

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD AT 8.00PM ON MONDAY 15TH FEBRUARY 2021 VIA TEAMS MEETING.

PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr L A Clarke

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

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

141. 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.

142. Questions from members of the public

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

- Application No: 21/0264M; Location: 64 Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 1NT.
- Sprink Farm development (2 applications):
- Application No: 20/5724M; Location: Land at Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 2NN.
- Application No: 21/0237D; Location: Land at Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 2NN.

The Chair proposed the order of business was amended to review the stated items of business following agenda item 4.

RESOLVED: That the order of business to review Application No: 21/0264M and the Sprink Farm development: Applications No: 20/5724M and 21/0237D was agreed (NC)

143. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

144. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests

The following declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests was received: Cllr Ms Whitaker in Application No: 21/0511M.

Planning Application

Application No: 21/0264M

Location: 64 Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 1NT

Applicants Name: Abode Property Development

Proposal: Full planning application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of three detached dwellings and apartments with associated landscape and access works

A resident from Dickens Lane spoke to object to Application No: 21/0264M. The resident raised the following points:

- The main concern is the serious flood risk. There has been experience of flooding on two previous occasions over the last four years. The infrastructure of Dickens Lane is very old with a one pipe system for both rainwater and sewage. During heavy down pours there is the potential risk of sewage into the house.
- The proposed three storey development will impact the privacy of the neighbouring single storey bungalow.
- There is a real safety risk associated with an increasing number of vehicles yards from a blind bend on a busy road, close to a T-junction, in close proximity to local schools and school children walking to and from school creates a myriad of safety concerns.

In summary, the erection of three detached dwellings and apartments with associated landscape and access works will be vast over development of the site.

The Chair thanked the resident and noted that the Town Council is not the decision-making body and residents should ensure they write to Cheshire East Council to fully express their views.

Members considered the application.

Recommendation: The development is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

In terms of Planning policy, it is the view that the proposed development is contrary to the prevailing Planning policies for the area which are at national, Borough and local level. Therefore, the application should be refused for the following reasons:

1. 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 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.

This house and its neighbours form an area of lower density housing, separating areas of higher density along Dickens Lane and providing a contrasting environment with larger gardens and a significant number of trees. 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)”.

2. The proposed development is contrary to the Development Plan for the Poynton area as set out in Cheshire East Local Plan 2017 and the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004 (Saved policies) and should be refused. There are no material circumstances justifying otherwise. Any benefits arising do not outweigh the many adverse impacts which would cause substantial harm to the amenities of the local community and cannot be mitigated against.

3. Planning permission should be refused as the development fails to comply with the following up-to date Development Plan policies: MP1, SD2, SE1, SE5, SC3 and SC4 of the Cheshire East Local Plan 2017 and the following Saved policies of the Macclesfield Borough Council Local Plan 2004: H11, DC3, DC6, DC8, DC37, DC38, DC41, RT1 and RT2.

4. The proposed development is contrary to relevant policies of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan 2019 as the local and up to date part of the Development Plan. As a cramped and intrusive form of development on the northern entrance into the town, the development would fail to meet the following policies of the Neighbourhood Plan: HOU 6 (housing mix), HOU 7 (environmental considerations), HOU 8 (density and site coverage), HOU 11 (design), HOU 15 (backland and tandem development) and EGB 2 (open spaces)

5. The proposed development fails to address the Supplementary Planning Guidance set out in the Cheshire East Borough Design Guide SPD 2017 both in terms of content of the application and the approach to be taken to preparing the application. The SPD is a material Planning consideration in its own right and is also a supporting document to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2017

The Town Council notes that land previously used as a garden does not qualify as a “brownfield” site for planning purposes.

6. Loss of Trees contributing to Amenity – The proposed development by virtue of its size and siting would result in the direct loss of existing trees which are of amenity value to the area. There are Tree Preservation Orders covering part of this property and all of the garden of the next-door house, 66 Dickens Lane. The roots of these trees could be damaged by development at 64 Dickens Lane.

7. Impact on Wildlife: Large gardens provide an essential habitat for endangered species such as bats, badgers, frogs, toads, newts, butterflies, moths and hedgehogs. Even if boundary trees are retained, the loss of garden space and increased proximity of new housing will drive away wildlife. Increased artificial illumination is a particular threat to bats and disrupts the breeding cycles of frogs and toads. Moths and glow-worms are especially impacted by bright artificial lights. Failure to protect the garden habitats in low density housing areas is also contrary to the Habitats and Biodiversity Chapter (Policies 174, 175, 176 and 177) of the NPPF.

