

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 7.00PM ON MONDAY 8TH MAY 2017 AT THE CIVIC HALL,
POYNTON.

PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr L A Clarke

Cllrs: M Beanland, C Gorst, L Podmore, Mrs J Saunders and G Smith

SO56: Cllr H Murray

Part A

1. Recording of meeting

The Deputy Clerk confirmed that the meeting is recorded for the purposes of minute taking and the recording is deleted within a week when the draft minutes are produced.

There were no other declarations of a recording of the meeting.

It was proposed that the order of the agenda is amended and planning application 17/2129M, 18 Shrigley Road North is taken as the next item of business on the agenda after the approval of the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the order of the agenda is amended and planning application 17/2129M, 18 Shrigley Road North is taken as the next items of business on the agenda after the approval of the minutes (NC)

2. Questions from members of the public

There were no questions from members of the public

3. Apologies for absence

Cllrs T Holbrook, I Hollingworth, M Sewart

4. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests

Cllr Podmore declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application 17/2129M and will abstain from the vote.

Cllrs Clarke, declared an interest in planning application 17/2067M and will leave the meeting for this item.

5. Approve minutes of meeting held 24th March 2017

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning and Environment committee meeting held on 24th March 2017 are approved (NC)

10.4 17/2129M, 18 Shrigley Road North

The Chair outlined the procedure and explained that people could speak for three minutes on the application. All questions must be directed through the Chair.

The Chair invited members of the public to speak.

Mr Keith Farrell spoke in favour of application 17/2129M and noted the following points:

- There is a desperate need for more properties in Poynton;
- This is in an in-fill position;
- Concerns over the last application related to parking and the provision of utilities, however no parking was being taken away and the new houses had their own parking on site. In any event the highways department and utility companies will all be asked to comment on the application.

Hayley Whittaker, 5 Shrigley Road North spoke on behalf of residents in attendance at the meeting against the application as follows:

- Due to the narrowness of Shrigley Road North additional turning movements would be required. Whilst the yellow lines have eased some of the traffic, there continued to be concerns over the level of traffic on busy days in the summer. Parking on the opposite side of the road is the issue, residents currently park there as they have no other option. This parking would make turning out of 18 Shrigley Road North hazardous;
- CE state that the minimum off road parking requirement for a four-bedroom property is three spaces and this isn't shown on the current application. Therefore, the parking spaces shown are inadequate;
- The pre-advice Mr Farrell used in support of his previous application was for four semi-detached properties and knocking down the existing bungalow. Cllrs should consider whether this was the likely in the long term, a two step process would allow the developer to negate the rules on infill in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- In relation to the Green Belt the NPPF states that the baseline for constructing a new building should be deemed to be inappropriate unless there are very special circumstances. No special circumstances have been put forward by the developer;
- The current plan does impact on the openness of Green Belt which is enjoyed by residents and visitors;
- The houses, as they are proposed, are three storeys and out of character with the neighbouring properties. They would tower over the remaining bungalow.

Cllrs asked for clarification on the differences between this current application and the previous application. The previous application was for five houses the current application is for two houses and to retain the existing bungalow.

Cllr Clarke explained that the Town Council could only decide on the application before them and not on the basis of what the developer might do in the future.

Cllr Saunders asked for clarification on the development of gardens of existing houses within the Green Belt. Cllr Clarke confirmed that previous research had been done by the Town Council and the Government did not treat the residential gardens as brownfield although the footprint on an existing building would be considered brownfield.

The committee members viewed the plans and made following resolution.

