

Public Document Pack

Date of meeting Tuesday, 11th September, 2018
Time 7.00 pm
Venue Astley Room - Castle House
Contact Geoff Durham



**NEWCASTLE
UNDER LYME**
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Castle House
Barracks Road
Newcastle-under-Lyme
Staffordshire
ST5 1BL

Planning Committee

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART 1 – OPEN AGENDA

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 4a APPLICATION FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT - LAND AT WEST AVENUE, KIDSGROVE. WESTLEIGH PARTNERSHIPS LTD, RELEVAN AND RELEVAN PROPERTIES LTD. 18/00239/FUL | (Pages 3 - 6) |
| 4b APPLICATION FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT - LAND AT WEST AVENUE, KIDSGROVE. WESTLEIGH PARTNERSHIPS LTD, RELEVAN AND RELEVAN PROPERTIES LTD. 18/00239/FUL | (Pages 7 - 8) |
| 5a APPLICATION FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT – ORME CENTRE, ORME ROAD, NEWCASTLE. MR LADSON. 18/00183/FUL | (Pages 9 - 14) |
| 7a APPLICATION FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT - DUALLING OF THE EXISTING 3.3KM STRETCH OF THE A500 BETWEEN JUNCTION 16 & MEREMOSS ROUNDABOUT. CHESHIRE EAST. 348/255 (CHESHIRE EAST REF 18/3766N) | (Pages 15 - 18) |
| 8a APPLICATION FOR MINOR DEVELOPMENT – LAND ADJACENT 45 MORAN ROAD, KNOTTON. ASPIRE HOUSING GROUP. 18/00465/FUL | (Pages 19 - 20) |
| 10a APPLICATION FOR OTHER DEVELOPMENT - 16 ST MICHAEL'S ROAD, CROSS HEATH. CLLRS J & G WILLIAMS. 18/00657/FUL | (Pages 21 - 22) |

12 APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE (HISTORIC BUILDINGS GRANT) - PROSPECT HOUSE, MAIN ROAD, BETLEY. 18/19002/HBG (Pages 23 - 24)

12a APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE (HISTORIC BUILDINGS GRANT) - PROSPECT HOUSE, MAIN ROAD, BETLEY. 18/19002/HBG (Pages 25 - 26)

13a REGISTER OF LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME – 2018 REVIEW (Pages 27 - 28)

Members: Councillors Burgess, Mrs J Cooper, Fear (Chair), Maxfield, Northcott, Pickup, Proctor, Reddish (Vice-Chair), Spence, S Tagg, G Williams and J Williams

Members of the Council: If you identify any personal training/development requirements from any of the items included in this agenda or through issues raised during the meeting, please bring them to the attention of the Democratic Services Officer at the close of the meeting.

Meeting Quorums :- 16+= 5 Members; 10-15=4 Members; 5-9=3 Members; 5 or less = 2 Members.

FIELD_TITLE

Officers will be in attendance prior to the meeting for informal discussions on agenda items.

NOTE: THERE ARE NO FIRE DRILLS PLANNED FOR THIS EVENING SO IF THE FIRE ALARM DOES SOUND, PLEASE LEAVE THE BUILDING IMMEDIATELY THROUGH THE FIRE EXIT DOORS.

ON EXITING THE BUILDING, PLEASE ASSEMBLE AT THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING BY THE STATUE OF QUEEN VICTORIA. DO NOT RE-ENTER THE BUILDING UNTIL ADVISED TO DO SO.

Published 7 September, 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
11th September 2018

Agenda item 4

Application ref: 18/00239/FUL

Land at West Avenue Kidsgrove

Since the publication of the agenda an Air Quality Assessment has been submitted.

The **Environmental Health Division** (EHD) has responded to the submitted Air Quality Assessment and the additional acoustic information (referred to within the main agenda report) indicating that they have no objections subject to conditions relating to the following:

- Submission and approval of an assessment of artificial lighting from the adjoining industrial premises and any mitigation measures that are identified as being necessary.
- Approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Submission and approval of design measures to ensure that appropriate noise levels are achieved addressing environmental noise, and industrial and commercial noise.

