

CONGLETON TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 17th AUGUST 2017

Please note These are draft minutes and will not be ratified until the next meeting of the Planning Committee

PRESENT

Councillor L D Barker (Chairman)
J G Baggott
R Boston
C H Booth
D T Brown
Mrs A M Martin
Mrs A E Morrison
Mrs J D Parry

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Mrs S Akers Smith, Mrs A Armitt, P. Bates, G R Edwards, Mrs S A Holland, E Wardlaw and G S Williams.

2. **MINUTES**

PLN/40/1617 RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 20th July 2017 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were reminded to declare both “non pecuniary” and “pecuniary” interests as early in the meeting as they become known.

Councillors Baggott declared a “non pecuniary” interest due to his membership of Cheshire East Council.

Councillor D. T. Brown declared a “non pecuniary” interest due to his membership of Cheshire East Council and also due to his membership of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Councillor Barker declared a “non pecuniary” interest in application number 17/4130C. He stated that although the interest was “non pecuniary” he would vacate the chair and leave the room while the item was discussed.

4. **OUTSTANDING ITEMS**

The Chief Officer reported that the two items of correspondence to Cheshire East requested from previous meeting are still to be actioned.

17/3258C – Letter to Ainsley Arnold

PLN 39/1617 – Letter to Cheshire East regarding a road at Greenfield Estate

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

PLN/41/1617 RESOLVED: That the following comments be made to Cheshire East Borough Council:

Weekly list 17th July 2017

17/3773C	17 Longdown Road, Congleton, CW12 4QH	NO OBJECTION
17/3703C	Land at Forge Mill, Forge Lane, Congleton, CW12 4HF	REFUSE – due to the following –

- **Open countryside**
- **River and wildlife corridor**
- **Not a strategic site in the Local Plan**

Note Cheshire East Policy SE6

The Chief Officer was requested to write to Cheshire East Enforcement Officers to inform them about a breach of previous application 16/0836C regarding the pond.

Jenny Unsworth, on behalf of Protect Congleton and the Neighbourhood Plan Housing Group, spoke with objections to application 17/3703C

Councillor Brown declared a “non pecuniary” interest in application number 17/3703C due to his membership of Cheshire East and did not vote on this item.

Weekly List 21st July 2017

17/3404C	13 Coronation Road, Congleton, CW12 3HA	NO OBJECTION
17/3585C	1 Beech Close, Congleton, CW12 4YL	NO OBJECTION
17/3711C	9 Bridge Street, Congleton, CW12 1AY	NO OBJECTION
17/3717C	24 Westholme Close, Congleton, CW12 4FZ	NO OBJECTION
17/3729C	62 Hawthorne Close, Congleton, CW12 4UF	NO OBJECTION

Weekly List 24th July 2017

17/3786D	Mossley School, Boundary Lane, Congleton, CW12 3JA	NO OBJECTION
17/3902T	4 Hillesden Rise, Congleton, CW12 3DR	NO OBJECTION Subject to usual conditions
17/3911T	15 Moody Street, Congleton, CW12 4AN	Refer the decision

to Cheshire East Landscape Officer to make the decision

17/3688C	Cranberry Gardens, Macclesfield Road, Congleton	REFUSE – objection to the tree being felled for the benefit of a straight path. Propose a bend in the path that is suitable for both cycling and a footpath.
17/3358C	Peover Lane, Congleton	NO OBJECTION – subject to adequate soundproofing of the dwelling due to the close proximity of the railway line
17/3812C	38 Daisybank Drive, Congleton, CW12 1LX	NO OBJECTION
17/3184C	Tommy’s Lane, Congleton, CW12	REFUSE due to the following –

- **The need to move the line of Tommy’s Lane**
- **Lack of information on how the houses would fit into the space**
- **The impact on wildlife and trees and biodiversity**
- **Not in the Local Plan**
- **Highway and safety issues**
- **Traffic generation**
- **Vehicular access**
- **Adequacy of parking**
- **Loss of important trees**
- **Landscaping**
- **Nature Conservation**
- **Risk of flooding**