RESOLVED: Poynton Town Council recommends rejection on the basis of:

- 1. The development is sited in the Green Belt and the development is contrary to the policies set out in the Macclesfield Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework relating to the Green Belt and in particular the principle of openness in the Green Belt.**
- 2. RO3HW additional turning movements due to Shrigley Road North being a narrow road and would be contrary to highway safety.**
- 3. The plans seem to show fewer parking spaces than would be required for properties of this size. There are only two parking spaces per house, despite them having four bedrooms.**
- 4. The proposed 3 storey development is out of character with neighbouring properties including the remaining bungalow on the site.**

4 for, 2 abstentions (Cllrs Podmore and Mrs Saunders)

6. Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy update

a) The Site Allocations and Development Policies Document: Issues Paper; Call for Sites; The Community Infrastructure Levy: Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule; The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report were submitted to Cheshire East prior to the deadline of the 10th April 2017.

RESOLVED: That the responses submitted are received (NC)

b) Members received the Spatial Planning Update for March and were asked to receive and consider the April 2017 Spatial Planning Update which had been published since the agenda had been issued.

Cllr Saunders informed the Committee that herself and Cllr M Sewart and Mrs J Sewart had met to prepare a response to the playing pitch assessment and strategy.

RESOLVED: That the Spatial Planning Updates for March and April are received. That the preparation of the response to the Playing Pitch Consultation Assessment is delegated to Cllr Mrs J Saunders, Mrs J Sewart and Mr M Sewart (NC)

c) Correspondence had been received from Adrian Fisher, Head of Planning Strategy and Cheshire East Council relating to the document identifying Higher Poynton as a separate settlement.

RESOLVED: That the correspondence dated 29th March 2017, from Poynton Town Council to Adrian Fisher, Head of Planning Strategy at Cheshire East Council and the response received dated the 5th April 2017 was received (NC)

d) It was noted that the Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document contains no proposals for mineral extraction in Poynton or adjoining Poynton.

RESOLVED: That the correspondence from Adrian Fisher is received. The Town Council respond to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document Consultation stating that we support that the plan contains no proposals for mineral extraction in Poynton or adjoining Poynton.

e) Cllr Lee Podmore had prepared a written report on the Local Plan implications for Poynton. Meetings had been held with David Rutley MP as well as representatives from Cheshire East Council and also Town Planner, Paul Goodman.

A number of points had arisen from the meetings with Cheshire East:

- In 2010 a decision had been taken to make Higher Poynton a distinct settlement and it was not considered part of Poynton for housing completions and commitment numbers.
- Cheshire East Council had added the number of completions and commitments between April 2010 and March 2016 to the number of houses allocated to be built rather than deducted the number from the 650 new houses. Poynton therefore had a figure of 693 new houses as opposed to 650.
- Cheshire East believed that the two episodes of flooding in 2016 were brought on by flash flooding as a result of exceptional weather.
- Despite twelve housing units per year being built in Poynton, which would, over the remaining plan period, provide an additional 156 units, Cheshire East have refused to include these in figures for Poynton

Cllr Gorst and Podmore had also met with Paul Goodman, a former Town Planner who had informed them that the planning inspector had had a number of his plans called in.

A number of recommendations were suggested in the report:

1. That the Town Council approach David Rutley asking him to speak to the leader again with the following request;
That Cheshire East Council agree that Poynton has a figure of no more than 650 Units during the plan period (as agreed at the meeting held with The Leader of Cheshire East Council; Rachel Bailey, Head of Planning; Adrian Fisher, David Rutley and representatives from Poynton Town Council)
 - a. This is made up of the strategic sites (450 units)
 - b. Plus units built in Poynton so far. Based on Cheshire East Council figures of around 48.
 - c. Plus allowance of 12 infill units per year which would give 156. This figure needs to be taken into account as whilst not marked on a map, there is a clear precedence indicating an average of 12 units per year in the preceding years.
 - d. This would give 654 Units over the plan period without releasing any further land.
 - e. If the council wished to have a buffer for additional units, then Vernon Infants School, which is owned by Cheshire East could support a further 30 units (based upon consultation with residents). This would then total 684 Units over the plan period.
2. Poynton Town Council formally rejects the revised Local Plan, and calls upon Cheshire East to withdraw it from the Inspector until (a) Poynton is treated fairly, and (b) the Plan is made compliant with the NPPF.
3. In the event that Cheshire East fails to comply with the first and second recommendation, the Town Council request David Rutley MP to ask the Minister to withhold approval from the Plan.
4. The Town Council investigates holding a local referendum to ask Poynton residents to reject the revised Local Plan.
5. A further meeting be held with Mr Goodman to consider whether legal action may be appropriate. No decision on this will be made without the agreement of the full Town Council.

