



Goostrey Parish Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the MEETING on TUESDAY 9th OCTOBER at 7.00PM

IN THE VILLAGE HALL LOUNGE

Present: Cllrs Morris (Chairman), Craggs (Vice- Chairman), Rathbone & Williams

In attendance: S Jones, Clerk and 9 members of the public

1. **Declarations of Interest** – Cllr Williams declared an interest in application 18/4949C – Fairfields, Blackden Lane, as the it is a neighbouring property.
2. **Apologies for Absence** - Apologies for absence were received from Cllr McCubbin.
3. **Minutes of the Meeting of 11th September 2018** - The Minutes of the Meeting on 11th September were accepted as a true recod of the meeting.
4. **Planning Applications**
 - **18/4872C** - 2, SWANWICK CLOSE, - Alterations to front porch – Comments due by 23rd October. **Decision:** *No objection.*
 - **18/4695C** - Pear Tree Farm, BOMISH LANE - Change of use from store to ancillary living accommodation – Comments due by 31st October. **Decision:** *No objection.*
 - **18/4658C** - 27, BOOTH BED LANE - Rear facing single storey extension and front facing two storey extension – Comments due by 17th October. **Decision:** *No objection.*
 - **18/4659C** - 29, BOOTH BED LANE - Rear facing single storey extension and front facing two storey extension – Comments due by 12th October. **Decision:** *No objection.*
 - **18/4764C** - 28, BANK VIEW - First floor rear/side extension to dwelling – Comments due by 17th October. **Decision:** *No objection.*
 - **18/4700C** - Wood Corner, GOOSTREY LANE - Replacement dwelling - Comments due by 24th October. **Decision:** *No objection*, but we ask that the building incorporates the usual protections against radio emissions which could affect the Jodrell Bank Observatory. We also ask that the building meets the Lifetime Homes Design Guide as required by the Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan Policy VDLC1 Part (g).
 - **18/4723C** - 61, MAIN ROAD - Partial demolition of existing dwelling and construction of an extension - Comments due by 12th October. 61 Main Road. **Decision:** Comment: If the Jodrell Bank Observatory raises an objection, we would support them as there would be a conflict with Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan Policies SC2 and HOU1. We also ask that the building meets the Lifetime Homes Design Guide as required by the Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan Policy VDLC1 Part (g).
 - **18/4731C** - WOODSIDE COTTAGE, BOOTH BED LANE - Proposed Replacement of hedgerow for new brick boundary wall and new entrance gates - Comments due by 17th October. **Decision:** Object. The Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan (page 136) states that walls and gates should not be taller than 1.0m along the highway frontage. It also states that gates should be set back from the carriageway by at least 5m to allow a vehicle to stop off the road prior to access. A wall of this size and length would be out of character with the street scene in this area and we recommend that the hedge is preserved. We also note that the oak tree close to the proposed left-hand gatepost is protected by a TPO and its root structure could be affected. We therefore recommend that the CEC arboriculturist is asked to comment on this as they appear to have overlooked the TPO in their report, which only comments on the hedge removal.

- **18/4510C** - Mount Pleasant Caravan Park, 60, MAIN ROAD - Demolition of 60 & 60a Main Road & garage blocks & the redevelopment of the site with 9 no. park homes & ancillary works - Comments due by 17th October. **Decision:** *Object (see Appendix)*
- 5. Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) Consultation** – The Committee resolved to recommend that the Parish Council submits the response proposed by the Chairman.
- 6. Update on Planning Enforcement Issues**
- **Waste Site at Blackden Firs** – The Clerk reported that the Enforcement Officer had asked for evidence of full skip lorries travelling to the site. Any evidence should be sent to the Clerk to forward to Planning Enforcement.
 - **51/61 Main Road outstanding planning applications by Henderson Homes** – Henderson Homes have said they will make good the pavement, but they may decide to appeal the refusal of their applications for more houses as 6 months has not yet elapsed.
- 7. Correspondence**
- To consider any correspondence received since the last meeting: - Complaint from residents of Lea Avenue regarding kennels at a property on Birch Tree Lane. There is a noise complaint as the dogs bark a lot and they also there could be a welfare issue for the dogs. It is perceived that the kennels may be run as a business. The Committee will advise residents to make their own report to Planning Enforcement and Environmental Health at Cheshire East. **Action:** Clerk to notify Cheshire East.
- 8. Minor Items and Items for the Next Meeting.**
- **Applications received after the agenda for this meeting was issued** – review of applications to be added to the next Planning Meeting Agenda.
 - **18/4949C** – Fairfields, Blackden Lane – Demolish existing 1930s dwelling and replace with an updated remodelled property – Comments due by 31st October 2018
- 9. To confirm date of the next** -The date of the next meeting is to be arranged.