The **Landscape Development Section** indicates that they have no objections in principle to the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment subject to the following comments:

- The tree protection fencing should be extended along the site boundary to the rear of plots 26 to 36 to protect tree group G24.
- Group G24 contains several important trees and it is likely that the Root Protection Area (RPAs) of some of the trees will extend into the gardens of plots 26 to 36. Ground protection should be included where required and there should be no changes in level with the RPAs.
- Any gaps in the tree cover resulting from tree removal should be replanted to mitigate tree loss.
- All recommendations of the Arboricultural Method Statement should be implemented.

The **Highway Authority** has no objections subject to the following conditions:

- Provision of access, internal roads, private drives and parking areas prior to occupation and retention for the life of the development
- Development not to be occupied until the visibility splays are provided. Such splays to be kept free of obstruction.
- Prior approval and implementation of the surfacing materials for the private drives, parking and turning areas and means of surface water drainage to such areas.
- Provision of a footpath link onto Knowle View.
- Private drives to remain ungated.
- Prior approval and implementation of a Construction Method Plan

In addition we have received confirmation that the independent viability appraisal was not undertaken in accordance with the new Practice Guidance and that it will need to be fully reviewed and updated. It is not known whether this will have been completed before the meeting. A further report will be prepared.

In light of the above the recommendation is amended as follows:

A. Subject to

- (a) your Officer still concluding, in the light of the July 2018 viability guidance and expert advice received, that any public open space contribution would result in the development being unviable, and
- (b) the applicant first entering into a Section 106 agreement by 9th November 2018 to secure a review mechanism of the scheme's ability to make a policy compliant contribution to public open space, if the development is not substantially commenced within 12 months from the date of the decision, and the payment of such a contribution if found financially viable,

PERMIT the application subject to conditions relating to the following matters:-

1. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (to be listed within the condition) unless otherwise required by condition of the permission.
 2. Prior approval of precise details of the following, and implementation of the approved details:
 - Existing and proposed levels, and finished floor levels of the dwellings.
 - All external facing materials and hard surfacing materials.
 - Boundary treatments.
 3. Implementation of the recommendations of the Arboricultural Method Statement.
 4. Tree protection fencing to be installed in accordance with the submitted details and along the site boundary to the rear of plots 26 to 36.
 5. Ground protection measures within the rear gardens of plots 26 to 36.
 6. No changes in ground levels within the RPAs.
 7. Approval and implementation of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping to include replacement tree planting in gaps in the tree cover resulting from tree removal.
 8. Surface water drainage scheme.
 9. Contaminated land.
 10. Submission and approval of design measures to ensure that appropriate noise levels are achieved addressing environmental noise, and industrial and commercial noise.
 11. Submission and approval of an assessment of artificial lighting from the adjoining industrial premises, including any mitigation measures that are identified as being necessary.
 12. Provision of a footway link from the site onto Knowle View or into the Woodland at the rear of the site.
 13. Submission and approval of a scheme of coal mining remedial works, and the implementation of such works.
 14. Prior approval of a scheme for the provision, in perpetuity, of 16 affordable housing units within the development. The scheme shall include the timing of the construction for the affordable housing, arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both initial and subsequent occupiers and the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity prospective and successive occupiers of such units and the means by which such occupancy will be enforced.
 15. Approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Method Plan
 16. Provision of access, internal roads, private drives and parking areas prior to occupation and retention for the life of the development
 17. Development not to be occupied until the visibility splays are provided. Such splays to be kept free of obstruction.
 18. Prior approval and implementation of the surfacing materials for the private drives, parking and turning areas and means of surface water drainage to such areas.
- B.** Failing completion of the above planning obligation by the date referred to in the above recommendation, that the Head of Planning either refuse the application on

the grounds that without the obligation being secured, the development would fail to secure an appropriate contribution for off-site public open space which would reflect the infrastructure needs of the development and (should there be a viability case for non-policy compliant contributions) there would be no provision made to take into account a change in financial circumstances in the event of the development not proceeding promptly; or, if he considers it appropriate, to extend the period of time within which the obligation can be secured.

