

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 8.00PM ON MONDAY 4<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2021 AT THE CIVIC HALL

PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr L A Clarke

Cllrs: M Beanland, K Booth, T Swatridge and Ms H Whitaker

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

19. Recording of meeting

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

20. Questions from members of the public

There were no members of the public in attendance.

21. Apologies for absence

Cllr S Lees, J Saunders.

22. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests.

23. Approve the minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2021

**RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning and Environment committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2021 were approved (4 for, 1 abstention)**

24. Receive and consider the action log for 2021-2022.

The Deputy Clerk provided an update on the action log for 2020-2021 as follows:

Tyres on Middlewood Way

Planning permission has now been approved for this site and it is now a development site; a section 215 notice cannot be served on a development site. The notice could not be issued earlier as the tyres were at the back of the site and were partially hidden from the street scene and had been left there with the owner's permission.

#### Use of outbuildings on London Road South

Further to the email received from the Senior Planning Officer regarding the use of outbuildings behind 61 London Road South as dwellings, it was agreed that the matter is regarded as completed. However, if in future the neighbours inform the Town Council that the outbuildings are occupied then the Town Council will refer the matter to Cheshire East Council again.

#### Sprink Farm

- Flood Risk drainage condition discharge

Members agreed to retain this item on the action log regarding ongoing issues from the flood risk team.

- Buffer Zone & other building issues reported

Cheshire East Enforcement have responded to the Town Council in reference to the plots on the Sprink Farm development to confirm that the development is adhering to the 8m wide undeveloped buffer zone bordering Poynton Brook and all reported issues are in line with the submitted drawings. Cheshire East Council will retain this issue as an open case and monitor the situation.

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

#### 25. Receive the summary from John Knight on the progress of the Stockport Local plan and note the proposed consultation periods.

Members considered the summary from John Knight on the progress of the Stockport Local plan and noted the proposed consultation periods.

**RESOLVED: That the summary from John Knight on the progress of the Stockport Local plan was received. That the proposed consultation periods were noted. That the Town Council await further developments regarding the Stockport Local Plan was agreed (NC)**

#### 26. Receive John Knight's email and consider if the council wish to respond to the GM consultation called Places for Everyone.

**RESOLVED: That John Knight's email was received. That the actions taken under SO51 to approve the response to the GM consultation called Places for Everyone was agreed (NC)**

#### 27. Receive and consider the reply from Senior Planning Officer regarding the position of the footings at the former Sprink Farm development.

**RESOLVED:** That the reply from the Senior Planning Officer regarding the position of the footings at the former Sprink Farm development was received. That the Town Council raise the issue of the proposed two further houses on the site (planning application 20/5724M) with the Planning Officer was agreed (NC)

28. Receive and consider the letter from Peter Hooley regarding 20/5039M, 9 Lostock Hall Road, Poynton.

**RESOLVED:** That the letter from Peter Hooley regarding 20/5039M, 9 Lostock Hall Road, Poynton was received, and the apology for the Planning Officers report wrongly stating that the Town Council had not commented on the original application was noted (NC)

29. Receive and consider the request from NALC for views on the Local Nature recovery strategies.

Members considered the request from NALC for views on the Local Nature recovery strategies and agreed the Town Council response as noted by the Deputy Clerk.

**RESOLVED:** That the request from NALC for views on the Local Nature recovery strategies was received. That the Town Council response as noted by the Deputy Clerk at this meeting for submission was agreed (NC)

30. Planning applications received for consideration.

**Application No: 20/5305M**

Location: Rose Lisieux, The Coppice, Poynton SK12 1SR

Applicants Name: Mrs Emily McDonagh

Proposal: Increase in ridge height, two front dormer windows, first floor rear extension and front porch

**Recommendation: Poynton Town Council has no objection providing that:**

- 1. The Planning Officer is satisfied that the proposed extensions are not out of place for a rural area in the Green Belt and also comply with retained policy GC12 of the Macclesfield Local Plan, which requires that, in the Green Belt, total extensions may not exceed 30 per cent of a property's original floor area.**
- 2. The Planning Officer must also be satisfied that the proposed extensions do not cause overlooking or a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.**

3. The Highways Officer is satisfied that there will be sufficient car parking space after the property is extended. As the Coppice Road is also Public Footpath 45, it is a highway and so on-street parking should be avoided.
4. The Public Rights of Way officer should be consulted, and any recommendations made incorporated in the planning conditions, so they are fully enforceable.

