Planning Application No. 16/6129N

development proceeds.

Land at 414 Newcastle Road, Shavington Approval of reserved matters from existing permission 13/4675N approved at appeal. Refer to drawings in relation to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

At an extra-ordinary meeting held on 7 February 2017, the Parish Council objected to this planning application on the following grounds:

- a) Density of development. The 47 dwellings on the site which is 1.17 hectares is in excess of the 40 dwellings per hectare (dph). This is a higher density than Shavington village in general and even compares unfavourably with nearby developments; eg, to the north side of Newcastle Road, Prospect Homes (28 dwellings on 0.9 hectares is 31 dwellings per hectare, whilst 'the Triangle' (Shavington Park development by Persimmon Homes) has an average of 31.7 dwellings per hectare) from the original planning application submission information.
- b) No public space. The density is increased by the lack of public open space.
- c) Surface Water run-off: The planning submission does not specify any surface drainage plan. United Utilities referred to this omission in its letter submitted on 2 February 2017. Planning application supporting documentation 'Preliminary Geo-Environmental Assessment', prepared by the company E3P (Ref 10-860-L1 1 December 2016) states in the summary (page 4) 'Soakaway drainage may be unsuitable'. Difficulties in using the existing surface drainage system in Newcastle Road have been encountered by other developers. The Parish Council supports the view that an appropriate surface water management system must be submitted to CEC for agreement by all parties, including United Utilities, before this
- d) Site access location: The latest Proposed Site Plan dated 11 January 2017, shows the site access road across from the site entrance for the 28 Prospect Homes. This location, which has had the consequence of creating a crossroad junction, has previously been accepted by Cheshire East Highways as 'dangerous and unacceptable' (Southern Planning Committee meeting held on 10 June 2015).
 - Members noted that Cheshire East Highways has requested a revised location that 'provides an acceptable offset'. The new plan has not yet been posted onto the planning portal of the website. It is understood that the entrance is to be located in the vicinity of the centre of the site, which could be near to the petrol station and would be an acceptable alternative to crossroads.
- e) Boundary buffer: Information indicates a request by the Inspector at appeal in respect of 39 v 47 dwellings, that there should be a boundary hedge or planted buffer on the southern edge of the site, rather than the hard fencing which is now proposed. The boundary forms the parish boundary at that location.
- f) Additional pedestrian/cycle access: Several documents, including comments from various consultees, refer to an additional access for pedestrians and cyclists 'on the north-west corner' of the site, as submitted in the original application (approved for 39 houses and then revised on appeal to 47 dwellings). There appears to be no document available showing this 'pedestrian/cycle path' but the Parish Council would request that this be reinstated.
- g) Much of the information used to support this on-going application is significantly out-of-date; for example, the public transport information references bus services 6 and 44 which no longer exist in Shavington. In addition, the traffic assessment does not include consideration of the additional developments, but references only the physical count of vehicles, reported in document 1 March 2013.
- h) If the Borough Council is minded to approve the application, the Parish Council requests that the following condition be added:

 Improvement of the pedestrian crossing on Newcastle Road at the traffic-lights junction at Crewe Road/Stock Lane. Pedestrians and cyclists, including children to and from schools, use this route to access most of the local amenities and the intersection should be made more user-friendly.
- i) There is no requirement for further development in the parish which has experienced, and continues to experience, large scale developments which are significantly in excess of the requirements for an area designated as a Local Service Centre.