

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 8.00PM ON MONDAY 20th APRIL 2026 AT THE CIVIC HALL

PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr L A Clarke

Cllrs: K Booth, Lee Podmore, J Saunders T Swatridge.
Cllr P Oakes (SO52) substituting for Cllr M Beanland

Officer in attendance: Kate McDowell (Deputy Town Clerk).

251. Recording of meeting

The Chair 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.

252. Questions from members of the public

There were no members of the public present.

253. Apologies for absence

Cllr M Beanland - Cllr P Oakes is substituting for Cllr Beanland under SO52

254. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests

There were no declarations.

255. To approve the minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 30th March 2026

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting held on 30th March 2026 were approved. (NC)

256. Receive and consider the action log for 2025-26

The response from Elan homes regarding the fence around contaminated land at Hazelbadge was noted.

RESOLVED: That the action log for 2025-2026 is received and the Deputy Clerk should contact Cheshire East Planning Enforcement and ask them if they feel that condition 9 (re fencing) has been successfully completed by Elan Homes at the Hazelfields site in Poynton. (NC)

257. To receive and consider a verbal update from the Cheshire East Councillors on the Committee.

Cllr Saunders provided brief updates on:

- The upcoming Northern Planning Committee meeting 22.04.26 where the application 25/4766/PIP: Land South of Coppice Road, Poynton SK12 1SP will be discussed.
- That Cllr Whitaker was currently investigating why Poynton has been removed from the list of mobile Household Waste & Recycling Centre on the Cheshire East website.
- The changes to portfolio holders, committees and scrutiny committees at Cheshire East, with a cabinet system replacing most committees.

RESOLVED: That the verbal update from Cllr Saunders on Cheshire East planning matters was received. The Deputy Clerk will make enquiries on which Cabinet Member will be responsible for Planning from May 2026 onwards. (NC)

258. To receive and consider the Brownfield Land Register toolkit from CPRE The Countryside Charity.

It was noted that Councillors from surrounding Parishes have entered sites that they feel should be included on the register and it was felt that this Committee should do the same.

RESOLVED: That the agenda item to consider the Brownfields Land Register toolkit from CPRE should be deferred to the next meeting. (NC)

259. To receive and consider the draft property disposal form for Network Rail at 16-18 Lostock Road, Poynton SK12 1LL.

Members discussed the proposed disposal of the site of the demolished former railway station.

RESOLVED: That the draft property disposal form for Network Rail at 16-18 Lostock Road, Poynton SK12 1LL be received. (NC)

260. To note the actions taken under S051.

- To write to Tim Roca MP regarding the Lostock Hall Farm, the definition of towns/villages and the issue of flood security.
- For the Chair to attend the Cheshire East Northern Planning Committee meeting on 22nd April 2026 in regard to planning application 25/4766PIP Coppice Road.

RESOLVED: That the decisions made under S051 regarding Lostock Hall Farm and Coppice Road were noted. (NC)

261. To receive and consider an email from Cheshire East regarding the removal of Poynton from the list of mobile HWRS sites

Cllr Saunders advised that Cllr Whitaker was looking into why Poynton has been removed as a mobile HWRS site, but we should also investigate independently.

RESOLVED: That the Deputy Clerk drafts a letter to the Head of Waste and Recycling at Cheshire East, asking why Poynton is no longer showing as a mobile HWRS on their website, with final wording to be approved under S051. (NC)

262. To receive and consider a verbal report from the Chair on the frequency of Royal Mail post-delivery in Poynton.

The Chair gave an overview of the delays and associated issues that residents have faced with ad hoc letter deliveries from Royal Mail in Poynton. The matter had been raised by several people at the Town Assembly last week.

RESOLVED: That the Deputy Clerk should:

- **Write to Royal Mail, Bramhall to complain about the lack of a daily postal service for letters in Poynton**
- **Bring the issue to the attention of Mr Roca MP (NC)**

263. To receive and consider a report from the Clerk on the quotations received for the Neighbourhood Plan / Green / Grey belt reviews.

