees and woodlands on the edges of the site, with new planting to re-enforce important landscape features and to properly define a new Green Belt boundary”*, and one of the site specific principles of development for the site is to *“Provide a comprehensive landscaping scheme which retains existing mature trees and hedgerows particularly on the perimeter of the site”*.

Trees

Policy SE5 of the CELPS states *“Development proposals which will result in the loss of, or threat to, the continued health and life expectancy of trees, hedgerows or woodlands (including veteran trees or ancient semi-natural woodland), that provide a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity, landscape character or historic character of the surrounding area, will not normally be permitted, except where there are clear overriding reasons for allowing the development and there are no suitable alternatives”*.

Condition 29 of the outline permission requires an arboricultural impact assessment to be submitted with the reserved matters submissions. One has been received in accordance with this condition as well as a shade assessment.

Selected individual and group of trees within and adjacent to the site (predominantly along the Sagars Road and Clay Lane boundaries) are protected by the Cheshire East Borough Council (Wilmslow – Handforth Land to the north of Sagars Road) Tree Preservation Order 2017 which was confirmed without modification on 8 March 2018.

The majority of trees along the site boundaries are to be retained as part of the development. The submitted Assessment identifies a number of low category trees for removal. Initially, a Horse Chestnut (T36) protected by the TPO was also proposed for removal due to its condition. This tree was graded as a Moderate (B) category tree with a life expectancy of in excess of 20 years, and following concerns being raised regarding the removal of this tree, it is now shown to be retained.

The Assessment indicates that there will be encroachment within the root protection area (RPA) of a number of trees. The Forestry officer advises that further detail is required to demonstrate that the encroachment into the RPA of T28 (a protected Horse Chestnut tree) is acceptable.

Similarly, the AIA explains that the encroachment into the RPA of T35 (Horse Chestnut) is within the tolerated 20% guideline of BS5837:2012 stating there is no requirement for specialist surfacing. However, given that it is a footpath that encroaches it is considered that a reduced dig solution as a precautionary approach is appropriate here. Encroachment into the RPAs of two other Horse Chestnuts (T33 and T37) are acceptable subject to the implementation/reliability of the Tree Protection Scheme.

A shading assessment of retained trees has been provided which is considered to be acceptable in terms of addressing shading from trees within the layout.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy SE5 of the CELPS.

Landscape

The key landscape requirement within LPS 37, as noted above, is the retention of trees and woodlands on the edges of the site, with new planting to re-enforce important landscape features and to properly define a new Green Belt boundary. This is largely achieved within the current proposal. However, there is some confusion over the existing hedgerows which are indicated to be retained within the layout plans, but identified for removal within the AIA. This matter must be clarified to ensure compliance with LPS 37.

The main focus on the negotiations with the application has been to get the layout to an agreed form. Once this agreement was reached it was intended that the detailed planting proposals would then be considered.

However, as noted elsewhere in this report there remains some disagreement on the layout, and given the applicant's enthusiasm to bring the application to committee, the detailed planting proposals have not been considered in detail. These matters will need to be reported as an update.

However, in terms of the layout the following landscape amendments are recommended:

- Remove plots 211 & 212 – cycleway is too enclosed by hedges & walls and too close to the frontage of both properties.
- Plots 57 and 55/56 are still too close to the existing hedgerow.
- Hedged enclosure to front of plots 201/2 unnecessary
- Clarification of railings around entrance feature – to tie in with other brick piers/railing details close by
- Does the bridge wall/pier need to extend into this feature area?
- What are the gradients in that area?
- Are any retaining walls needed in this area?
- Plots 1-3 should be within the less formal character area (orange dashed line)
- Central cycleway surfacing and footpath in front of plots 12-16 should be Natratex Cotswold (as previously agreed)

- Landscaping and boundary treatments to courtyard areas need consideration to ensure attractive, safe spaces and surveillance.
- Side boundary walls should be set back from the pavement/road by at least one metre to allow space for shrub planting - to soften/enhance
- Levels & cross sections along eastern brook area required
- Railings along the eastern brook where necessary for safety
- Pond details/profiles
- Plan and Schedule of ecological mitigation works to show where the Entrance Area mitigation has been relocated to.
- A hard surfacing materials plan in accordance with the Design Guide
- Boundary details to include all railing types, walls & fences
- Revised Landscape & Habitat Management Plan (as required by amendments made since submission)
- Productive planting details required and to be agreed with Manchester Airport

Ecology

Policy SE3 of the CELPS requires all development to positively contribute to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity and should not negatively affect these interests. One of the site specific principles of development listed under policy LPS 34 is *“New development will be expected to respect any existing ecological constraints on site and where necessary provide appropriate mitigation”*.

