

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD AT 8.00PM ON MONDAY 25<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2021 VIA TEAMS MEETING.

PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr L A Clarke

Cllrs: M Beanland, K Booth, S Lees, L Podmore, Mrs J Saunders and Ms H Whittaker

Officers in attendance: K McDowell, (Deputy Clerk) and T Juss (Minute Taker)

129. Recording of meeting

The shorthand assistant confirmed that the meeting is recorded for the purpose of minute taking and the recording is deleted when draft minutes are approved. There were no other declarations of a recording.

130. Questions from members of the public

Questions from members of the public in attendance were in relation to the following planning applications:

Application No: 20/3061M

Location: Towers Yard Farm, Towers Road, Poynton, SK12 1DE

Applicants Name: Mr and Mrs Whitehurst

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of agricultural buildings to form a single dwelling house and domestic outbuildings

Application No: 20/5775M

Location: 16 Fir Close, Poynton, SK12 1PD

Applicants Name: Mr Nick Good

Proposal: Erection of 1no. Detached bungalow

The Chair proposed the order of business was amended to review the two planning applications.

**RESOLVED: That the order of business to review Application No: 20/3061M and Application No: 20/5775M following agenda item 4 was agreed (NC)**

131. Apologies for absence

Cllr J Waterhouse

#### 4. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests

The following declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests was received:  
Cllr Booth in Application No: 20/3061M and Application No: 20/5697M.

##### Planning Applications

Application No: 20/5775M  
Location: 16 Fir Close, Poynton, SK12 1PD  
Applicants Name: Mr Nick Good  
Proposal: Erection of 1no. Detached bungalow

A resident from Fir Close spoke as follows on Application No: 20/5775M:  
*“Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak, I am a neighbour of 16 Fir Close, and I am speaking on behalf of a number of neighbours, many of whom attend today. We strongly object to the planning application for a bungalow within the rear garden of 16 Fir Close. A previous application was submitted for this site in April 2020. The previous application included an extension to 16 Fir Close (which has now been constructed), as well as the proposed bungalow. Poynton Town Council objected to this. We understand that the (Cheshire East) Case Officer also provided negative feedback regarding the bungalow, and this was removed from the application to gain permission for the extension of 16 Fir Close. However, identical plans have now been resubmitted for the construction of the bungalow.”*

The resident suggested several reasons why the proposal is not in accordance with local planning policy, in particular the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan, including:

- This proposal depletes the existing spacious setting which is predominant in this area and the wider ‘Tree Estate’.
- Cheshire East refused a similar planning application on 41 Brookside Avenue, 19/4362M, which also sought to divide a corner plot to create a bungalow in the back garden.
- The proposed development would provide inadequate space around and between buildings, particularly with regard to the provision of adequate levels of private open space.
- The proposed bungalow is very close to neighbouring houses on Fir Close and Ivy Road. One house on Fir Close has planning permission for a side extension and the proposed plans do not appear to have considered the proximity of the bungalow. The proposed bungalow application would create the issues of inadequate space between buildings, loss of privacy and cramped development, leading to a terracing effect.
- They strongly consider the development to be unneighbourly.
- Increased risk of flooding due to the building over land that is currently used as garden.
- Parking provision detrimental to highway safety.
- The resident urged that the Town Council carefully review the planning application, which overall seeks to maximise the commercial value of the site at the detriment of residential amenity and is not in keeping with the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan and its guiding policies.

The Chair thanked the residents in attendance for their views. Members then reviewed the application.

**Recommendation: The Town Council objects to this application for the following reasons:**

The proposed development is an inappropriate form of development on this site and in this location as it is not sympathetic to the site, immediately adjoining properties or the character of the surrounding housing area. The development fails to meet national Planning Guidance as set out in the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (sections 11 and 17 concerned with the efficient use of land and design) and as set out in the National Design Guide October 2019.

Policy 122 (d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that: *“Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account ... d) the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens)”*.