8. Backland Development: The proposal represents an undesirable form of backland development without proper road frontage. The houses at the rear of the site would be accessed off Dickens Lane, along the side of the proposed block of flats.

9. Development Unneighbourly - The proposed development, 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. The proposed three-storey block of flats is much taller than the existing house and are significantly higher than nearby properties, especially 62 Dickens Lane which is a bungalow.

10. 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. This section of Dickens Lane has some houses with large rear gardens and the proposed development would change this character very much to the detriment of the appearance of this area and would set a dangerous precedent.

11. 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, especially from the three-storey block of flats. The proposed access road to the rear of the site will pass very close to the boundary with 62 Dickens Lane.

12. Highways Issues: The Town Council urges that a qualified Highways Engineer visits the site to conduct a full review of the highway issues. The proposed development may pose a threat to highway safety:

- a) Increased Turning Movements - Access to the site is onto Dickens Lane, a busy road, with many vehicles and pedestrians travelling to the three nearby schools: Vernon Primary, St. Paul's Primary and Poynton High School.
- b) The new estate of 150 houses currently under construction at Sprink Farm, further up Dickens Lane, will greatly increase existing traffic volumes. The site is near a Zebra crossing and the busy junction with Clumber Road and is close to a blind bend.
- c) Inadequate Visibility – The proposed access road has an inadequate visibility splay. It is not acceptable to argue that the access for a single house can be replicated for a major development that will greatly increase traffic movements onto and off the site.
- d) There may not be sufficient space for manoeuvring vehicles within the site, particularly to avoid the need for cars leaving the site to reverse out onto Dickens Lane.
- e) Inadequate Service Provision – the lack of parking for visitors and tight internal layout may lead to internal congestion and inadequate provision for service vehicles to load and unload, resulting in a threat to highway safety.
- f) It is not clear that the rear of the site will be fully accessible for large vehicles such as the dustcart or a fire engine. The proposal to allow wheelie

bins to be left on the pavement – up to 18 bins – would be a danger to pedestrians.

13. Flood Risk - the applicants have not provided a flood report. The loss of garden area will reduce absorption of rainfall and increase run-off into Poynton Brook, which flooded in 2016 and 2019.

The Town Council urges Cheshire East to seek the advice of their Flood Risk Team.

That the current plans do not show the illustration of the street scene as proposed – there is no illustration of the new street scene as viewed from Dickens Lane.

(NC)

Note the communication message agreed under SO51 in relation to Sprink Farm.

A resident spoke in relation to the Sprink Farm housing estate. The resident confirmed that he has obtained more details about the development and concerns from other residents. The resident continues to liaise with the Clerk to ensure information in relation to the Sprink Farm development has been forwarded to the Clerk and to the relevant councillors. The Chair thanked the resident.

RESOLVED: That the communication message agreed under SO51 in relation to Sprink Farm was noted (NC)

Application No: 20/5724M

Location: Land at Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 2NN

Applicants Name: Mr Matthew Buckle for Bellway Homes

Proposal: Erection of two additional dwellings

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

1. Detailed planning consent for 148 houses was granted under 19/1972M. It is inappropriate to seek to increase the size of the estate by small applications of this type, which cannot consider the strategic issues. Further development will increase the strain on Dickens Lane and local roads, public services and increase air pollution.
2. There is particular concern that the loss of the pumping station and “wet well” required under 19/1972M will increase strain on local sewers and surface water drainage. The Town Council has received complaints from residents that the existing sewers on Dickens Lane are unable to cope with the volume of foul waste from existing properties. The addition of 148 or 150 extra houses could cause sewage overflow with serious impact on public health and the environment.
3. Loss of the “wet well” could increase surface water discharge into Poynton Brook, causing flooding to land and properties downstream.

4. These plans are incompatible with application 21/0237D, which is also under consideration by Cheshire East. The site plan for 21/0237D do not include these two houses but do show a 150 mm Foul Water pipe crossing the site. It is clearly unsatisfactory for houses to be built over a sewage pipe, for which access will be required for maintenance or to clear blockages.
5. The Planning Application form appears to be incomplete – part of Question 10: Assessment of Flood Risk has not been answered, in that none of the three options for “How will Surface Water be Disposed Of?” have been ticked. The plans do not give any details of foul or surface water drainage.