A number of conditions attached to the outline planning permission are relevant to ecology matters in the reserved matters submission, and are discussed, in turn, below:

Condition 8 - Provision of gaps for hedgehogs

The submitted Landscape and Habitat Management Plan includes acceptable proposals for small, 5-inch square gaps that will be provided at the base of garden fencing panels to allow hedgehogs and other small mammals to move between gardens. These hedgehog holes will be incorporated into fences that run along the edges of the site to maintain connectivity with the surrounding landscapes.

Condition 13 – Ecological enhancement strategy

This condition requires proposals for:

- Features for nesting birds and roosting bats
- Native species planting
- New wildlife ponds.

Acceptable native species planting and new ponds have been included on the submitted landscape plans and proposals for the provision of features for nesting birds and roosting bats are included in the submitted Landscape and Habitat Management Plan.

Proposals for the provision of additional wildlife ponds are further discussed below.

Condition 14 - 10 year management plan

The Landscape and Habitat Management Plan that has been submitted in support of this reserved matters application provides acceptable management arrangements for a period of 25 years.

Condition 15 – 10m undeveloped buffer to Dobbin Brook

The submitted layout plan is not in accordance with this condition. The boundary of plots 205 / 206 is only 7.5m from the Brook, with the pathway 8.5m from the Brook.

Condition 15 does allow for the reduction in the size of the buffer where it can be demonstrated that it is not required for part of the site. The applicant's consultant has suggested that the reduction in the buffer is acceptable due to the status (largely absent) of protected species on site, the presence of existing vegetation and the fact that a buffer of 8m would not result in an increased pollution risk compared to a 10m buffer.

All of these factors were known at the time of the determination of the outline application when the condition requiring a 10m buffer was imposed. The nature conservation officer advises that based on his experiences of other sites in Cheshire East where development has been undertaken in close proximity to water courses and has resulted in disturbance of the adjacent water course, a 10m buffer is appropriate. The layout plan should therefore be amended to provide the 10m buffer as required by condition 15.

Condition 21 - Updated badger and otter survey

An updated protected species report has been submitted in accordance with this condition. No evidence of these species was recorded and they are therefore unlikely to be significantly affected by the proposed development.

Condition 27 – Retention of hedgerows and mitigation for any hedgerows removed.

Hedgerows are a priority habitat and hence a material consideration in the determination of the application. As anticipated at the time of the determination of the outline application, the development of this site will result in the loss of a number of sections of hedgerow. The majority of the existing hedgerows are to be retained as part of the proposal, and an acceptable level of compensatory hedgerow planting is proposed as part of the latest landscaping scheme to compensate for that lost.

Ponds

Three ponds were identified on site during the surveys undertaken in support of the outline application. Of these it appears feasible for one pond to be retained (identified as pond 3 by the ecological assessment submitted with the outline), which lies close to the Clay Lane boundary to the north / west of the site. Pond two is present in the central hedgerow, and would be lost as a result of the proposed development (although further surveys as part of the outline application confirmed that this was not in fact a pond as such).

Pond 1, which would be lost under the layout, appears as a pond on the 1891-1912 OS maps and again appears on the 1904-1939 OS. This habitat was also considered to be a pond during amphibian surveys submitted in respect of the outline application. Therefore as this pond is lost to the proposed development a new pond must be provided to compensate for its loss.

Two new ponds are proposed within the red line of the access application (19/1797M), these were however provided under that application to ensure that the proposed scheme delivered a net gain for biodiversity in accordance with Local Plan Policy SE3. The two ponds were not intended to compensate for the loss of biodiversity from the main part of the development site. As part of the current application, one of the ponds secured as part of the access application

has been repositioned to the western boundary of the site, and an additional small wildlife has now been incorporated into the proposed layout to compensate for the loss of Pond 1. This new pond is shown close to the location of pond 3 (by the Clay Lane boundary), and overall there is a satisfactory level of pond creation within the proposed development. A condition would be required to secure the detailed design of the ponds.

Nesting Birds

Due to the hedgerow removal that is required, if planning consent is granted a condition will be required to safeguard nesting birds.

Updated bat survey

An updated bat survey of 15 Hampson Crescent, which is proposed for demolition, did not record any evidence of roosting bats. Therefore, roosting bats are unlikely to be present or affected by the proposed demolition of this property.

The nature conservation officer has noted that whilst the application site offers limited opportunities for roosting bats, bats are likely to commute and forage around the site to some extent. To avoid any adverse impacts on bats resulting from any lighting associated with the development, a condition was attached to the outline consent requiring any proposed lighting to be agreed with the LPA.

