

APPENDIX B

The Report of the Meeting of the Planning Committee which met on Wednesday, 22nd, August 2018 at 9.30am at the Council Chamber.

Present:

Councillors T Jackson, K Podmore, M Leather, G. Clewley, V Herbert, D Foden

Apologies for absence:

To receive declarations of interest:

None.

Planning applications to be considered:

18/3164M	Spencer Cottage, Spencer Brook, Prestbury (05/09/18) Alterations of an existing dwelling and erection of 7 no dwellings with Associated landscaping and infrastructure
PPC Comments	We object to this application as we consider that it does not comply With any of the following policy grounds <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. NPPF 109 – The development can be refused on highway grounds If there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The PPC consider this to be very relevant2. NPPF 131 – Heritage statement, the desirability of a new development should make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area and should carry great merit – this development does not in any respect3. NPPF 162 – The development must ensure that the flood risk is not increased elsewhere as a result of approval. As this development is in flood risk areas 1, 2 & 3 it contravenes this policy4. NPPG 170 – This development in our opinion contravenes the conservation and enhancement of the ecological environment of the area5. SD 1 – provide safe access and sufficient car parking in accordance with adopted highway standards6. SD 1 – contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural built, historic and cultural environment7. SD 1 – prioritise the most accessible and sustainable locations8. SD 2 – contribute positively to an areas character in terms of height, scale, form and grouping9. SD 2 - contribute positively to an areas character in terms of its relationship to neighbouring properties, street scene and the wider neighbourhood10. SD 2 - contribute positively to an areas character in terms of its relationship, and where possible enhance, the significance of heritage assets, including their wider settings

11. SD 2 - contribute positively to an areas character in terms of avoiding high risk flood areas, or where necessary provide appropriate mitigation measures
12. SE 1 – make a positive contribution to the surroundings in terms of sense and place
13. SE 7 – seek to avoid harm to heritage assets and make a positive contribution to the character of CE historic and built environment
14. BE 2 – seek to preserve, enhance and interpret the historic fabric of the environment within Macclesfield Borough
15. DC3 – the development should not significantly injure the amenities of adjacent residential properties with an overbearing effect
16. DC 3 - the development should not significantly injure the amenities of adjacent residential properties with traffic generation, access and car parking
17. DC 6 – that any development should normally ensure that vehicular and pedestrian access is safe and convenient, with particular regard to visibility splays
18. DC 41 – that garden spaces should reflect the typical ratio of garden space within the curtilages in the area and location, size and shapes should be suitable for the intended purpose
19. DC 41 – the proposal should not result in excessive amount of new traffic into a quiet area or on unsuitable roads
20. DC 41 – that vehicular and pedestrian access should be safe
21. We disagree with the access statement “Spencer Brook wil always provide a safe access to and from the site from the South West- we dispute this point in the current developments layout
22. Trees have been removed on site and additional trees are proposed to be removed adjacent to area of “Designated importance “ within the Prestbury conservation area approval document dated April 2006
23. We understand that the proposed access/egress through Spencer Mews is in fact through private land for which no permission has yet been approved

18/3751M	Brook House, Dunbah Lane Prestbury (16/08/18) Demolition of single storey ancillary buildings and existing rare Garage. Proposed new side extension to replace above
PPC Comments	No objections
18/3824M	Ridgeway, 90, Macclesfield Road, Prestbury (21/08/18) Extension to previously approved application to show increased pool Area, kitchen and outbuildings to rear of dwelling
PPC Comments	We have no objection to this application however we are concerned That the proposal may exceed the 30% allowance for developments in green belt considering the previous planning approvals

18/3838M 14, Chelford Road, Prestbury (29/08/18)
Alterations, porch, side and rear extensions including attached garage

PPC Comments No objections

18/3951M Shortacre, 6, Macclesfield Road, Prestbury (23/08/18)
Variation of condition on existing permission 17/2743M; Demolition
Of a split level bungalow to be replaced with new dwelling

PPC Comments No objections

18/4005M Hollybrook House, Castle Hill, Mottram St Andrew (05/09/18)
Demolition of an existing dwelling, garage and outbuildings and
erection Of a replacement dwelling with garage and associated
landscaping works

PPC Comments This development is within the Parish of Mottram St Andrews

18/4019M The Gables, 4, Macclesfield Road, Prestbury (05/09/18)
Detached garden store

PPC Comments No objections

Decision notices approved:

Applications withdrawn:

Applications under appeal:

Any other business:

Kings School - A short update on the Kings school site was given by Dr Hyde, Kings School Headmaster, in which he confirmed that preparatory work had commenced on site and that completion was anticipated for the academic year 2020/21. He also advised that an application would be forthcoming for the Fallibroome Farm site that they had recently acquired. This application would be for the use of the land adjacent to the farmhouse for the relocation of the first team cricket pitch from their current main site and for the redevelopment of the farmhouse for other school facilities. Regarding street lighting along the main road in front of the site CE highways were considering imposing a condition that this would be required for safety purposes but the schools consultants were still in discussion regarding this matter. The application for the revised main entrance had now been refused by CE and the schools consultants were now considering alternative proposals