Application No: 21/0237D

Location: Land at Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 2NN

Applicants Name: Mr Matthew Buckle – for Bellway Homes

Proposal: Discharge of conditions 7&15 on application 17/4256M – Outline planning application for the demotion of all buildings and structures and the erection of up to 150 dwellings with 30% affordable homes, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Dickens Lane. All matters reserved except for means of access.

Recommendation: Poynton Town Council recommends that the planning application 21/0237D, to discharge various conditions imposed by planning consent 17/4256M should be REJECTED as relating to Condition 15 regarding the drainage of the site.

1. The two site plans submitted by the applicants show that surface water drainage will be discharged into Poynton Brook. It is not clear how this will be controlled in the times of increasingly heavy rainfall. The severe rainfall and flooding experienced along Poynton Brook in June 2016 and 31st July 2019 show that full and total compliance with Condition 15 is a matter of the highest importance. We urge that the Lead Local Flood Authority give these plans a thorough and detailed appraisal.
2. These plans are incompatible with application 20/5724M, which is also under consideration by Cheshire East. The site plan for 20/5724M show two houses occupying a space that in this application is open land with a 150 mm Foul Water pipe crossing the site.

Regarding Condition 7, the Town Council recommends that the rules in the Construction Management Plan submitted by Bellway Homes regarding parking and deliveries to the site should be addressed as follows:

Page 9 says “Access to site will be via Dickens Lane. No unloading on or parking or stopping on Dickens Lane.” This should be expanded to say “... on Dickens Lane or other public roads. All parking must be within the site”.

Page 29 says: “Poynton High School for Performing Arts is on Yew Tree Lane near the site. Ongoing assessments will be required to ensure construction traffic does

not have an adverse effect during busy school times. Delivery times may need to be restricted.”

This is inadequate – the site is close to Poynton High School and Vernon, Worth and St Paul’s primary schools. The final sentence on page 29 of the Construction Management Plan should state: *“No deliveries shall take place between 8 am to 9 am and 2.30 pm to 4 pm during term time.”*

A planning condition should be imposed making any breach of the Construction Management Plan subject to action by Cheshire East Planning Control. This will avoid the situation at another site in Poynton where workmen and delivery lorries often park on the road and ignore the plan. The Town Council have received complaints from residents that lorries delivering equipment and materials are parking on Dickens Lane and causing a traffic hazard.

That the Town Council contact the Cheshire East Council Planning Officer, Mr Wakefield, and the Chief Enforcement Officer, Mr Hooley to inform them that the Town Council have received repeated allegations that work is proceeding on site of a far more extensive nature than is required to build four show homes; that a councillor driving past has seen JCB’s moving large drainage pipes into position. That the Town Council urge that a site inspection take place by the Planning Officer and Enforcement Officer at the earliest opportunity. That this correspondence is copied by the Deputy Clerk to the Cheshire East Council Portfolio Holder, Cllr Toni Fox and Cllrs Clarke, Mrs Saunders and Mrs Wylie was agreed **(NC)**

145. Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th January 2021.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning and Environment committee meeting held on 25th January 2021 are approved (NC)

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

The Deputy Clerk provided an update on the action log for 2020-2021. It was noted by Cllr Saunders that in relation to the Household Waste and Recycling Consultation, the issue has been considered by the Cheshire East Council Scrutiny committee and although there is no impact for Poynton, the Council reserve the right to review the situation in future. Cheshire East currently plan to close the Household Waste and Recycling site in Congleton.

RESOLVED: That the action log for 2020-2021 was received (NC)

147. Note the Cheshire East response to the Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone.

It was noted that Cheshire East have supported the Town Council's concerns that the proposed Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone could result in traffic diverting through Poynton and other areas near the border to avoid paying the charge.

RESOLVED: That the Cheshire East response to the Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone was noted (NC)

148. Consider and agree a response to the Cheshire East Air Quality Consultation and to note the virtual drop-in session on the 22nd February 2021.