Members discussed the report and quotations from ONH and decided to proceed with the full neighbourhood plan review with a request to expediate the green/grey belt study.
ONH should also be asked for a quotation on producing an area map showing all sites adjacent to Poynton where building threats have been made.

RESOLVED: The Clerk should recommend to full Town Council that ONH should be instructed to proceed with the full neighbourhood plan review at a cost of £19,950 +VAT. (NC)

264. To receive a report from the Chair on the state of repair of the listed building Lostock Hall Farmhouse, Poynton.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED: The Deputy Clerk should raise the following matters with Cheshire East Council:

- **That Poynton Town Council urges Cheshire East to take appropriate action under the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act to ensure the restoration of Lostock Hall Farmhouse.**

- The current planning proposals for developing land around Lostock Hall Farm exclude the Farmhouse and so may avoid the imposition of a planning condition requiring its restoration.
- Cheshire East should therefore proceed to issue a repairs notice and / or undertake urgent repairs themselves (to be recharged to the owner) under Sections 47 and 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.
- That a meeting be arranged between Poynton Town Council and Cheshire East Heritage Officer to discuss the timetable for further action. (NC)

265. To receive and consider a report from the Chair on Adlington New Town Task & Finish Group.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED: That Poynton Town Council, in regard to Adlington New Town:

- Recommends to the Finance & General Purposes Committee spending to a maximum of £15,000 (to be divided between the Councils by the agreed formula) on legal work.
- The Clerk will circulate a response to the consultation to the committee for consideration and recommendation to the Town Council for approval. (NC)

266. To receive and consider the email response from enforcement regarding the TPO contravention on Princes Incline.

It was noted that an enforcement case has been opened by Cheshire East following unauthorised work carried out on a tree on Princes Incline by a resident whose house backs on to the Incline. A further issue was noted; the Tree Preservation Order that protects the trees on Lady's Incline does not protect any trees less than 52 years old. A more modern TPO would protect all the trees within the woodland.

RESOLVED: That

- the enforcement case on unauthorised work on a tree on Princes Incline was noted
- That the Trees Officer at Cheshire East Council be asked to replace the existing TPO on Lady's Incline, Poynton, with a modern Woodland order to protect all trees, irrespective of their age. (NC)

267. To receive and consider the report from the Chair on planning application 26/1305/EIA, EIA Screening Opinion on a proposed residential and employment development on land north of Adlington Business Park, Poynton.

The Chair gave a summary of the report and the issues that will affect Poynton should this development go ahead.

RESOLVED: That the following comments are submitted to Cheshire East on this application:

Poynton Town Council is concerned at these proposals to build an unspecified number of houses and employment facilities. We believe that these plans are contrary to established planning policy and are unacceptable for the reasons below:

Development Pressure: This EIA scoping application should be considered in conjunction with the recently received EIA application (26/0803/EIA) for 500 houses on neighbouring land at Lostock Hall Farm. Taken together, these plans will increase massively the pressure on Poynton's roads, services and environment.

Confusion as to Site Boundaries: The plans submitted by the applicants appear to include part of the A523 Poynton Bypass within the site. The applicants state the site is 24.4 hectares, while the Cheshire East Local Plan says 22 hectares. The two plans submitted by the applicants showing flood risk each have different southern site boundaries. These points should be clarified.

Safeguarded Land: The site is included in the Cheshire East Local Plan as safeguarded land, site LPS 52. The Local Plan states that the site is "to meet longer term development needs beyond the plan period." Developing it now is premature and outside the scope of the Local Plan.

Brownfield First: The Register of Brownfield Land for Cheshire East lists 172 sites. There may be other brownfield sites which are not so far included, registration being voluntary. All such sites should be developed before any safeguarded land is considered for development.

Traffic and Transport: It is proposed that the vehicular access would be from a new junction with the Poynton Relief Road (A523). Despite claims (see page 21) that the site is only a "seven minutes" car journey from Poynton Railway Station, the distant location of this access would in practice make such trips much longer.

