

Prestbury Parish Council

To: All members of the Planning Committee – Councillor Clewley, Dicken, Foden, Jackson, Leather, Podmore, Martin, Miles.

From: Prestbury Parish Council

28th, June, 2017

**A meeting of the Planning Committee will take place at
The Council Chambers on Wednesday, 28th June, 2017 at 9.30am.**

Agenda

Apologies for absence:

Cllrs Clewley, Dicken, Foden, Martin, Miles

To receive declarations of interest:

None

Planning applications to be considered:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 17/2743M | Shortacre, 6 Macclesfield Road (28/6/17)
Demolition of split level bungalow to be replaced with new dwelling.

Comments made: The Committee object to this application
This development overlooks a conservation area and does not in our
Opinion “add to the physical texture of the village”
Village Design Statement “the built environment” recommendations
Paragraphs 4&5 are contravened
Village Design Statement “areas close to the Prestbury conservation
Area” recommendations 1&2 are contravened
In our opinion we consider this development is out of character with
The street scene |
| 17/2524M | Alstonfield, Castle Hill (28/6/17)
Demolition of existing two storey detached dwelling and construction
of a two storey replacement dwelling with basement and detached
garage (renewal of application 07/2701P)

This is a Mottram-St-Andrews application and was therefore not
considered |

- 17/2227M 75 Meadow Drive (16/6/17)
Amendment to approved scheme 11/0426M to permit the retention of the full height sliding doors to bedroom 3 (with external opaque balustrade) and the retention of the existing flat roof area (as built).
- This application was commented on at the meeting held on 17th, May, 2017
- 17/2760M Wildacre, Withinlee Road (5/7/17)
Replacement dwelling
- The committee object to this application on the following grounds:-
It is an isolated property in the green belt and from the information Provided there is no indication of the exact floor area in comparison To the existing dwelling (does this exceed the 30% allowance?)
This development is totally out of character with the rural setting and The street scene
- 17/2959M Point Grey, New Road (30/6/17)
Two storey rear and front extensions, alterations to existing elevations and detached garage.
- No Objection
- 17/2965M Broad Oak, 50 Heybridge Lane (3/7/17)
Erection of replacement dwelling and amended access including widening entrance gate and brick piers.
- We would like to see obscure glazing to the side windows which overlook the adjacent properties
- 17/2752M Kings School Alderley Rd (04/07/17)
Variation of condition 2 on approval 15/4286M
- The Committee object to this application on the following grounds
The decision notice approving application no 15/4286M dated 23rd January 2017 specifically stated in the final paragraph clause (b) That “variation to the approved plans will require the submission of a Planning application” This application refers only to a variation of Condition 2. Condition 2 referred to a list of drawings (approved)
This application includes additional drawings nos. 000PE00XXDRE 0800-P03; 000PE00XXDRA7001-P02 & 723.001Rev B
These drawings should not be considered within Condition 2 as they Did not form part of the original planning approval.

The revised drawings show an increase in car parking of 13.5% plus Additional drop off areas. As the site is still within the green belt and Is designated as category GC1, any additional development should Only be allowed under special circumstances. We do not consider the increase to be a special circumstance.

The drawing indicating the external lighting is not covered in Condition 2 but in Condition 12 and therefore should not form part Of this application

If it is considered we would make the following comments:-

The original decision notice granted approval “for infrastructure Lighting limited in scale and restricted to school hours with Floodlighting to the tennis/netball courts” as detailed in EIA Vol 1 Chapter 6 clause 6.10.3.

The decision notice also stated that new lighting impact would be of a Moderate/Adverse magnitude

The new proposals include for a very substantial number (approx 90) 6m high lamp standards both single and dual, plus approx 90 Bulkhead fittings. In our opinion this will have an Extremely Adverse Impact on the residents, the night sky and the wild life Lighting as proposed will unreasonably and substantially interfere With the use and enjoyment of homes and premises and quality of life No data has been provided to comply with Condition 12

The new application also states that the main access roads will have The use of low level lighting explored. This has not been carried out This development falls within the guidelines of “ILE Guidance for Rural area zones EZ1 & EZ2”. These guidelines have not been Adhered to

17/2975M

Bollin House, 1, Bollin Grove (10/07/17)
Single storey rear extension to existing dwelling

This development is out of character with the conservation area and it Looks like a carbuncle.

The committee would like to see the design of any extension more in Keeping with the existing environment and cottages around

17/2889M

Ford House, The Village
Variation of conditions 2 & 26 on approval no 14/3531M

This application was deferred until the next meeting

Decision notices approved:

17/1872M 4 Highfield – two storey side extension and internal alterations
4 conditions

PPC comment: No objection

16/6102M	The Cottage, Chelford Road – a replacement dwelling generally as extant approval 16/1438M with the addition of a single storey rear addition (extant) 8 conditions
PPC comment:	On receiving further information it was discovered the plans were very misleading that they now feel this application is very un-neighbourly and would be an excessive intrusion into the greenbelt because it — <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is 1.33m higher than the previously approved scheme ● Has an increased eaves height (by 400mm) ● Is therefore 28% larger by volume than the previously approved scheme ● Is now larger (not smaller) than the 'fall back' Permitted Development option ● Has a vastly more substantial retaining structure require to support the rear terrace.
17/0889 & 0890M	The Coast Restaurant & Bar, The Village – erection of a rear store and fence (retrospective) 2 conditions
PPC comment:	The Committee object to this application because it is out of character in a conservation area. When planning permission was originally approved there were nine parking spaces and this store takes up some of those spaces. Also, they originally supported the work at this restaurant on condition that the extractor fans would go up the chimney which has not happened. The smells and noise from those fans and anti-social to local residents.
17/1656M	2 Meadow Drive – single storey rear extension 3 conditions
PPC comment:	No objection

Tree Work approved:

17/2555T

St Peters Church

T1 Cypress – Fell

T2 Cypress – Fell

T3 Maple – Fell

T4 Maple – Fell

T5 Maple – Fell

T6 Beech – Fell

Tree A Lime – Remove lowest branch extending towards extension.
Reduce second branch extending towards extension by 2.5 metres.
Crown light to 3.5 metres (churchyard) removing secondary, sub
lateral branches and epicormics growth.

Any other business:

17/0181M

Brundred Farm, 45 Castle Hill

To consider comments on appeal to the Secretary of State of the refusal
of this application

Our comments are with the Secretary of State