This page is intentionally left blank

Published 11 September, 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
11th September 2018

Agenda item 4

Application ref: 18/00239/FUL

Land at West Avenue Kidsgrove

Since the publication of the main agenda and the advance supplementary report, the independent viability appraisal has been revised and is now compliant with the new Planning Guidance on the consideration of the issue of viability. The recommendation remains that based upon a development of 100% affordable housing the development cannot support any level of policy compliant financial contribution.

As set out in the main agenda report, if a scheme is unviable it will not proceed and there will be no contribution to the supply of housing in a sustainable location where there has been under-delivery. In addition, as noted within that report, this development provides more affordable housing than is necessary to satisfy policy and as such will make a contribution towards addressing the shortfall in affordable housing provision on other developments within the Borough. These are material considerations and in light of such considerations it remains the conclusion that it would not be appropriate, if granting planning permission, to insist upon the payment of the public open space contribution.

As policy requires provision of 25% affordable housing a condition has been recommended specifying that 16 units (25%) to be retained, in perpetuity, as affordable housing. As such the developer is not required to build a development that is fully affordable housing. Whilst there is no reason to believe that this will happen it would be appropriate to require within the wording of the required planning obligation a further appraisal on viability to be undertaken, as it is not known whether that form of development could support any financial contribution.

In light of the above the recommendation is amended as follows:

- A. Subject to the applicant first entering into a Section 106 agreement by 9th November 2018 to secure a review mechanism of the scheme's ability to make a policy compliant contribution to public open space, if the development is not substantially commenced within 12 months from the date of the decision, and the payment of such a contribution if found financially viable, and to require a further viability appraisal to be undertaken if the development as constructed is not 100% affordable housing and the payment of a policy compliant contribution if found financially viable :-**

PERMIT the application subject to conditions relating to the following matters:-

- 1. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (to be listed within the condition) unless otherwise required by condition of the permission.**
- 2. Prior approval of precise details of the following, and implementation of the approved details:**
 - Existing and proposed levels, and finished floor levels of the dwellings.**
 - All external facing materials and hard surfacing materials.**
 - Boundary treatments.**
- 3. Implementation of the recommendations of the Arboricultural Method Statement.**
- 4. Tree protection fencing to be installed in accordance with the submitted details and along the site boundary to the rear of plots 26 to 36.**
- 5. Ground protection measures within the rear gardens of plots 26 to 36.**

6. No changes in ground levels within the RPAs.
 7. Approval and implementation of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping to include replacement tree planting in gaps in the tree cover resulting from tree removal.
 8. Surface water drainage scheme.
 9. Contaminated land.
 10. Submission and approval of design measures to ensure that appropriate noise levels are achieved addressing environmental noise, and industrial and commercial noise.
 11. Submission and approval of an assessment of artificial lighting from the adjoining industrial premises, including any mitigation measures that are identified as being necessary.
 12. Provision of a footway link from the site onto Knowle View or into the Woodland at the rear of the site.
 13. Submission and approval of a scheme of coal mining remedial works, and the implementation of such works.
 14. Prior approval of a scheme for the provision, in perpetuity, of 16 affordable housing units within the development. The scheme shall include the timing of the construction for the affordable housing, arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both initial and subsequent occupiers and the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity prospective and successive occupiers of such units and the means by which such occupancy will be enforced.
 15. Approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Method Plan
 16. Provision of access, internal roads, private drives and parking areas prior to occupation and retention for the life of the development
 17. Development not to be occupied until the visibility splays are provided. Such splays to be kept free of obstruction.
 18. Prior approval and implementation of the surfacing materials for the private drives, parking and turning areas and means of surface water drainage to such areas.
- B. Failing completion of the above planning obligation by the date referred to in the above recommendation, that the Head of Planning either refuse the application on the grounds that without the obligation being secured, the development would fail to secure an appropriate contribution for off-site public open space which would reflect the infrastructure needs of the development and (should there be a viability case for non-policy compliant contributions) there would be no provision made to take into account a change in financial circumstances in the event of the development not proceeding promptly; or, if he considers it appropriate, to extend the period of time within which the obligation can be secured.