The development is contrary to current Planning Policies, as well as national planning policies which seek to promote high quality and inclusive design:

Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: Policies HOU7 (Environmental Considerations), HOU 8 (Density), HOU11 (Design) and HOU15 (Tandem and Backland Development)

Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1, SD2 (Sustainable Development), SE1 (Design), SE2 (Efficient use of land) and SE13 (Flood Risk and Water Management)

Macclesfield Local Plan (retained policies): DC1, DC3 (Design – amenity), DC8 (Landscaping), DC37 (Residential – landscaping) and DC41 (Infill Development)

As the site is currently used as part of a garden, it is not a “brownfield” site.

**Loss of privacy** - The position of the proposed development, in relation to adjoining residential properties, would result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of privacy presently enjoyed by the occupiers of those adjoining properties by reason of overlooking.

**Cramped development** - The proposal by reason of scale, form and design would result in a cramped and intrusive form of development out of keeping with the character of the existing properties in the area. In addition, the "Trees" estate is one that is generously spaced particularly with corner properties where roads meet and this proposed development would change this character very much to the detriment of the appearance of this area and would set a dangerous precedent.

**Inadequate space around buildings** - The proposed development would provide inadequate space around and between buildings, particularly with regard to the provision of adequate levels of private open space. The proposed bungalow is very close to the existing number 18 Fir Close and to the boundary with 37 Ivy Road. It would also be close to the proposed rear extension of 16 Fir Close.

The Town Council notes that a planning application has recently been approved relating to 18 Fir Close, ref 20/1529M. This is for a side extension which will extend 18 Fir Close closer to the site of the proposed bungalow. The latest application would exacerbate the

issues of inadequate space between buildings, loss of privacy and cramped development.

**Development unneighbourly** - The proposed development by virtue of its size, design and position relative to adjoining properties, would be unduly dominant, causing an unacceptable loss of light to the detriment of the residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties.

**Parking provision detrimental to highway safety.** The development would be detrimental to the interests of highway safety through an increase in parking taking place in unsuitable locations on the highway. It appears from the Town Council's own observations that the parking spaces allocated to the proposed new bungalow may be too small for two cars and this will lead to further on-street carparking.

**Flood Risk:** The recent flooding in Poynton in July 2019, seriously affecting a number of houses on the "Tree Estate" show the risk of building over land currently used as gardens as it increases the run-off of water in wet weather increasing the risk of flooding. The applicants have not provided a flood risk assessment.

**(NC)**

The Chair reminded members of the public that in terms of planning applications, Cheshire East Council are the decision-making body and residents are urged to write to Cheshire East Council to express their opinions.

*Cllr Booth withdrew from the meeting.*

Application No: 20/3061M

Location: Towers Yard Farm, Towers Road, Poynton, SK12 1DE

Applicants Name: Mr and Mrs Whitehurst

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of agricultural buildings to form a single dwelling house and domestic outbuildings

On behalf of the applicants, a representative from Emery Planning spoke on the application plans. The planning application for Towers Yard Farm had previously been rejected and these application plans have been revised and resubmitted taking into account the comments from the first application submission. They explained in detail the changes made to the planning application and how these amendments addressed previous comments and provided a more sympathetic design approach whilst remaining respectful to the original building. The following points were noted:

- The amended proposals are brought forward in response to comments by consultees on the original submission; including Poynton Town Council. Members were referred to the letter explaining how the revised proposals have evolved.
- Originally, the project was approached as a simple change of use of an existing building which is acceptable in principle in Green Belt policy terms.
- As the application progressed it emerged that this may not be the best option. Apparently, the main building had its origins as a smithy in the former colliery railyard, at the junction of Towers Road and Princes Incline. The Cheshire East Council's Conservation Officer felt it would be a missed opportunity to convert the modern blockwork lean-to on the rear of the smithy to its original form.
- A Heritage consultant was instructed to research local history archives and identify how the site currently relates to the former colliery railyard. As a result,

the proposals now respond to the history of the site in a number of different ways. Efforts have been made to retain the original character of the smithy and the brick storage building adjacent to Princes Incline. Garden paths are proposed on the footprint where a former sawmill once stood, and the site boundary would be realigned to follow the route of a former colliery siding.