(NC)

**Application No: 21/4613M**

Location: The Capstan House, Middlewood Road, Poynton SK12 1SH

Applicants Name: Mr John Rose

Proposal: Change of use from an office to one residential dwelling with associated parking and access.

**Recommendation: Poynton Town Council has no objection in principle to this application, but have the following comments:**

1. Capstan House (and the neighbouring Old Pump House) are one of the few remaining structures from Poynton's coalmining history, and the Town Council are keen that it be preserved, and its appearance not changed significantly. We note that this application appears to respect the building and hope that this will not change.
2. The Highways Officer should be asked to review the proposed new access from Middlewood Road. This is a busy road, and traffic should be able to turn round within the site and exit without reversing onto Middlewood Road.
3. The site borders an area of protected woodland. The Trees Officer should be asked to review the plans to ensure there will be no risk to the protected trees.
4. The site is close to a stream which flooded in 2016 and 2019. The advice of the Council's Flood Risk Officer should be obtained as to the suitability of the site for residential use. The stream may flow under this site in a culvert and any impact by the proposed development on the culvert should be fully considered.

(NC)

**Application No: 21/4705M**

Location: Kenilworth, Middlewood Road, Poynton SK12 1TU

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Webster

Proposal: Proposed single storey ground floor rear extension and replacement render finish to all external walls.

**Recommendation: No objection, providing the Planning Officer is satisfied that the proposed extensions are not out of place in the Green**

**Belt and also comply with retained policy GC12 of the Macclesfield Local Plan, which requires that, in the Green Belt, total extensions may not exceed 30 per cent of a property's original floor area.  
(NC)**

**Application No: 21/4770M**

Location: 7 Dombey Road, Poynton SK12 1LT

Applicants Name: Mrs Susan Yearn

Proposal: Single storey rear extension.

**Recommendation: No objection (NC)**

**Application No: 21/4794M**

Location: 2A Yew Tree Lane, Poynton, SK12 1PU

Applicants Name: Kedleston Group

Proposal: Resurfacing of drive & external footpaths to replace existing gravel finish with black tarmacadam.

**Recommendation: No objection providing the new surface is permeable to rainwater and will not cause potential for water to flow into the road and add to the flood risk. (NC)**

**Application No: 21/4851M**

Location: Unit 6D, Adlington Business Park, Adlington SK10 4NL

Applicants Name: David Flack

Proposal: Construction of 2no. B2 (Units A+C) industrial units and retention and completion of partly constructed (Unit B) B2 use and suitable for MOT car testing centre.

**Recommendation: Poynton Town Council is concerned over two aspects of this development:**

- 1. The height of the proposed buildings A and C is such that they will be visible from a significant area. This may include both residential areas of Poynton and also the Green Belt around Lostock Hall Farm. This area of visibility will be increased by the flat topography of this area of Poynton.**
- 2. Another concern is the possible flood impact. The site is close to Poynton Brook, which flooded at several points in 2019, and the Environment Agency's flood risk map shows that land adjoining the site at risk from surface water flooding. Run-off of rainwater from the roofs of the proposed buildings may increase the risk of flooding, both in the immediate area and downstream along Poynton Brook. This application should be reviewed by the Council's Flood Risk Officer. A flood risk assessment should be provided by the applicants.**

**(NC)**

**Application No: 21/4952M**

Location: 137 Dickens Lane, Poynton, SK12 1NZ

Applicants Name: Mr and Mrs McGlone

Proposal: Two storey side extension.