Public Session

Mount Pleasant Park Planning Application – Residents highlighted a number of inaccuracies in the planning application including:

- The change from an in and out to a single entrance/exit, including width of the road and pedestrian access
- Right of way to Dromedary Lodge
- Reduced number of parking spaces with demolition of garages
- Sewage – connection to existing drainage
- Trees
- Bats
- No pavement but the road is wide but if its narrowed there won't be enough room.

APPENDIX

4. Planning Applications - 18/4510C. Mount Pleasant Goostrey.

Goostrey Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons.

1. The site is in direct radio sight of the Lovell telescope, so the new dwellings are very likely to cause cumulative radio interference which would conflict with Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan (GNP) Policies SC2 and HOU1 which seek to protect the Observatory.
2. The proposed new park homes would be visible from Main road and cause an adverse impact on the street scene which would conflict with GNP Policy VDLC1 (d) which says 'Be sympathetic to the character of the local parish environment, the rural street scene, the linear and street frontage layout of development'.
3. It appears that 16 garages are to be removed which will reduce the parking space and storage space available for existing residents and may force vehicles of residents and visitors to be parked on Main Road.

4. It is unclear whether new garages/storage spaces are to be provided for the new dwellings as there is no mention of these in the application and no elevations are shown. If no storage space is provided there will be a conflict with the intention of GNP Policy HOU5.
 5. GNP Policy TTT2 requires that '*New developments, other than cul-de-sacs of up to 20 dwellings, should include a footway ('pavement') on at least one side of the road for pedestrians.*' The new entrance appears to be narrow and does not include a footway causing a danger to cars and pedestrians entering and leaving the site.
 6. GNP Policy TTT2 also says that '*All new housing or employment developments shall, where possible, include public footpaths or bridleways which link the development to the existing public footpath and bridleway system.*' However, the proposal would remove a long-established footpath/cut-through that links Mount Pleasant directly to Goostrey footpath Number 9.
 7. GNP Policy HOU7 says '*Densities for new developments should not exceed around 15 dwellings per hectare*' and that they should '*not exceed the density of adjoining residential development (existing or permitted)*'. The proposal is for 9 dwellings in 0.35 hectares which is 25dph and is far in excess of 15dph. It is also much higher than the existing density of that area (see GNP Appendix 6.25, page 106 which shows Zone 3 including Mount Pleasant is only 13.6dph).
 8. There are no bat, ecology or arboriculture surveys provided and no landscape plan.
5. **Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) Consultation** - This is the response that the Planning Committee will recommend to the Parish Council at the October Parish Council Meeting.

Proposed Comments on CEC SADPD Consultation for Goostrey Parish Council

It is proposed that the following comments are submitted:

1. Support for the proposed changes to the Village Settlement Boundary.
2. Support for the absence of allocated sites (due to the potential effect on JBO).
3. Point out that the house between the Pharmacy and Mrs Kettle's shop should not be included as part of the retail 'Local Centre'.

It is also proposed that the following specific comments are also submitted:

Paragraph 12.3 Site Allocations (CEC propose no site allocations in Goostrey)

Comment only

Agree with the position on Goostrey but point out that FD30 is wrong to state in para 2.1 that Goostrey village has a population of 3,800 people. The ONS Census of 2011 shows that the population of the entire Goostrey Parish is only 2,179, so the figure in FD30 is not credible and should be corrected.

Policy HOU12 Housing Density (CEC propose 30dph, higher in LSC's)

Object

In Policy HOU12 part 2i, reference to local service centres having a higher density should be removed. A number of the LSC's are villages in the countryside with existing lower density, so the landscape and townscape character would be expected to dictate lower (not higher densities). 2i just adds confusion because para 1 already covers different circumstances, so there seems no point in then adding an opposing statement which will lead to costly Appeal arguments about whether 1.i or 2.i should prevail, especially in the smaller LSC's. As an example, the made Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan Policy HOU7 (which is part of the Development Plan) states that "Densities for new developments should not exceed 15dph", the evidence accepted by the Inspector in that case shows this is because the average density across Goostrey village is only 12.8dph.