- As a project for the applicant's own family home, the applicant is keen to recognise these local history connections in the development of the site.
- In terms of other planning considerations, the proposed extensions would be smaller than the blockwork extension that would be demolished. The unsightly front part of the pole barn would be removed. These would enhance the openness of the Green Belt, as well as the local history value of the site, and its visual appearance.
- The site is currently unkempt, the buildings are beginning to fall into disrepair, and it provides a poor outlook to the surrounding dwellings, and for users of the public footpaths and bridleway on Princes Incline.
- The applicant's letter addresses the concerns previously raised by the Town Council in respect of potential flood risk, vehicle movements, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and other aspects of sustainable development.

Members considered the application.

**Recommendation:** The Town Council recommends approval of this planning application subject to:

1. The Cheshire East Council Planning Officer being satisfied that this will not create a precedent for further development in the Green Belt in the area.
2. The Town Council urge that a condition is imposed that the Princes Incline (which is also public footpath 56) is not used for access for construction purposes.
3. Recommend that Cheshire East Council undertakes an appraisal of the issue of surface water drainage and possible flood risk that may result from this development and if necessary, provides a suitable remediation action and strategy.

**(6 for, 1 abstention)**

*Cllr Booth re-joined the meeting.*

132. Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

**RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning and Environment committee meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021 are approved (NC)**

133. Receive and consider the action log for 2020-2021.

The Deputy Clerk provided an update on the action log for 2020-2021 and the following point was noted:

Tyres at Land off Middlewood Road

The Deputy Clerk confirmed that the Cheshire East Council Planning Officer has obtained the necessary photographs of the site and is due to liaise with the Cheshire

East Council Legal Department with a view to issuing a s125 Notice. Members agreed that the Deputy Clerk request an update from the Planning Officer.

**RESOLVED: That the action log for 2020-2021 was received. That the updates to the action log were noted (NC)**

134. Note the action taken under SO51 in relation to:

- Approve the wording of an email sent to Cheshire East in relation to the S106 Agreement for Sprink Farm.
- To agree to a further email to be sent to Planning Enforcement in relation to Sprink Farm.
- Agree the submission of possible street names for the Sprink Farm Development Site.
- To appoint a Town Council representative to attend the Northern Planning meeting in relation to 79 Shrigley Road North.

**RESOLVED: That the actions as stated taken under SO51 were noted (NC)**

135. Receive an update from the Clerk on the non-compliance of the developers at Sprink Farm regarding condition 15 of planning consent 17/4256M.

**RESOLVED: That the update from the Clerk on the non-compliance of the developers at Sprink Farm regarding condition 15 of planning consent 17/4256M was received. That the Town Council go back to Cheshire East Council and enquire about the actions taken to ensure compliance with the condition requiring Bellway Homes to produce a construction manual to be approved by Cheshire East Council on how they go about their business to build the houses was agreed. That the Town Council continue to monitor the drainage issues and actions required was agreed (NC)**

136. Receive and consider the government consultation on Supporting Housing Delivery and Public Service Infrastructure and to agree a response.

**RESOLVED: That the government consultation on Supporting Housing Delivery and Public Service Infrastructure was received. That the response as drafted by Mr Knight was approved for submission, with thanks to Mr Knight, was approved (NC)**

137. Receive and consider the correspondence from Cheshire East in relation to an illegal dwelling at Elm Beds caravan park.

**RESOLVED: That the correspondence from Cheshire East in relation to an illegal dwelling at Elm Beds caravan park was received and Councillor Saunders will pursue after lockdown ends (NC)**

138. Receive and consider a table of Cheshire East planning decisions.

**RESOLVED: That a table of Cheshire East planning decisions was received (NC)**

139. Planning applications received for consideration:

*Cllr Booth withdrew from the meeting.*

Application No: 20/5697M

Location: 2 Millstone Close, Poynton, SK12 1XS

Applicants Name: Hopwood

Proposal: Outline application to form a housing plot for a single dwelling

**Recommendation:** Poynton Town Council recommends that this application be rejected on the grounds of “insufficient information”, as the applicants have not supplied such vital information as the footprint of the proposed new house, its height or the means of access.