Poor Connectivity - Vehicles: Vehicles would have to exit from the site onto the Relief Road (A523) and then drive either south to Adlington and then head north along London Road South (B5092) or go north to the junction with the A555 then east along Chester Road (A5149). Either trip would take at least ten minutes to reach the centre of Poynton, and much longer at busy times. Traffic would increase substantially on both London Road South and Chester Road. These roads are already badly potholed and poorly maintained by Cheshire East. **Loss of Bypass:** The whole point of building the A523 Poynton Relief Road was as a bypass

for Poynton (see the SEMMMS Final Report of 2001). If new accesses are built off it, it will cease to be a bypass and become an ordinary, congested urban road. The applicants wish to build a new access onto the A523 Poynton Bypass, which will be in addition to the proposed new “four armed” roundabout for the Lostock Hall Farm site (see 26/0803/EIA).

Poor Connectivity – Footpaths: There is poor connectivity for travellers on bicycle or foot for active travel between the site and the centre of Poynton. The only path to cross the railway (Poynton with Worth Public Footpath 80) goes under the railway line by Lostock Road, in a cramped, unlit, muddy passage less than six feet high. It is dangerous in heavy rain and unusable when Poynton Brook floods. This is the only direct route to walk from the site to Poynton High School and the southern part of Poynton village. It is wholly unsuitable for active travel. Remedying this would require a footbridge to be built over the railway (at the expense of the developer) – but who would enforce this construction? Bizarrely, the applicants claim (page 20) that: “... an existing pedestrian and cycle access point is located on the eastern boundary, providing connectivity towards Poynton”. As noted above, this access point is wholly unsuitable. The inclusion of this claim suggests a lack of familiarity with the site.

Public Transport: There are no bus services to the site, and no bus stops closer than Chester Road. Bus services are limited to one bus per hour to Stockport and every two hours to Macclesfield. There is no service to Woodford, Bramhall or Wilmslow. The applicants suggest that residents could use the cramped, unlit and muddy passage under the railway line to travel to the nearest bus stop on the corner of Weller Avenue and Copperfield Road. This is an untenable proposal. Poynton Town Council disagrees totally with the applicant’s claim that “it is not considered that traffic and highways impact from the development would be sufficient to warrant an EIA to evaluate the highway impact.” An EIA for traffic and transport is essential, covering both this site and the Lostock Hall Farm site.

Pollution: The applicant’s EIA scoping report includes no estimates of the traffic generated by the proposed development. In contrast, the Lostock Hall site applicant estimates that that development would produce “up to 2,112 daily two-way vehicle movements.” Despite the lack of figures, it is clear this site would generate significant extra traffic which will contribute to air pollution and congestion. Note that electric vehicles also create air pollution by releasing particulates from tyres and brake-pads. Construction of the site will take several years and require many journeys by HGVs and contractors’ vehicles.

Public Facilities: The site lacks all public facilities – the report makes no mention of providing any shops, schools, health services or public facilities of any kind. The statement (page 4) that the application will cover “public open space, roads, parking and landscape” implies that

the applicants do not intend to provide any schools or other social infrastructure, just basic facilities for a high-density development.

Education and Health: Any residential development will impose significant burdens on local schools, GPs, dentists and other facilities. Local schools and medical facilities are already used to capacity. The nearest hospitals at Macclesfield and Stepping Hill are well known for overcrowding and lengthy queues at A&E. Recent figures released by NHS England show that the East Cheshire NHS Trust, which provides hospital and community health services for Poynton, is one of the worst performing trusts in England. The NHS England performance figures for Quarter 3 of 2025/26 shows that the East Cheshire NHS Trust has truly dire scores in several categories. It is the very worst in England for Percentage of cases where a patient waits 18 weeks or less for elective treatment, the difference between planned and actual 18-week performance and the percentage of emergency attendances dealt with within 4 hours.

Death Rates: These failings have real consequences for people's health. The NHS Trust figures show that, between December 2024 and November 2025, the East Cheshire NHS Trust had a death rate over 28 per cent higher than would be expected. It is the fourth worst hospital trust in England for this metric. (The figures include patients who died in hospital as well as those who died within 30 days of discharge). It is clear that no new housing should be built as the local hospitals cannot care for the existing population. The draft Stockport Local Plan proposes several thousand new homes, which will increase pressure on local services in Stockport, especially schools and Stepping Hill Hospital. Around Woodford there are five major new housing sites within 2 km / 1.2 miles of this site. Some residents of Woodford seek to avoid these problems by using public facilities in Poynton.