Published 11 September, 2018

Supplementary Information

The following information is being reported to the Planning Committee at its meeting on 11th September 2018

Agenda Item 5 Application No. 18/00183/FUL The former Orme Centre, Orme Road, Newcastle-under-Lyme

As indicated in the agenda report in order to provide independent expert advice on issues of financial viability and in particular the ability of a development to make policy compliant contributions, it is practice at the Borough Council to commission the obtaining of an independent viability appraisal. The methodology to be followed is that set out within recently issued National planning practice guidance on viability and valuers if they are members of the RICS will also follow their Institute's Guidance on "Financial Viability in Planning". The Government have made it clear in the planning practice guidance that any viability assessment should reflect the government's recommended approach to defining key inputs. In this case a viability appraisal has been undertaken by Mr Phillips of the District Valuer Service – the "District Valuer" or DV.

In July immediately prior to the Planning Committee meeting at which the application was to be considered the report of the DV was received. The applicant was provided with an opportunity to comment upon that report. They raised a number of concerns with the report, and since that time further information has been provided by them via your officers to the DV and the DV has been asked to reconsider the advice that he had previously given. The further information provided were a number of invoices evidencing the sale and marketing fees have been paid and a letter of offer for the premises which the previous vendor received (from the "underbidder"). Very recently the DV has provided a further opinion on the matter. Various oral submissions have been made to your officers concerning the possibility that the scheme, on the basis might be concluded to be able to support the contributions that would normally be required, and the implications of the Council seeking such policy compliant contributions.

The DV, having been provided with an appraisal undertaken by the applicant (or by persons employed by him) has made comment upon that appraisal and has undertaken their own. In essence the first part of an appraisal is an assessment of the likely gross development value that can be expected to be achieved and the second is one of the expected costs. Having assessed the likely values and the likely costs, what is termed a residual land value is then obtained (the difference between the two).

In respect of this development the gross development value is based upon the prices of the one and two bed units, and the DVs' GDV figure is significantly less than that assumed by the developer – possibly because in part the value of the car parking spaces has not been factored in by the DV. If the DVs' figure is accepted this will be a factor which will reduce the residual land value (and thus lessen the likelihood that the scheme is "viable").

In relation to expected costs these are not just the construction costs, including various "abnormals", but they also include expected fees, the cost of financing the development, the policy compliant contributions (which in this case amount to some

£176,760) and an allowance for profit. In terms of the construction costs the DV has assumed a higher construction cost than that assumed by the applicant. Again if the DV's figure is accepted this will again be a further factor reducing the residual land value of the scheme.

There are a number of points where there is a significant divergence of approach between the DV and the applicant's appraisal which are disputed by the applicant. Inevitably these are where acceptance of the DV's approach would increase the residual land value of the scheme. Further reference will be made to them below.

As indicated above, having assessed the likely values and the likely costs, what is termed a residual land value is then obtained – this being the difference between the two. This then is compared with either what is termed the site or benchmark value – which according to the government's recommended methodology is to be based upon either the Existing Use Value + approach (EUV+) – or what is termed the Alternative Use Value approach. If the residual land value of the scheme is greater than the EUV+ or AUV values then the scheme is considered to be viable with the policy compliant contributions. If it is less then the scheme is considered not to be viable (with the policy compliant contributions).

The conclusion reached by the DV in his draft report was that the Residual Land Value for the scheme is of the order of £841,500, and that to determine the appropriate benchmark value in this case it is appropriate to undertake a Residual appraisal of the scheme that was granted consent under permission 16/00796/OUT which he calculates would give a residual land value of in the order of £538,000. Because the Residual Land Value of the current proposal is greater than the Site Value his conclusion is that the scheme is viable on a policy-compliant basis – i.e. with Section 106 contributions of £176,760.