John Knight reported that the Secretary of State had withdrawn the holding direction in both the Bradford and Birmingham cases and had decided not to intervene. The Government had taken the view that the NPPF was not explicit in requiring councils to consider all other options before the release of Green Belt land. The Government was currently consulting on proposals to amend the NPPF but this would not be concluded before the Inspector produced his final report on the Cheshire East Local Plan. There is a strong possibility that if David Rutley asked the Housing Minister to intervene that a similar response would be forthcoming.

There is a six week period for challenge following the publication of the Inspector's final report. It is possible that the publication of the report will be delayed until after the election.

RESOLVED: That the report is received. The Town Council requests that David Rutley approaches Cheshire East Council with a demand that they limit any building in Poynton to 650 houses which should be written into

the Local Plan. All houses built since 1st April 2010 should be included towards the housing target for Poynton.

Due to the confidential nature of the business of this part of the agenda item, under SO71 it is proposed to put forward a motion to exclude members of the public during discussion of this agenda item.

RESOLVED: That members of the public are excluded during discussions of this agenda item (NC)

7. Neighbourhood Plan update

- a) **RESOLVED: That the verbal update on the Neighbourhood Plan from Cllr Podmore is received (NC)**
- b) **RESOLVED: That the correspondence from David Rutley MP is received (NC)**
- c) **RESOLVED: That the award of £9,000 to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for a movement study was noted**

8. Housing White Paper

The response to the housing white paper had been approved under SO51 and submitted prior to the deadline of the 2nd May 2017.

RESOLVED: That the Town Council submitted response to the Housing White Paper is received (NC)

9. Approve Prior Application 17/2089M

The prior approval application to convert offices into flats at Sovereign House, London Road South, Poynton was discussed.

RESOLVED: Poynton Town Council recommends no objection but would formally request that the additional housing should count towards the Poynton Housing target figures contained within the Local Plan (NC)

Mr Knight left the meeting at 8.25pm.

10. Applications received to date

10.1) 17/2016M, 282 Park Lane, Poynton, SK12 1RQ
Applicant: Mr David Bates

RESOLVED: Poynton Town Council recommends no objection in principle but are concerned that the stream at the rear of the property

flooded extensively in June 2016 and that any development should be designed accordingly, so it does not flood when a similar event occurs again (NC)

10.2) 17/2054M, 17 Nickleby Road, Poynton, SK12 1LE

Applicant: Mr Paul Stewart

RESOLVED: Poynton Town Council recommends no objection (NC)

Cllr Clarke had declared an interest in this item and left the meeting. Cllr Podmore chaired the meeting for this item

10.3) 17/2067M, 19 Moreton Drive, Poynton, SK12 1FA

Applicant: Mr Paul Anthony Clare

RESOLVED: Poynton Town Council recommends no objection (NC)

Cllr Clarke returned to the meeting and re-took the chair

10.5 17/2137M, 45 Anglesey Drive, Poynton, SK12 1BU

Applicant: Mr I Howson

RESOLVED: Poynton Town Council recommends no objection (NC)

Additions Agenda Item 7d

RESOLVED: That the Hulme Walfield & Somerford Booths Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Pre-submission Statement is received (NC)

11. Communication messages

Members agreed the following communication message:

- That the Town Council requested that David Rutley MP intervene with Cheshire East on the Local Plan

RESOLVED: That the communication message stated is approved (NC)

Meeting End Time: 8.30pm

Part B

This section of the meeting minutes have been removed from the public record under Town Council Standing Order 71.