Flooding: A major concern regarding this site is that large parts of it are in the flood risk zone from Poynton Brook, which is classed by the Environment Agency as a "main river." Poynton Brook flooded in this area in 2016 and 2019. The applicants have published maps in their report, which shows that most of the northern part of the site is at risk of flooding from Poynton Brook, while the southern part has areas of surface water flooding. This is a major concern, both for the risk of any new buildings flooding, and also that attempts to prevent this may divert flood waters downstream. This would increase the risk of buildings in the western part of Poynton being flooded. Water might also back up and flood houses upstream. The LLFA should conduct a full review of this application.

Accidents and Disasters: Poynton Town Council was concerned at reference in the applicant's report to the risk of live munitions remaining at part of the site from the Second World War. There are other risks connected to the former use of the site for aircraft construction.

Asbestos may have been used and remain within the site, and there may be other dangerous chemicals present such as benzene.

Risk of Radioactive Contamination: Radioactive Radium-226 was widely used until the 1970s to paint luminous dials, gauges, and switches in aircraft for night viewing. Former aircraft factories, repair depots, and airfields are often contaminated with radium due to the handling, breakage, or disposal of these instruments. These instruments would have been installed in aircraft built at Woodford. Note that, even though the radioactive paint has often degraded to a sandy material and no longer glows in the dark, it remains highly dangerous. The radium decays, emitting radiation beta particles which strike molecules of phosphor, exciting them to emit visible light. When the phosphor degrades, the paint will stop glowing even though the radium remains radioactive. Radium 226 has a half-life of 1600 years, and decays into Radon 222, a radioactive gas which is also a serious threat to life. The atoms then transmute into several other radioactive elements before finally becoming the stable isotope Lead 206. The EIA should certainly assess this point. It may be necessary for the site to be checked for radioactive materials using a Geiger counter.

Heritage Asset: Whilst the Grade 2 listed Lostock Hall Farmhouse is not part of the site, it is close to the site boundary. Building a large housing or industrial estate nearby will irreversibly change the setting and environment of this heritage asset. The Town Council does not accept that Built Heritage can be “scoped out” of the EIA report. The Cheshire East Heritage Officer should be consulted.

Agriculture: The proposed development will result in the loss of a significant area of agricultural land. Much of the site is Grade 2 agricultural land. The proportion of home-grown food consumed in the UK is rapidly declining. This poses a major strategic risk for the United Kingdom. Current events show the vulnerability of merchant ships to hostile states and militias; we cannot afford to lose good agricultural land to housing development. It is essential that brownfield land should be developed first. As noted above, Cheshire East currently has identified 172 such sites.

Ecology: The EIA scoping report says little about wildlife present within the site. This is in contrast to the scoping report for the adjacent Lostock Hall Site, which concedes that “the proposed development may significantly affect on-site and nearby habitats, ... and protected species including roosting and foraging bats, breeding birds and badgers.” A total of 42 bird species were recorded in the Lostock Hall site, with 38 possibly, probably or confirmed as breeding there. It seems clear that the current site will also include a similar level of wildlife, which should be considered as part of the EIA process. Streetlighting and exterior lights on housing will be a particular threat to nocturnal wildlife, including bats, insects (such as moths and glow-worms), frogs, toads and small mammals.

Biodiversity: Poynton Town Council has a biodiversity plan, which seeks to protect green spaces, enhance ecological networks and promote environmental education. This would be totally undermined by this development. Similarly, the development wholly conflicts with Cheshire East's strategy to 'enhance green infrastructure and protect biodiversity' as part of a commitment to become a carbon neutral borough by 2045.

Public Health: Green space is vital to both physical and mental health and wellbeing (see Cheshire East's Mental Health Plan). The network of footpaths across the former Aerodrome site is used by many local residents. These paths allow walkers access to the countryside, without any nearby traffic, and to see the many trees and birds in the area.