Additional Items

17/3808C	Land West of Padgbury Lane, Congleton	REFUSE –
	on the grounds that the appeal conditions should be complied with	
17/3863C	47 Rood Hill, Congleton	NO OBJECTION
17/4031C	Vale Business Centre, Priesty Fields, Congleton	REFUSE –
	Due to the following –	
	- Overbearing on surrounding properties	
	- Design, visual appearance and materials	
	- Overshadowing/loss of outlook	
	- Overlooking and loss of privacy	
	- Noise and disturbance from use	
	- Highway and safety issues	
	- Traffic generation	
	- Vehicular access	
	- Adequacy of parking	
	- Inappropriate in a conservation area	
17/3982C	War Memorial Site, Lawton Street, Congleton	NO OBJECTION –
	subject to the site having full disabled access and that appropriate materials being used.	
	Every effort should be made to ensure that due respect is made to current memorabilia	
17/4003C	Canal Bridge No. 67, Harvey Road, Buglawton, Congleton	NO OBJECTION
17/4059C	81 Lower Heath, Congleton, CW12 1NJ	NO OBJECTION
17/4130C	Land Off Sprink Lane, Congleton	NO OBJECTION
	Councillor Barker declared a “non pecuniary” interest in application number 17/4130C. He vacated the chair, left the room and did not vote. The Vice Chairman took the Chair for this item	
17/4146C	19 – 21 High Street, Congleton	NO OBJECTION
17/4172C	35 Buxton Road, Congleton	DEFER to next

Planning Committee

6. PLANNING APPEALS

The following were noted -

16/0798C – Vale Business Centre – Appeal dismissed

PLN/42/1617 RESOLVED – that the following statement be submitted to the Planning Inspector
Appeal APP/RO660/W/17/3178234 on Application 16/3286C –
130 Holmes Chapel Road - Congleton

The proposed development is not being in keeping with the area.

This part of the housing estate was built on four green fields that had belonged to the Congleton Inclosure Trust, a local charity which was set up to administer the common land. In recent times it has been selling off land and using the proceeds to make grants to community projects. In order to ensure that its land was used for high-quality housing, the Inclosure Trust placed restrictive covenants on the plots to prevent building at too high a density. The restrictive covenant on the “Pegasus” plot allows only one dwelling on the site, with its design to be approved by the Inclosure Trust. The rest of the four fields were restricted to a maximum of 160 dwellings overall. Each of the four corner plots on the main road is occupied by a single bungalow.

The result of these covenants is clear if you walk round the estate. The scale is generous. Even 3-bedroom semi-detached houses each a wide window both upstairs and down. They have a double-width entrance, allowing a side-panel with windows beside the front door, replaced in many instances by a fancy porch. Each house has a garage, allowing a two-storey side extension to be built if required. In addition to parking space, they have well-kept front gardens, with beds beside the footpath. By contrast the houses proposed for the “Pegasus” site have windows only half as wide. The front entrance is just the width of one door. There is no garage, nor any space to build one. The scale is mean and allows no scope for future extension, other

than into the small back garden. Apart from narrow bed for flowers or shrubs along the front of the house, there was no room for any front garden.

The improved visual design submitted recently does not solve the problem of a scale and density that is incompatible with the neighbourhood. Even with the small increase in size, the proposed houses are only 7m wide and are to be built on plots only 8m wide, but the existing semi-detached houses on Delamere Road are 9m wide and are built on plots more than 10m wide. This makes them 25% wider than the proposed houses. The five neighbouring houses on Holmes Chapel Road are on average nearly twice as wide as the proposed houses, with several metres of separation between them. If the proposed houses were of the same scale and density as nearby semis, there would only be room for three houses on the site. That would allow the end house to be a detached house facing Holmes Chapel Road, a much more attractive aspect. Incidentally, the high density housing behind Delamere Road is social housing for disabled people on Chatsworth Drive, built when the Isolation Hospital was closed down. It cannot be described as part of this neighbourhood and is not comparable.

This is a neighbourhood to be proud of; that is why so many residents have taken the trouble to object to this proposal, which would set a precedent for the erosion of an attractive area by speculative developments. The Neighbourhood Plan Housing team has surveyed our estate agents and established that, because of our aging population, bungalows are in high demand. We do not want people buying them up in order to demolish the bungalow and cram the site full of little family houses, of which we already have an adequate supply.

L. D. Barker – Chairman