**Recommendation: Objection, as contrary to Poynton Neighbourhood Plan policies HOU13 and HOU14 and Cheshire East Local Plan policy SD2 and retained policies DC1, DC2 and DC43 in the Macclesfield Local Plan.**

It appears that the proposed side extension will go very close to the site boundary with 139 Dickens Lane. This would appear to breach Poynton Neighbourhood Plan policy HOU14, as the plans do not leave a gap of one metre to the side boundary.

The proposed extension would produce a terracing effect out of character with properties in the area, most of which have gaps between the side wall and the site boundary.

**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.**

**(NC)**

**Application No: 21/4460M**

Location: "Domek", Towers Road, Poynton, SK12 1DE

Applicants Name: Mr T Ratcliffe on behalf of Harvey Homes of Altrincham

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and erection of two new homes

**Recommendation: Poynton Town Council urges that this application be rejected. There is no material difference to the previous applications for this site, ref 21/1846M, 20/5504M and 19/4443M. The fact that this is an outline application does not negate the reasons that led to the earlier applications being rejected.**

The Town Council reiterates its previous objections regarding the proposed development of this site:

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 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)”.**

**2. The applicants have failed to address the Inspector’s concerns in the appeal into the first application (ref. 19/4443M and appeal ref. APP/R0660/W/20/3251771). As with the earlier application, the proposed development would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area, with the new houses forming a dominant and intrusive feature in the street scene.**

**3. Similarly, the applicants have failed to address the second Inspector’s concerns into the subsequent application (ref. 20/5504M and appeal ref. APP/R0660/W/21/3272140). The Inspector concluded that the proposed plans:**

***“... would lead to an excessively scaled development with disproportionate massing that would contrast with the character of development on this part of the road. It would conflict with Policies SD2 and SE1 of the LPS, Policies HOU8 and HOU11 of the Poynton-with-Worth Neighbourhood Plan and saved Policy H12 of the MBLP as they seek development to reflect the height, scale, massing and character of surrounding development.”***

**4. 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.**

**5. 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, H12 (low density housing), DC3, DC6, DC8, DC37, DC38, DC41, RT1 and RT2.**

**6. 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 (back land and tandem development) and EGB 2 (open spaces).**

- 7. 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.**
- 8. 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.**
- 9. Development is 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.**
- 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. The proposed houses are significantly higher than the nearby properties of “Ismorus House” and the “Charter House”. This section of Towers Road and Poynton Park 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 – also contrary to policy 122 of the NPPF.**
- 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.**
- 12. Flood Risk - the applicants have not provided a flood risk assessment, despite recent serious flooding across Poynton in June 2016 and July 2019. There was significant flooding in the fields of the east of Towers Road, adjacent to the site. Loss of garden areas to development will reduce absorption of rainwater and increase runoff.**

**The Town Council queries the applicants answers of “no” to the questions regarding Assessment of Flood Risk in Section 12 of the**



**Application Form.** We note that the Environment Agency’s Flood Risk map shows a high risk of surface water flooding in the fields to the east of Towers Road, opposite the site. We would also query the Applicants’ reply of “no” to the question in Section 12 regarding the presence of a watercourse within 60 metres of the site, as a stream in the field opposite the site flows into a culvert that runs beneath part of the site.

**13. Culvert:** There is a culverted stream running under the site. Any diversion or blockage of the culvert may cause debris to accumulate and obstruct the flow of water, possibly leading to flooding. The Town Council urges Cheshire East to ask the applicants to submit a full Flood Risk Assessment and to seek the advice of the Flood Risk Team.

**14. Archaeology:** The bungalow occupies much of the site of the former Poynton Towers, a partly Elizabethan building which the former Macclesfield Rural District Council disgracefully allowed to fall into ruin and be demolished in the 1950’s. A full archaeological excavation should take place before any new building commences.

**(NC)**

31. Communication Messages

**RESOLVED:** That there were no communication messages from this meeting was agreed **(NC)**

Meeting end time: 8.25pm

Chair .....

Dated.....