Members reviewed the Cheshire East Air Quality Consultation and the following points were noted from discussion:

- That it is the wrong time to make a decision because for the last 12 months traffic has been artificially reduced by the pandemic and repeated lockdowns, particularly in the north of the borough where many people commute to work in Greater Manchester.
- That the whole policy does not fit with the fact that Cheshire East Council have repeatedly allowed a large amount of new developments, mostly of the outskirts of settlements and so requiring the use of a car to access shops, schools and public services.

Members agreed that a response to the consultation should be prepared under SO 51 to include the points raised at this meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Cheshire East Air Quality Consultation and the virtual drop-in session on the 22nd February 2021 were received and noted. That the Deputy Clerk draft a response with submission prepared on behalf of the Town Council under SO51 to include the points raised at this meeting was agreed (NC)

149. Consider and agree a response to the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe consultation.

Members reviewed the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe consultation and the following points were noted from discussion:

- That the focus should be on the difficulty of accessing this new service for those who live in areas that do not have a direct rail link to Crewe. Also, there is risk of reducing services to London and the West Midlands from Manchester, Stockport, Poynton, Stoke and southwards and may end up reducing the rail options for these areas.
- That due to this proposed development, the investment which is needed in local rail will not take place and this will only benefit relatively few people. Investment

is needed in the northern areas and the northern areas will not benefit from decent infrastructure.

RESOLVED: That the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe consultation was received. That the Town Council respond with a submission prepared by the Deputy Clerk on behalf of the Town Council under SO51 to include the points raised at this meeting was agreed (NC)

150. Receive and consider the letter from Frank Jordan, Cheshire East Director of Place, in relation to the New Homes Bonus.

Members considered the letter from Frank Jordan, Cheshire East Director of Place, in relation to the New Homes Bonus. It was noted that the Town Council has sought advice from Mr John Knight. Cllr Mrs Saunders provided background information in relation to the New Homes Bonus. It was agreed that there was no effective action that could be taken.

RESOLVED: That the letter from Frank Jordan, Cheshire East Director of Place, in relation to the New Homes Bonus was received (NC)

151. Receive a verbal report from the Chair in relation to the meeting with the A6MARR Team to discuss the access off Woodford Road.

The Chair provided a verbal report in relation to the meeting with the A6MARR Team. The Chair explained that the views and concerns of the Town Council about the access off Woodford Road; the incompatibility with the Green Belt including concerns with the "bell mouth" entrance were strongly expressed at the meeting with Stockport Council. The points raised by the Town Council will be considered.

RESOLVED: That the verbal report from the Chair in relation to the meeting with the A6MARR Team to discuss the access off Woodford Road was received (NC)

152. Receive and consider the response from Paul Bayley, Cheshire East, in relation to noncompliance with planning conditions.

Members considered the response from Paul Bayley, Cheshire East, in relation to noncompliance with planning conditions. Members agreed to pursue the matter to obtain a response in relation to Question 5 in the email from the Clerk which states, *Does Cheshire East's Planning Department undertake any proactive enforcement of planning conditions, or wait for complaints from town councils or residents?*

RESOLVED: That the response from Paul Bayley, Cheshire East, in relation to noncompliance with planning conditions was received. That the Town Council reply to thank Mr Paul Bailey for the email but pursue the matter for a response in relation to Question 5 was agreed (NC)

153. Planning applications received for consideration:

Application No: 20/4510M
Location: 21, Easby Close, Poynton, SK12 1YG
Applicants Name: S Reid-Peters
Proposal: Single storey rear extension and porch
Recommendation: No objection (NC)

Application No: 20/5444M
Location: 207 Coppice Road, Poynton, SK12 1SW
Applicants Name: P Averell
Proposal: Erection of two storey extension to side and part two storey, part single storey extension

Recommendation: Poynton Town Council reiterate our previous concerns regarding this application:

1. Poynton Town Council remain concerned that the plans supporting this application are misleading, as they show the entire existing garden of 207 Coppice Road and ignore the fact that a planning application (ref. 20/5087M) is currently under consideration to build two houses on a large part of this garden.
2. It is not clear how close the proposed extension would be to the site boundary that would be created if application 20/5087M is approved. If this is less than 1 metre, the Town Council objects to this application as being in breach of policy HOU14 of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan and Policy SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan.
3. If the total floor area of the extension exceeds 30 per cent of the floor area of the property as it existed in 1948, the Town Council further objects on the grounds that the proposed extension breaches retained policy GC12 of the Macclesfield Local Plan.
4. The Town Council would also draw the attention of the Planning Officer to comments recently submitted on application 20/5087M by the Cheshire East LLFA flood risk management team regarding surface water drainage. As this effectively covers the same site, similar conditions should also be considered for this application.