This renders it impossible to confirm whether the application complies with current development plan policies, including:

Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: Policies HOU7 (Environmental Considerations), HOU 8 (Density), HOU11 (Design) and HOU15 (Tandem and Backland Development)

Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1, SD2 (Sustainable Development), SE1 (Design), SE2 (Efficient use of land) and SE13 (Flood Risk and Water Management)

Macclesfield Local Plan (retained policies): DC1, DC3 (Design – amenity), DC8 (Landscaping), DC37 (Residential – landscaping) and DC41 (Infill Development)

The proposed development is an inappropriate form of development on this site and in this location as it is not sympathetic to the site, immediately adjoining properties or the character or the surrounding low-density housing area. The development fails to meet national Planning Guidance as set out in the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (sections 11 and 17 concerned with the efficient use of land and design) and as set out in the National Design Guide October 2019.

Policy 122 (d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that: *“Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account ... d) the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens)”*.

We note that, as the site is currently used as part of a garden, it is not a “brownfield” site.

**(NC)**

*Cllr Booth re-joined the meeting.*

Application No:20/5788M

Location: San Rafael, Willow Close, Poynton, Sk12 1UL

Applicants Name: Colin and Gillian Garnsworthy

Proposal: Proposed new vehicular access

**Recommendation:** Poynton Town Council notes that the existing access to “San Rafael” off Willow Close is an adopted road with a proper visibility splay at its junction with Park Lane. In contrast, the proposed access is a narrow path, which crosses the footway where it meets Park Lane with poor visibility. This path is well used by the mainly elderly residents of the Long Row on Park Lane and Willow Close.

The Town Council therefore opposes this application as it endangers highway safety.

**Inadequate Visibility** – The proposal would be contrary to the interests of highway safety by reason of inadequate visibility at the point of access onto Park Lane.

**Use of Sub-Standard Access** - The proposal would be contrary to the interests of highway safety since it would result in an intensification of the vehicular use of the path from Willow Close to Park Lane, which is sub-standard, having regard to local and national design standards.

**(NC)**

Application No: 21/0113M

Location: 3 Lostock Hall Road, Poynton, Sk12 1DP

Applicants Name: M Leech

Proposal: Proposed amendments to 17/2600M

**Recommendation:** No Objection **(NC)**

Application No: 21/0155M

Location: 9 Parklands Way, Poynton, Sk12 1AJ

Applicants Name: Robert Harvey

Proposal: Extension to existing driveway to front and side of dwelling. A section of the existing lawn to be used to make an extension to the existing driveway (tarmac). The materials used will be tarmac with coping stone edging to match existing. The existing entrance from the highway and curb drop will be used as access to the proposed extension driveway.

**Recommendation:** No objection, providing the Highways Officer is satisfied that there will be no adverse impact on road safety **(NC)**

Application No:21/0161M

Location: 21 Lyme Road, Poynton, SK12 1TH

Applicants Name: Kerry and Matt Trinder

Proposal: Two storey rear extension to an existing link detached house and single storey conservatory.

**Recommendation: Objection**, as contrary to Poynton Neighbourhood Plan policies HOU 11 and HOU 13 and Cheshire East Local Plan policy SD2 and retained policies DC1, DC2 and GC12 in the Macclesfield Local Plan.



The property appears to have already been extended, and so the latest proposals may exceed the limit of 30 per cent in Policy GC12 for extensions in the Green Belt.

**Extension Unneighbourly** - The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, design and position relative to adjoining property, would be unduly dominant when viewed from adjoining property, causing an unacceptable loss of light to the detriment of the residential amenities of the occupiers of that property.

**Green Belt** – The proposal is an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt as defined by the Development Plan.

**(NC)**

Application No: 21/0182M

Location: 66 Clifford Road, Poynton, SK12 1JA

Applicants Name: Mr A Mizon

Proposal: Single/double storey rear extensions, front porch, front canopy and render to existing building

**Recommendation:** No Objection **(NC)**

Application No: 21/0241M

Location: 14 Hepley Road, Poynton, SK12 1RP

Applicants Name: Ms T Ratcliffe

Proposal: New front porch with associated roof alterations and internal changes to an existing house.

**Recommendation:** No Objection **(NC)**

140. Consider and agree any communication messages arising from this meeting.

Members agreed a communication message regarding Sprink Farm with an expression of thanks to residents for their support and to confirm that the Town Council continue to pursue the issues with the development. The Deputy Clerk will draft the text for the communication message to be agreed by members under SO51.

**RESOLVED: That the communication message as stated regarding the Sprink Farm development was agreed (NC)**

Meeting end time: 9.00pm

Chair .....

Dated.....