Paragraph 8.26 Housing Standards (CEC propose new houses should be adaptable)

Support

Support including M4(2). This is already included in the made Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan (Policy VDLC1 part g) which says that 'The layout and Design of new housing and extensions to existing housing in Goostrey shall satisfy the following local design principles g) Design to comply with 'Building for Life 12' and 'Lifetime Homes Design Guide'. The latter is equivalent to M4(2) and was accepted by the NP Examiner. This can well be justified by the fact that the population is ageing and living longer across the UK as well as in CE, so there will inevitably be more people who need wheelchair and other wider and closer access (both residents and visitors). However, it is also justified by the need to accommodate children and the disabled. It would be irresponsible to allow new houses to be built which cannot be readily adapted to plan for this inevitable and entirely predictable requirement.

Paragraph 2.5 Policy PG8 Spatial Distribution and Settlements

Comment only

Support the proposed new housing figure for Goostrey. However there is a mistake in FD30. Para 2.1 of FD30 says "Goostrey is a village with its own settlement boundary.....Ithas a 2016 mid-year population estimate of 3,800 people". The 2011 ONS Census shows that the entire population of the Parish of Goostrey only had a population of 2,179, so it is impossible that the village of Goostrey has a population 74% higher than the entire parish. This factual error should be corrected.

Paragraph 2.4 Policy PG8 Spatial Distribution and Settlements

Comment only

Agree with the proposed number of 16 new homes for Goostrey due to JBO. However the method of calculation of the different scenarios in FD05 is illogical. For Goostrey FD05 (eg Table 23) says that the existing number of dwellings is 1,594 even though the entirety of Goostrey Parish is only 956 dwellings (ONS Census 2011 figure). The explanation given by CEC senior officers to the Inspector at the Local Plan hearings was that at the time of work on the LP in 2012, only the Lower Super Output Area figures were available. But that was 6 years ago and the Parish figures have been available since then, so there doesn't seem to be any reason why the correct figures cannot be used now. The higher figure used appears to be the combined figures of Goostrey Parish, Cranage Parish, Twemlow Parish and Swettenham Parish, but the residents of these latter 3 parishes are closer to, and much more likely to use, Holmes Chapel LSC than Goostrey so counting them as a physical part of Goostrey doesn't make sense. A further difficulty is that any new houses built in Cranage Parish, Twemlow Parish or Swettenham Parish are not being counted towards the total for Goostrey as they are outside Goostrey village boundary. So bizarrely, as more houses are built in "Goostrey" outside the settlement boundary (eg in the other 3 parishes), these are not counted as built, but instead they drive the calculation in the methodology to require more houses to be built inside the Goostrey settlement boundary. Neither the Local Plan nor the SADPD, nor any of the supporting documents give a specific definition of when houses are to be counted as delivered for the LSC and when they are counted as 'rural' (or why). I accept that JBO is an overarching affect, but since the Goostrey NP has to do its calculations according to the Goostrey Parish boundary and ONS figures (and is part of the Development Plan) the SADPD throws up a conflicting and confusing method of assessment for future decision makers at all levels.

Paragraph 8.39 Policy HOU11 Distance between new houses

Object

The standards only cover space between 'buildings'. Suggest a fourth category of 'Habitable room facing a blank wall or fence'. It seems illogical that a distance of 14 metres is required for 'Habitable room facing non-habitable room' (which includes a blank wall as per para 8.39), but that relates only to space between 'buildings'. There is nothing to stop a blank garden wall or fence being constructed just millimetres from the sole or principal window in a habitable room, for example on a boundary, unless 'buildings' is defined as including any permanent construction. There is no definition of 'buildings' in the Glossary so suggest that one is added and includes 'any permanent construction'.

Paragraph 5.9 – Policy HER7 World Heritage Site – Protection of JBO

Support

Fully support this, JBO is an active scientific institution with a world renowned reputation for continuing to carry out cutting edge science. It is the third largest fully steerable radio telescope in the world. When it is also inscribed by UNESCO as having Outstanding Universal Value, it will be one of the most important assets in the Borough.