The applicant disagrees with a number of the assumptions made

In particular he contends that the DV has significantly underestimated his sales and marketing costs – in support of this the applicant has provided copies of a significant number of invoices demonstrating that his business model involves sales and marketing costs of 11% of sale values rather than the 3% figure assumed by the DV in his appraisal.

The DV's response has been as follows

"I have considered the Applicant's business model whereby the proposed units are forward funded by Investors by way of an exchange of contracts to purchase and the provision of finance at an interest rate of 5%. This model has the benefit of providing 100% finance, and also obviating the need to secure bank finance and any requirement to provide some form of guarantee. This forward funding finance has been arranged for the Applicant by Residential Estates Limited whose fees are 11% of the sales prices for the identification of the purchasers and the arrangement of the forward financing of the scheme by these purchasers.

Whilst this approach to financing the scheme provides the benefits confirmed above, it is in my view expensive in comparison to a more traditional method (employed by many developers/operators of student accommodation) whereby the finance would be secured from a bank or other finance institution, the scheme built out, the units marketed during the course of the development programme, with completion of the lettings to students taking place after practical completion of the scheme has been achieved. Subsequent to this the completed scheme would either be sold or retained and operated by the developer.

The Applicant has confirmed their finance cost of £250,750 together with agent's fees of 11% (for identification of the investors/purchasers and negotiating the forward funding of the scheme by them) in the sum of £792,550 – ie. a total of £1,043,300. My appraisal, which assumes the acquisition of finance and disposal of the units by the more traditional method detailed above, shows an interest cost of £238,764 and sales fees £212,000, which gives a total cost in these respects of £450,764.

Whilst I appreciate the benefits of the Applicant's business model, it can be seen from the above that it is £592,536 more expensive than proceeding traditionally, and it is my view therefore that the majority of developers of student accommodation would finance and dispose of the scheme using the traditional, more cost-effective method.

I therefore remain of the opinion that the costs which I have provided for in my appraisal in these respects are reasonable”.

The purpose of an appraisal, is always to determine what the financial position is on the assumption that a rational and logical approach is taken by the developer, rather than to allow for the particular business practices of any particular individual developer. On this basis and given the apparently significant difference in the “cost” of the two options, with the applicants approach being much more expensive, it is considered that the DV's approach should be utilised in any viability appraisal for planning purposes.

The second issue is what the benchmark value should be. In his draft report the DV concluded that the benchmark value against which the Residual Land Value of the scheme should be measured was £538,000. However the applicant paid £1.4 million for the site and he contends that figure should be the benchmark value

In response the DV has advised as follows

“The Draft Report was undertaken in accordance with the NPPF key principles regarding viability as published on 6th March 2014 and updated on 24th July 2018. Specifically, the approach recommended for the assessment of benchmark land value and referred to in the Guidance as EUV+, was implemented in my assessment of viability. This revised NPPF Guidance states that “a benchmark land value should be established on the basis of the existing use value (EUV) of the land, plus a premium for the landowner” (in order to incentivise the landowner to sell the land for development). It goes on to say that “EUV is the value of the land in its existing use together with the right to implement any development for which there are policy compliant extant planning consents” and that “where viability assessment is used to inform decision making under no circumstances will the price paid for land be a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan”.

The Guidance goes on to say that the alternative use value (AUV) “of the land may be informative in establishing benchmark land value. If applying alternative uses when establishing benchmark land value these should be limited to those uses which have an existing implementable permission for that use”. It also states that “valuation based on AUV includes the premium to the landowner. If evidence of AUV is being considered the premium to the landowner must not be double counted”.

Accordingly, it was considered that extant Planning Consent Number: 16/00796/OUT for the provision of 92 no. units of Student accommodation within the converted former Orme Centre and a new building, would derive best value and would also provide the incentive for

the landowner to sell for development, as referred to in the Guidance. The land value was assessed on this basis using a Residual Land Valuation and a value of £538,000 was derived.