Amendments are required to the layout to plots 205 / 206 to achieve the 10m undeveloped buffer to Dobbin Brook. If such amendments are made, then the proposal will comply with the requirements of policy SE3 of the CELPS, and the site specific principles relating to ecology of LPS 34.

Layout / Design

Another of the site specific principles of the site listed in LPS 34 is that *“The development must be a high quality design which reflects and respects the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring properties”*.

Amongst other criteria, policy SD2 of the CELPS expects all development to contribute positively to an area’s character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness in terms of:

- a. Height, scale, form and grouping;
- b. Choice of materials;
- c. External design features;
- d. Massing of development - the balance between built form and green/public spaces;
- e. Green infrastructure; and
- f. Relationship to neighbouring properties, street scene and the wider neighbourhood

Policy SE1 of the CELPS expects housing developments to achieve Building for Life 12 (BfL12) standard, and 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. BfL12 uses a traffic light system, with the aim of eliminating reds, whilst maximising the number of greens. The Council’s Design Officer has undertaken a BfL12 assessment of the application, which is reflected in the commentary below.

Connections - **GREEN**

The site is located within a semi-rural location on the eastern edge of Styal immediately adjacent to the settlement of Handforth. The sole vehicular access will be across Dobbin Brook from Hampson Crescent to the east from Handforth. Pedestrian and cycle links are also provided to Sagars Road and Clay Lane connecting to the north, west and south and a further pedestrian connection is provided to the open space at Meriton Road park. These links provide the necessary connections to the existing surrounding development and leisure offer. Generally the development relates to the adjacent open countryside beyond the site, providing a green buffer on the outskirts, as required by LPS 34. Although, the interface and relationship between the existing buildings, the Brook and the development to the north east could be stronger.

Facilities and services - **GREEN**

The development is within a 10 minute walk to shops, schools, healthcare, community facilities and public transport within Handforth centre, and is within a 5 minute walk to Meriton Road park. All these local facilities are therefore accessible on foot from the application site

Public transport - **GREEN**

The number 88 bus which travels between Knutsford and Wilmslow has its nearest bus stop on Manor Park North, which is not particularly convenient for residents of the site, as it is located within the housing estate on the opposite side of Mobberley Road, but is still a non car option for travel between Knutsford and Altrincham. The train station is approximately 2kms from the site.

Meeting local housing requirements - **RED**

As noted above, in terms of market housing there is a predominance of 4 bed detached dwellings (57%), which does not reflect a diverse range of sizes of homes. There are very few smaller dwellings and no provision within the open market offer specifically for older residents.

Whilst the affordable homes present the required 30% allocation, this is leaning towards one and two bed homes.

A more diverse mix, particularly for the open market dwellings, would release land and provide opportunity to create a more unique and high quality environment. Pepper potting of affordable homes could be spread further throughout the site as there are areas of concentration dictated by the building type proposed (apartments).

Given the conflict identified above with policy SC4, a red light is considered to be appropriate.

Character - **RED**

Whilst this scheme departs in some ways from a standard housing development, the proposal has not sufficiently exploited the context of the site. This translates at several levels in terms of urban design, the approach to blue and green infrastructure and the design of buildings. Where water bodies are included they are not being exploited for positive layout purposes and their location is primarily an engineering/ecology response rather than considered place making.

The quality of the architecture, application of density and the street environment in parts of the site will also adversely impact upon the development's sense of place. The density in particular has not been sufficiently resolved, resulting in a uniform density across the site apart from areas housing the affordable homes where the density is at its highest.

There has been an attempt at translating local character details and architectural reference onto a standard type but the scale of the height of details such as ridge and eaves have not been analysed and transferred to the type designs, again raising concerns as to whether the development will sit comfortably within the context of its surroundings.

The use of black window frames should be restricted to use within the 'feature building' homes with timber framed detailing as the area predominantly characterises white window frames. Green windows are also proposed throughout the Country Fringe character area located to the edges of the site. No white windows are proposed anywhere within the development, only black and green. The introduction of this stylised element across the suite of homes within the development would be inappropriate and out of character for this area.

Working with the site and its context - AMBER

The main landscape features of the site are the trees and woodland to the edges of the site, the hedgerows dividing fields, Dobbin Brook and a small number of ponds. The majority of existing landscape features are being retained as required by LPS 34. Other features are being altered or replaced within an alternative location on site.

A sustainability statement has been submitted with the application, but the development does not take into account the opportunity to harness passive and active energy creation with the use of south facing units and photovoltaic technology.