Conclusion Poynton Town Council believes that this development is not justified or supported by the submitted EIA scoping report. Our concerns include:

- The EIA scoping report is deficient in many ways and fails to identify several issues of concern. The exact size and boundaries of the site should be resolved.
- The latest EIA should be assessed in conjunction with the request in March 2026 for an EIA scoping report for 500 houses on the adjacent Lostock Hall Farm site.
- There is no justification for this premature development on safeguarded land when there are numerous brownfield sites available in Cheshire East.
- The proposed development would cause major traffic congestion and air pollution problems and has poor connectivity to Poynton for road, cycle and pedestrian travel.
- The proposal that access on foot or cycle to Poynton village is obtained via a cramped, low roofed muddy tunnel under the railway is wholly unreasonable.
- The lack of "social infrastructure" for education, health and public services is a major concern, in view of the stress such services already face in Poynton.
- NHS England figures confirm that hospital services in East Cheshire are already on the point of collapse and cannot care for the existing population.
- The planned development would have a devastating effect on the ecology and biodiversity of this area of Poynton. Protected species including roosting and foraging bats, breeding birds and badgers would be endangered.
- The loss of open space would negatively impact the mental and physical health of local people. (NC)

Other Representations: The Town Council should also write to the following people:

1. The Chief Highways Officer at Cheshire East – to draw to his attention that the owners of this site are using maps which appear to show that part of the A523 Poynton Bypass is within their ownership.

2. Tim Roca MP – to express our concern at a second application for a major development in the west of Poynton and the impact these will have on public services. Also to suggest that, in view of the serious deficiencies in the recent performance of the East Cheshire NHS Trust, the government should suspend the “grey belt” rules and increased housing targets in this area until the Trust is in a position to properly treat the existing local residents.

3. To invite Pea Green Environmental Planning to view the passage under the railway line and to suggest that this should not be promoted as an access route to the site. (NC)

268. To receive a report on the following Cheshire East planning applications and to agree a response:

Application: 26/0946/VOC

Location: 48 Brookside Avenue, Poynton SK12 1PW

Proposal: Variation of condition of condition 3 on approval 25/4281/HOUS.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council urges that, to ensure privacy and comply with SADPD policies HOU11 (Extensions and Alterations) and HOU12 (Amenity), the proposed new window facing 50 Brookside Avenue be glazed in obscured glass. (NC)

Application: 26/1029/CLPUD

Location: 14 Pickwick Road, Poynton SK12 1LD

Proposal: Certificate of proposed lawful development for a single storey rear extension.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council have no objection in principle but note that the proposed extension will be close to neighbouring houses at 12 and 16 Pickwick Road. We urge the Planning Officer to visit the site and ensure the proposed extensions comply with the requirements for a Certificate of Lawful Development and with relevant planning policies, including:

- **Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1 (Sustainable development), SD2 (Sustainable development) and SE1 (Design)**
- **Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU8 (Density and Site Coverage), HOU11 (Design), HOU13 and HOU14 (Extensions)**
- **Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies HOU 11 (Extensions and alterations), HOU12 (Amenity) and HOU13 (Residential Standards). (NC)**

Application: 26/1026/HOUS

Location: 28 Oakfield Road. Poynton SK12 1AS

Proposal: Proposed single storey front and side extension.

RECOMMENDATION: No Objection. However, we note that there is an error on the Block Plan, which wrongly shows “Parklands Way” instead of Beech Crescent. (NC)

Application: 26/1082/HOUS

Location: 105 Chester Road, Poynton SK12 1HJ

Proposal: Double and single storey rear extension.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council notes that the proposed two-storey side extension will increase the height and massing of the roof of the rear of the house. This may cause some loss of light to 103 and 107 Chester Road. The Town Council urges the Planning Officer to visit the site and ensure the proposed extensions are not unneighbourly to nearby properties and comply with relevant planning policies, including:

- Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1 (Sustainable development), SD2 (Sustainable development) and SE1 (Design)
- Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU8 (Density and Site Coverage), HOU11 (Design), HOU13 and HOU14 (Extensions)
- Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies HOU 11 (Extensions and alterations), HOU12 (Amenity) and HOU13 (Residential Standards). (NC)

Application: 26/1014/PIP

Location: Land adjacent to Mill Hill Hollow and Woodford Road Junction, Poynton SK12 1EJ

Proposal: Permission in principle for a dwelling.