Additionally, in accordance with the Guidance, I would confirm that the purchase price of £1,400,000 paid by the Applicant was not taken into account. Subsequent to the provision of the Draft Report I have not found or been provided with any evidence to support the Applicant's contention that this figure comprises the land value to be used for benchmarking purposes in the assessment of the scheme's viability, and it continues to be my view that the figure of £538,000 comprises the land value as at the date of the Draft Report".

As will be noted the DV has not been persuaded by sight of the "underbidders" offer of £1.315 million. Whilst the DV did show a willingness to take into account information relating to the sale of the land in January 2018, particularly if it had been in the form of a number of unconditional offers from parties of substance, he is not satisfied that there is good enough evidence that a truly market value of the site has been paid. Indeed he contends that it would appear from the appraisals that he has undertaken that the applicant has overpaid for the site, and the NPPG does make it clear that under no circumstances should the price paid for land be justification for failing to make to accord with relevant policies in the plan (ie for not making the contributions required by planning policy). Although it accepted that the presumption against the consideration of viability appraisals at the decision-making stage does not yet apply in Newcastle, because of the out of date nature of the Local Plan, the principle – of the very limited weight to be given to "price paid" in such appraisals is very relevant to the decision.

A further factor which the applicant has referred to is that the Council did accept, in relation to the 2016 scheme that that scheme was not viable with the contributions that it required – which amounted at the time to some £145,608 . Your Officer's view on that argument is that any assessment of viability has to take into account the circumstances at the time, and the advice received at that time – which was not from the DV – that the appropriate benchmark site value was only £240,000. The circumstances that should be taken into account have changed, and no "precedent" has been set.

The NPPG indicates that the weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including the transparency of assumptions behind evidence submitted as part of the viability assessment.

Your Officers' recommendation is that given it would be appropriate for the Council to seek the contributions and accordingly the recommendation now given with respect this application is amended to read as follows

- (1) Subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 obligation by agreement by 12th November 2018 requiring**
 - a. financial contributions to the enhancement and maintenance of Queen Elizabeth Park of £124,560 (allowing for the extant permission) and a travel plan monitoring fee of £2,200**
 - b. a financial contribution of £50,000 to be used to fund a Resident Parking Zone in the event that it has been demonstrated (through surveys secured by condition) that the development has resulted in on street parking problems**

PERMIT subject to conditions relating to the matters listed in the recommendation section of the agenda report

(2) Failing completion by the date referred to in the above resolution (1) of the above planning obligation, that the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to either refuse the planning application on the grounds that in the absence of a secured planning obligation the public open space needs of the development would not be met and the development would fail to ensure it achieves sustainable development outcomes; or if he considers it appropriate, to extend the period of time within which the obligation can be secured.

This page is intentionally left blank

A500 BETWEEN M6 JUNCTION 16 AND THE MEREMOOR MOSS ROUNDABOUT
CHESHIRE EAST HIGHWAYS

Cheshire East ref 18/3766N (NulBC ref 348/255)

The Borough Council has been consulted by Cheshire East Council on an application for planning permission which they have received from Cheshire East Highways for the dualling of an existing 3.3 km stretch of the A500 between junction 16 and the Meremoor Moss Roundabout (at the point where the A500 joins with the A531 and the B5472

For any comments that the Borough Council may have on these proposals to be taken into account, they have to be received by the City Council by no later than 14th September.

RECOMMENDATION

That Cheshire East Council be informed that the Borough Council supports the planning application on the grounds that it would improve journey times and assist in the economic development of the area

Reason for Recommendation

The proposals are in accordance with the Council's priorities including that of being a "borough of opportunity".

Key Issues

The planning application upon which the Borough Council has been consulted by Cheshire East Planning Authority is for an upgrade of the existing stretch of the A500 between the M6 Junction 16 and the Meremoor Moss roundabout. The proposal is to widen the existing road to the south of the existing alignment. The A500 begins at Nantwich as a dual carriageway, then travels eastwards, passing to the south of Crewe, until the junction at the Meremoor Moss Roundabout, from which it currently continues as a single carriageway road until it connects to the M6 at Junction 16. To the east of the M6 the A500 continues as dual carriageway towards Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle.