Creating well defined streets and spaces - RED

There is a hierarchy within the street design, however, the lack of integrated green infrastructure (GI) that reinforces the street hierarchy has not been applied and results in reduced legibility throughout the site.

In places buildings positively address corners but there are concerns about the strength of corner turning designs, and whether there is sufficient emphasis on both elevations in terms of architectural quality and interest. (Adding a further opening may not be enough in some cases where there is no distinctive feature to the corner to enable greater legibility of the site.) There are also areas within the site where corners are handled less well and where rear gardens are exposed in views from the street, often as a consequence of providing frontage parking.

The layout is heavily reliant on the quality of landscaping and materiality for streets and there is insufficient opportunity for substantive soft landscape in relation to streets and the proposed hard surfacing is not in compliance with the materials palette for North Cheshire Fringe areas stated in the Design Guide. The Design Guide states that *"If there is a departure from the suggested materiality then the Design and Access Statement should state the reasons why the materials have been specified."* The Design & Access Statement does not provide this, but the applicant has stated that this requirement is not being universally applied to all applications across Cheshire East. Until it is applied consistently, and only varied where reasons have been provided, the objectives of the Design Guide will continue to be

undermined. In this case, as stated above, the materials simply do not comply with the relevant requirements of the Design Guide, and no explanation for this departure is provided.

Easy to find your way around - **AMBER**

The scheme is generally legible but more could have been done to reinforce that through stronger landscaping of the principal and secondary streets, the creation of a stronger and more distinct principal gateway and the creation of stronger, potentially bespoke groupings in key locations within the layout to reinforce key views and vistas. Weakening of the frontages in certain locations and exposing the backs of properties dilutes legibility. An approach to density with lower density edges and a higher density at the entrance/ core of the site in association with the local centre would also have helped to reinforce legibility.

Streets for all - **AMBER**

Within the cells of development the reduced street width and hierarchy should identify these streets as mixed environments for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as vehicles, punctuated by squares and areas of shared surface.

The perception of the streets will be heavily influenced by the quality of surface materials and landscaping. Whilst the spine road integrates and enhances existing GI, there is a lack of GI connected to the road hierarchy. The secondary streets presently lack sufficient tree planting and soft landscaping to create the feel of a high quality pedestrian focused environment. This is exacerbated by the amount of frontage parking in certain areas, weakening the street scene

Car parking - **RED**

A mix of parking solutions is encouraged by the Design Guide to ensure that the street scene is not dominated by vehicles. Many of the plots have the parking spaces to the front of the units, and the effect of this is the dominance of vehicles in the street scene with very limited scope for landscaping to prevent the street scene becoming visually dominated by vehicles. This frontage car parking weakens street scenes and creates gaps in the continuity of frontages in relation to streets and opens up views of the rear of properties.

Rear parking courts are employed in parts but there is insufficient space to make these quality spaces, which is important in making them feel usable and safe. This may force vehicle parking into the street where they have not been planned for. Such courtyard areas should look good as spaces both with and without cars in order to be an effective design solution.

Public and private spaces - **AMBER**

The main spine of open space incorporating the pedestrian and cycle route provides the potential for an attractive green core to the development. The removal of plots 211 and 212 would improve this central green leisure corridor to the site as in this area the cycleway is too enclosed by hedges & walls (existing and proposed) and too close to the frontage of these properties. The gateway and eastern area of public open space has been simplified since the access permission, and does offer the potential for a distinct landscape feature. Other spaces within the layout provide the opportunity for local greening and meeting spaces but those spaces could have been made more distinct than is indicated.

There are elements where there are views into private space from the public realm. Plots 171 and 172 have their main front elevations and entrances immediately adjacent to the children's

play space in the centre of the site. Their proximity to this public area creates the potential for conflict between these public and private spaces.

External storage and amenity - RED

Whilst this is referenced at the end of the Design and Access statement, insufficient information has been provided in the application to demonstrate that storage space has been adequately considered as part of this proposal.

Some properties are shown to have detached garages, which will serve as part of the parking provision for the relevant dwellings. However, no plans or elevations for these structures have been submitted. Unless they are particularly generously proportioned garages, they cannot be relied on for external storage, as it is expected that once the car is parked in the garage, no space will be available for other storage. Further external storage facilities are required for all plots.

Design conclusions

As noted above, concerns are raised regarding: the mix of the properties proposed; the character and density of the development; the definition of streets and spaces, and associated landscaping; hard surfacing materials; the inter-relationship between public and private spaces; the way in which plots turn corners; the extent of frontage parking and bland parking courts and general dominance of parked cars; and; the lack of external storage. For these reasons conflict with policies SD2 and SE1, and the CEC Design Guide can be identified.