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

- 1. The site is part of the Green Belt, so development is contrary to Local Plan policies PG3 (Green Belt) and PG6 (Open Land). The applicant has not demonstrated any “very special circumstances” that might justify building in the Green Belt.**
- 2. The proposed development would result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed development would not represent infilling development between existing buildings in a village and would fall outside any settlement boundary and would not meet any of the other exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.**
- 3. There are no material considerations that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The principle of the development is therefore not acceptable, and it is considered the proposals would not represent sustainable development. The proposals are considered contrary to Policies MP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SD1**

(Sustainable Development in Cheshire East), SD2 (Sustainable Development Principles) and PG3 (Green Belt) of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, Policy PG10 (Infill Villages) of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The site is very close to the border of Cheshire East and Stockport MBC. The border is only some 50 metres away, at Norbury Brook. With regard to Purpose B of the Green Belt as stated in the NPPF: Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, it is clear that this site makes a Significant Contribution. The gap between Poynton and Greater Manchester is very narrow in this location. Development of this land reduce the gap further. The ARUP report of 2015 noted that “the Green Belt is particularly narrow to the north of Poynton ... ”

5. The Location Plan submitted by the applicants does not show the county boundary. A more detailed map would show clearly that the boundary runs along either Norbury Brook or a short distance to its east.

6. The draft Stockport Local Plan has identified several areas of open land on the southern edge of Hazel Grove for development. This land in Stockport is directly north of this site, so its development will materially reduce the gap between the built-up areas of Hazel Grove and Poynton. The importance of the site in preventing the two towns from merging has therefore increased since the previous Local Plan exercise in 2015.

7. Development sites in the Stockport Local Plan bordering Poynton to the north include HOM 2.19 Jacksons Lane West (170 houses), HOM 2.20 Jacksons Lane East (270 houses) and HOM 2.37 Norbury Hall / Land off Chester Road (Hazel Grove) (300 houses). The Jackson Lane sites are directly north of this site. Site HOM 2.26 Dairy ground Farm, Bramhall (500 houses) directly abuts the border with Poynton to the north-west. Stockport Council’s planned development will reduce significantly the existing gap between the built-up areas of Poynton and Hazel Grove and Bramhall.

8. As the site makes a significant contribution to purpose B of the Green Belt, preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another, the site is not part of the so-called grey belt.

9. The applicant’s planning statement claims that the site is a “hamlet,” known locally as “Mill Hill Hollow.” This is not correct; the area is largely rural with a few scattered houses. It has no public facilities of any kind. The Ordnance Survey maps show the names of hamlets such as Hope Green, Skellorn Green and Booth Green in Adlington. However, they do not show “Mill Hill Hollow” as such a place. That name is used only for the road and Mill Hill bridge over Norbury Brook.

10. Highways - the development would increase traffic at the existing unsatisfactory junction of Woodford Road and Mill Hill Hollow (an unadopted road). There are poor sight lines at this junction. Woodford Road has no pavement or footway in either direction. Residents report that cars often have to back out onto Woodford Road.

11. The site is not safely accessible on foot, due to the lack of pavements along Woodford Road. Access would inevitably be by private car. Woodford Road is narrow at this point and traffic often travels fast. It is heavily used by traffic seeking to avoid congestion along the A6 in Hazel Grove and at the Fiveways junction on the A523.

12. The application is therefore contrary to Policy CO1 of the Local Plan and SADPD Policy INF3. Policy INF3 specifically requires that “Development proposals should ... provide safe access to and from the site for all highway users” which is clearly not the case. The development would also not be in a sustainable location and is contrary to paragraph 155(c) of the Framework. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

13. There is also additional harm to the Green Belt arising from conflict with Green Belt purpose c) – safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The proposed plans would create development along Woodford Road and urbanise a rural area.