A very small part of the application site (approximately 1% of the site area) lies within the boundary of the Borough. The Borough Council at its meeting on 16th May 2015 resolved inter alia to delegate to Cheshire East Council the discharge of the Borough Council's planning control functions to determine, insofar as it relates to the land that lies within the Borough, the cross boundary planning application that has now been made.

The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement, which is viewable on the Cheshire East Website. If you are viewing this report electronically [please click here](#). The most accessible document is the Non-Technical Summary of the Environmental Statement

The Planning Statement submitted with the application says that the section of A500 between the M6 Junction 16 and the Meremoor Moss Roundabout was constructed in the mid-1980s but development in eastern Crewe and the construction of the A500 Hough Shavington Bypass immediately to the west (opened to traffic in 2003) have generated a significant increase in traffic flows, causing congestion. It is also indicated that the proposed developments required to deliver "All Change for Crewe" and included in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy will generate more traffic, and exacerbated problems on the A500.

Cheshire East's objectives for the proposed scheme are indicated as being as follows

- to support the economic, physical and social regeneration of Crewe and the wider Constellation Partnership area (which includes the North Staffordshire conurbation)
- to improve journey time and reliability
- to improve the reliability of public transport;
- to improve connectivity between important economic centres, Local Enterprise Partnerships, local authority areas, regions and to North Wales

- to support delivery of key national infrastructure i.e. HS2 and the Crewe Hub station
- to support delivery of key employment and housing allocations
- to boost business integration and productivity; improve the efficiency and reliability of the highway network; reduce the conflict between local and strategic traffic, and provide an improved route for freight and business travel; and
- to facilitate future improvements to M6 Junction 16

The existing road has a speed limit of 60 mph, once the road has been dualled it is envisaged that the speed limit will be 70mph and the geometry of the road has been developed on that basis

In responding to such consultations the Planning Committee, on behalf of the Borough Council, as a whole usually takes a view on whether the proposal which is the subject of the application can be considered to be in the strategic interests of the Borough. Given the significant number of journey to work flows by residents of the Borough in the Crewe direction there can be little doubt that the proposal would assist them in such journeys, if undertaken by car, and would have a wider economic benefit for the area including the Borough. It is less clear how the development will improve the reliability of public transport other than by the easing of congestion along it, but it is recognised that the development does directly address an existing "bottleneck" along the strategic highway network.

In terms of more specific impacts on the Borough the road, and its associated impact upon the character and appearance of the area and residential amenity, already exists. Because of the alignment of the Borough boundary (which will be viewable on a plan to be displayed at the Committee) only one property Domville Farm within the borough could be described as being within the vicinity of the road widening, and this property is some 700 metres from the road, (and considerably closer to the M6)

Date report prepared: 3rd September 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

Published 7 September, 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
11th September 2018

Agenda item 8

Application ref: 18/00465/FUL

Land adj 45 Moran Road, Knutton

Since the publication of the agenda report further consultation advice has been received from the **Landscape Development Section** of the Council.

The **Landscape Development Section** advises that should a public open contribution be sought it would be used for improvements at Pool Dam (a nearby Local Nature Reserve) to interpretation information (signage, information boards etc.). Pool Dam is a 360m walk from the site and is classed as a Semi-natural Area within the Council's Open Space Strategy.

They also now note given the one bedroom nature of the development applied for the play element of the expected contribution should be removed from the original sum requested. This reduction has already been applied within the amount recommended in the report.