Flooding

Policy SE13 of the CELPS states that developments must integrate measures for sustainable water management to reduce flood risk, avoid an adverse impact on water quality and quantity within the borough and provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity, health and recreation.

The application site lies within flood zone 1, which is land that has a less than 0.1% chance of flooding. The proposals do include the diverting and culverting of a section of Dobbin Brook. These same proposals have already been approved as part of the access application (19/1797M), and have previously been found to be acceptable.

The Environment Agency and the LLFA raise no objections to the proposal, and relevant conditions relating to flood risk were attached to the outline permission, which will ensure that the development complies with policy SE13 of the CELPS.

Contaminated Land

Contaminated land matters were considered and appropriately conditioned at the outline stage. No further contaminated land matters are raised by the proposed reserved matters.

Other matters

The comments received in representation are acknowledged, and are addressed within the preceding text, or were considered as part of the outline planning application, which has been approved.

BALANCE OF ISSUES

The proposed development seeks to provide a residential development of 217 dwellings on a site allocated for around 250 dwellings in the CELPS. The submission relates to the detail of the proposal in terms of its scale, layout, appearance and landscaping, however a range of concerns are raised in terms of this submission.

The proposed affordable housing is not considered to be adequately pepper potted around the site. These units could be further dispersed in the western and eastern sections of the site, with an associated reduction in the existing cluster. Whilst an updated plan is awaited to show the affordable units, using the previous iteration of the layout plan to identify their positioning within the site, it is concluded that the proposal does not comply with policy SC5 of the CELPS.

The proposed housing does not provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. In terms of open market housing, there is considered to be an over provision of larger 4 bed detached dwellings, and an under provision of smaller units for single people, first time buyers and the elderly. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy SC4 of the CELPS.

Assessment of the proposals against the CEC Design Guide and Building for Life 12 indicates that there are issues in several fundamental areas. As a consequence, the proposal is not considered to be good enough to approve in its current form. The proposal is contrary to policies LPS 34, SD2 and SE1 of the CELPS, and the CEC Design Guide.

The level of parking for some 4 bed properties does not meet the parking standards within the CELPS. A number of the proposed parking spaces also fall short of the dimensions stated for parking spaces and garages set out in the CELPS. This would force vehicles to park on the road and would thereby be harmful to the visual amenity of the area and highway safety.

Clarification is required on matters relating to encroachment within the RPA of a protected tree, the removal of hedgerows and landscaping and further details on these matters will be provided as an update. Similarly an amendments are required to ensure plots 205 and 206 are located outside of the 10m undeveloped buffer to the Brook, as required by condition 15 of the outline permission. Each of these issues has the potential to be an additional reason for refusal.

The provision of 217 new dwellings is clearly a benefit of the proposal, which will make a valuable contribution to the delivery of the Council's 5 year housing land supply. However, it should be noted that 217 dwellings is still a significant shortfall from the allocated 250, and the proposal still does not provide a design that adequately reflects the requirements of the Local Plan or the design guide even at this lower density, which does make it harder to accept.

Other benefits relating to the development were secured at the outline stage, including 30% affordable housing, and contributions towards improvements to local footpaths / leisure routes, towards recreation and outdoor sports provision, towards healthcare and towards education.

The applicants have worked with officers over several months in an attempt to achieve a mutually acceptable scheme, which to date has not been realised. It is expected that the

applicant will seek to address the outstanding issues in the coming days and further details will be provided as an update.

As it currently stands, there is clear conflict with the development plan and supplementary planning documents. The conflict with the development plan identified above is not considered to be outweighed by other material considerations in this case. The proposal is therefore not considered to be a sustainable form of development. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed affordable housing is not considered to be adequately pepper potted around the site, and therefore does not comply with policy SC5 of the CELPS.**
- 2. The proposed housing does not provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities, and is therefore contrary to policy SC4 of the CELPS.**
- 3. Assessment of the proposals against the CEC Design Guide and Building for Life 12 indicates that there are issues in several fundamental areas. As a consequence, the proposal is not considered to be good enough to approve in its current form. The proposal is contrary to policies LPS 34, SD2 and SE1 of the CELPS, and the CEC Design Guide.**
- 4. The level of parking for some 4 bed properties does not meet the parking standards within the CELPS. A number of the proposed parking spaces also fall short of the dimensions stated for parking spaces and garages set out in the CELPS. This would force vehicles to park on the road and would thereby be harmful to the visual amenity of the area and highway safety.**

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.