14. Public Footpath: Mill Hill Hollow is an unadopted road but is also a public footpath; Poynton with Worth Footpath 3. This path is used by many local residents and allows walkers access to the countryside, without any nearby traffic, and to see the many trees and birds in the area. Development may result in the path being obstructed. The advice of the Public Rights of Way Officer should be obtained.

15. Public Health: Green space is vital to both physical and mental health and wellbeing (see Cheshire East’s Mental Health Plan). Development would reduce this beneficial impact, contrary to Local Plan Policy SC3 (Health and Wellbeing).

16. Loss of Trees: There are numerous mature trees on the site and along the boundary with Glastonbury Drive. The proposed development would lead to significant loss of trees, contrary to Local Plan Policy SE5 (Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands).

17. Biodiversity: Poynton Town Council has a biodiversity plan, which seeks to protect green spaces, enhance ecological networks and promote environmental education. This would be totally undermined by this development. Similarly, the development wholly conflicts with both Cheshire East’s strategy to ‘enhance green infrastructure and protect biodiversity’ as part of a commitment to become a carbon neutral borough by 2045 and Local Plan Policy SE3 (Biodiversity).

18. Threat to Wildlife: This undisturbed land provides an essential habitat for wildlife, including bats, foxes, birds, insects, invertebrates, amphibians and many other species. Development would be contrary to Local Plan policy SE3 (Biodiversity) and Poynton Neighbourhood Plan policy EGB9 (Nature Conservation).

19. Conclusion: Very special circumstances to permit development in the Green Belt do not exist. The application does not comply with Local Planning policies, including: • Cheshire East Local Plan: Policies MP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SD1 and SD2 (Sustainable development), SE1 (Design), PG3 (Green Belt), PG6 (Open Countryside), PG10 (Infill Villages), SE3 (Biodiversity), SE4 (Landscape), SE5 (Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands), SC3 (Health and Wellbeing) and CO1: Sustainable travel and transport. • Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU7 (Environmental Considerations), EGB3: (Natural and Historic Environment), EGB7 (Landscape Enhancement), EGB8 (Protection of Rural Landscape Features) and EGB9 (Nature Conservation). • Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies: GEN 1 (Design principles), PG9 (Settlement boundaries) PG11 (Green Belt boundaries), ENV1 (Ecological network), ENV 3 (Landscape character), ENV5 (Landscaping), ENV6 (Trees, hedgerows and woodlands) and INF3: Highways safety and access. (NC)

Application: 26/1210/HOUS

Location: 23 Grebe Close, Poynton, SK12 1HU

Proposal: Erection of a two-storey rear extension, roof alterations including rear dormer, installation of a new front window to bedroom, and formation of a new garage door within an existing window opening.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council has no objection in principle to this application, providing the Planning Officer is satisfied that it is not unneighbourly to nearby properties and complies with the relevant planning policies, including:

- Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1 (Sustainable development), SD2 (Sustainable development) and SE1 (Design)
- Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU8 (Density and Site Coverage), HOU11 (Design), HOU13 and HOU14 (Extensions)
- Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies HOU 11 (Extensions and alterations), HOU12 (Amenity) and HOU13 (Residential Standards). (NC)

Application: 26/1183/PRIOR-1A

Location: 23 Grebe Close, Poynton, SK12 1HU

Proposal: Prior Approval for a proposed single-storey rear extension, extending 5.00m beyond the rear wall, maximum height of 3.00m and eaves height of 2.80m.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council have no objection to this application, providing the Planning Officer is satisfied that it complies with the rules of the prior Approval scheme.(NC)

Application: 26/1328/HOUS

Location: 181 Chester Road, Poynton, SK12 1DS

Proposal: Proposed Ground Floor single storey extension to the side and rear of the property.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council notes that the proposed rear extension will be close to the neighbouring houses at 179 and 183 Chester Road. We urge the Planning Officer to visit the site and ensure the proposed extensions are not unneighbourly and comply with relevant planning policies, including:

- Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1 (Sustainable development), SD2 (Sustainable development) and SE1 (Design)
- Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU8 (Density and Site Coverage), HOU11 (Design), HOU13 and HOU14 (Extensions)
- Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies HOU 11 (Extensions and alterations), HOU12 (Amenity) and HOU13 (Residential Standards).