(NC)

Application No: 21/0153M
Location: 53 Copperfield Road, Poynton, Stockport, SK12 1NQ
Applicants Name: Amy Harding
Proposal: Rebuilding of two bungalows destroyed by fire
Recommendation: No objection – Poynton Town Council welcomes the rebuilding of these houses **(NC)**

Application No: 21/0313M
Location: 3 Chestnut Drive, Poynton, Sk12 1QG
Applicants Name: S&T Davenport
Proposal: Single storey extension
Recommendation: No objection (NC)

Application No: 21/0415M
Location: 18 Micawber Road, Poynton, SK12 1UW
Applicants Name: Mr J Dempsey
Proposal: Proposed two storey side extension
Possible Recommendation: No objection (NC)

Application No: 21/0433M
Location: 5 Micawber Road, Poynton, SK12 1UW
Applicants Name: Mr Hooper
Proposal: Proposed rear dormer extension
Recommendation: No objection (NC)

Application No: 21/0474M
Location: Byfield, Towers Road, Poynton, Stockport, SK12 1DA
Applicants Name: Mrs P Knox
Proposal: Extension to ground floor at rear and extension to dormer bedroom at front. Renovation of bedroom roof at rear
Recommendation: Poynton Town Council is concerned that Cheshire East have accepted plans which do not show the site boundaries or the relationship with nearby houses. This makes it difficult for us to comment.

However, we note that the applications are of significant extent and, if they do fall within one metre of the site boundary, the Town Council will formally object as this is a breach of Policy HOU14 of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan, Policy SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan and retained policy DC43 of the Macclesfield Local Plan (see Appendix below).

The proposed balcony first floor balcony at the rear will overlook nearby gardens and so constitute a breach of privacy.

Loss of privacy. The position of the proposed development, particularly the balcony, in relation to adjoining residential property, would result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of privacy currently enjoyed by occupiers of that adjoining property
(NC)

Application No: 21/0499M
Location: 21 Parklands Way, Poynton, SK12 1AL
Applicants Name: Chris and Gemma Kerr
Proposal: Proposed 2 storey extension
Recommendation: Objection, as contrary to Poynton Neighbourhood Plan policies HOU 11, HOU 13 and HOU14 and Cheshire East Local Plan policy SD2 and retained policies DC1, DC2 and DC43 in the retained Macclesfield Local Plan. A

further issue is the existing garage. The extension will block all access and prevent its continued use for this purpose, yet the plans continue to describe it as a “garage”.

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.

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.

The Highways Officer should be asked to confirm that the loss of parking to the side and access to the rear garage will not prevent sufficient parking spaces within the curtilage of the property.

(NC)

Cllr Ms Whitaker withdrew from the meeting for this item.

Application No: 21/0511M

Location: 30 Shrigley Road North, Poynton, SK12 1TE

Applicants Name: Mrs Rachel Farrel

Proposal: Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer build upside gable.

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 Town Council is concerned that the proposed second floor dormer windows will look over a significant area, so risking overlooking of nearby gardens and loss of privacy. The loss of the hipped roof will be out of character with nearby houses.

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

Loss of Privacy - The high position of the proposed dormer windows, in relation to adjoining residential property, would result in an unacceptable reduction of the level of privacy presently enjoyed by the occupants of the adjoining property.

Out of Character – The proposed extension, especially the loss of the hipped roof and addition of second-floor dormer windows, would be out of character with existing properties in the vicinity of the site.

Green Belt – The proposal is an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt as defined by the Development Plan, particularly retained policy GC12
(7 for, 1 abstention)

Cllr Ms Whitaker re-joined the meeting.

Application No: 21/0556M

Location: 21 Chestnut Drive, Poynton, SK12 1QG

Applicants Name: Mr and Mrs Airey

Proposal: Proposed new porch, single storey side and rear extension

Recommendation: No objection, but the Town Council would urge a condition be imposed that the proposed side window and door be glazed in obscured glass **(NC)**

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

RESOLVED: That there were no communication messages arising from this meeting (NC)

Meeting end time: 8.55pm

Chair

Dated.....