It is therefore now advised the RECOMMENDATION be revised to the following:-

A. Subject to the applicant first entering into a section 106 obligation securing a financial contribution of £9,866 towards public open space improvements and maintenance at Pool Fam (local nature reserve), by 9th November 2018, PERMIT subject to conditions relating to:-

- 1. Time Limit.**
- 2. Plans.**
- 3. Approved external materials.**
- 4. Detailed hard and soft landscaping provision.**
- 5. The provision of parking and turning areas.**
- 6. Provision of surface water drainage provision.**
- 7. Provision of secure weatherproof cycle storage.**
- 8. Site investigation and remediation works to deal with historical coal mining risk.**
- 9. Construction operational hours outside of the hours of 18:00 and 07:00 Monday to Friday, no time on Sundays, Bank Holidays or after 13:00 on any Saturday.**

B. Failing completion of the above planning obligation by the date referred to in the above recommendation, that the Head of Planning either refuse the application on the grounds that without the obligation being secured, the development would fail to secure an appropriate contribution for off-site public open space which would reflect the infrastructure needs of the development; or, if he considers it appropriate, to extend the period of time within which the obligation can be secured.

This page is intentionally left blank

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

11TH SEPTEMBER 2018

Agenda Item 10

Application Ref. 18/00657/FUL

16 St Michaels Road, Cross Heath, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Since the publication of the main agenda report, comments have been received from the **Highway Authority** and **Landscape Development Section**.

The **Highway Authority** raises no objections to the proposed development subject to conditions to secure the parking area, access and its surfacing prior to the first use. An informative should also be included on any permission granted drawing the applicants attention to the requirement for a Section 184 approval from Staffordshire County Council.

The **Landscape Development Section** note that the existing Hawthorn tree in the road verge is of sufficient distance away that it's BS5387:2012 Root Protection Area will not be affected by the proposed access, providing the tarmac access does not unduly exceed the specified 3.6m width from the eastern boundary of the property. As such no objections are raised and permission should be subject to tree protection to BS5387:2012 being carried out during the construction phase of the scheme.

The recommendation remains to PERMIT as per the main agenda report but with amended conditions and informatives as now recommended as follows:

- 1. Time limit relating to the commencement of development**
- 2. Approved plans**
- 3. Completion of parking/access prior to first use**
- 4. Provision of access/parking areas in a bound and porous material prior to first use**
- 5. Tree protection measures during construction**

Informative included drawing the applicants' attention to the requirement for a Section 184 Notice of Approval from Staffordshire County Council prior to construction commencing.

This page is intentionally left blank

Application for Financial Assistance (Historic Buildings Grants) from the Conservation and Heritage Fund for Prospect House, Main Road, Betley (Ref: 18/19002/HBG).

RECOMMENDATION:

That the following grant is approved:-

- 1. £2,178 to overhaul and repair 6 windows at the property, subject to the appropriate standard conditions**

Purpose of report

To enable members to consider the application for financial assistance.

Prospect House (Grade II) is a former large dwelling, with attached schoolroom, now split into 2 dwellings. Known as The Croft and Prospect House, the latter is on the left hand side. Built in the early 19th Century at the south end of Betley village the 3 storey building is set back from the main road with the schoolroom (currently being refurbished) attached - The Croft.

Built from brick with plain tile roof, the windows are in need of general overhauling and the owner has achieved 2 quotations from reputable firms capable of such renovation for 6 of the windows.

The total cost of the works is estimated at £10,890.41. The works are eligible for a grant of up to 20% or up to a maximum of £5,000.

The Conservation Advisory Working Party will consider this application at their meeting on the 4th September and their recommendations will be reported to the Committee.

Financial Implications

There is sufficient funding to meet the grant applications with £32,000 in the Fund allowing for commitments.

This page is intentionally left blank

Published 7 September, 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
11th September 2018

Agenda item 12

Application for financial assistance (Historic Buildings Grant) – Prospect House, Main Road, Betley

The Conservation Advisory Working Party have recommended to the Planning Committee that the application be approved.

This page is intentionally left blank

Published 7 September, 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
11th September 2018

Agenda item 13

Register of Locally Important Buildings and Structures in Newcastle-under-Lyme - 2018 Review

The Conservation Advisory Working Party has recommended to the Planning Committee that the additions to the Register, as set out in Section 1 of the main report be agreed.

This page is intentionally left blank