If the application is approved, the proposed new side window facing 179 Chester Road should be glazed in obscured glass. (NC)

Application: 26/1079/HOUS

Location: 43 Anglesey Drive, Poynton, Stockport, Cheshire East, SK12 1BU

Proposal: Proposed new front porch. Proposed ground floor single storey extension. Proposed ground floor single storey extension to the rear of the property with walk on balcony roof. Proposed ground floor single storey side extension. Proposed changes to the existing external elevations.

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council notes that the proposed side extension appears to intrude on the site boundary with 45 Anglesey Drive. The proposed balcony may also cause a loss of privacy to nearby properties by overlooking. The Town Council urges the Planning Officer to visit the site and ensure the proposed extensions are not unneighbourly to nearby properties and comply with relevant planning policies, including:

- Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1 (Sustainable development), SD2 (Sustainable development) and SE1 (Design)
- Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU8 (Density and Site Coverage), HOU11 (Design), HOU13 and HOU14 (Extensions)
- Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies HOU 11 (Extensions and alterations), HOU12 (Amenity) and HOU13 (Residential Standards). (NC)

Application: 25/4746/HOUS

Location: 2 West Park Avenue, Poynton, SK12 1DX

Proposal: Removal of existing part, rear extension and construction of part single storey and part double storey rear extension, with internal modifications. (Revised plans)

RECOMMENDATION: Poynton Town Council have reviewed the revised plans and have no objection in principle to the proposed works, providing the Planning Officer is satisfied that there will be no adverse impact on the neighbouring house at 4 West Park Avenue. We urge that the Planning Officer visits the site to ensure that the application complies with all relevant planning policies, including:

- **Cheshire East Local Plan: SD1 (Sustainable development), SD2 (Sustainable development) and SE1 (Design)**
- **Poynton Neighbourhood Plan: HOU8 (Density and Site Coverage), HOU11 (Design), HOU13 and HOU14 (Extensions)**
- **Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) policies HOU 11 (Extensions and alterations), HOU12 (Amenity) and HOU13 (Residential Standards). (NC)**

269. The Chair proposed that two items should be added to the agenda under SO19

- Sports Club update on move to Glastonbury Drive field
- A brochure detailing building plans for a parcel of land to the south of Lower Park Road, Poynton

RECOMMENDATION: That the items regarding the Sports Club and Lower Park Road are added to the agenda under S019 (NC)

270. To receive and consider the update from the Sports club on the move to Glastonbury Drive fields.

Members discussed the letter that has been sent to club members by the Sports Club advising that the planned move to Glastonbury drive field was no longer a possibility and Jones Homes were seeking to develop the site into residential properties.

RECOMMENDATION: The update from the Sports Club advising the planned move to Glastonbury Drive field is noted. (NC)

271. To receive and consider the brochure detailing the land at Lower Park Road that has been submitted for potential development under the Cheshire East call for sites.

Members discussed the continuing threat to land surrounding Poynton being targeted by developers.

RECOMMENDATION: Ask ONH if they will create a map showing all potential building in and around the boundaries of Poynton as part of the work they will be doing on the Neighbourhood Plan. If this is not possible, we should consider buying a subscription to a mapping tool via SO51 to prepare a map in house. (NC)

272.Communication Messages

The following Communication messages should be made:

RECOMMENDATION: Communication messages to be made following this meeting

- **Have your say on 26/1014P: Mill Hill Hollow.**
- **Poynton Town Council's response to EIA 26/1305/EIA: Land to the North of Adlington Business Park.**
-
- **Current investigations being pursued by Poynton Town Council are:**
 - o **Poynton currently not showing on the Cheshire East Recycling page as a mobile HWRC.**
 - o **The lack of daily post/letter delivery across parts of Poynton. (NC)**

Meeting end time: 9pm

Chair

Dated.....