

Report of Visiting Team
Monday 14 August 2023 from 10.00 am

PRESENT

Councillor Steve Gribbon (Lead Councillor); Councillors Rosemary Barratt, Sue Glithero, Mark Jones, Wendy Meikle and Rachel Wise.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

2. SITE VISIT

Councillors visited the following sites and made a recommendation for consideration by the Planning & Highways Regulation Committee. Councillors were requested to refer to the plans list for a full report on the applications and details of objections and observations received. The Visiting Team recommendation was made without prejudice to the formal consideration of the application by the Committee.

- (i) DC/082329 – RAILWAY COTTAGE, 7A RYDAL AVENUE, HAZEL GROVE, STOCKPORT, SK7 5AW

Application for Outline Planning Permission with Access and Layout to be considered, all other matters reserved, for the erection of 2no. three-bedroom detached dwelling houses (Use Class C3(a)) within the garden of 7a Rydal Avenue, including associated parking and incidental development.

Members conducted a thorough site visit and considered the safety concerns around the proposed access to and parking for the proposed dwellings in terms of intensification of use and visibility at the junction with Rydal Avenue.

Members made the following comments/ observations:

- It was noted that the widened access with pedestrian visibility splays at the junction with Rydal Avenue provides space for vehicles to pass on the shared driveway and for bin storage on bin collection days.
- Members queried whether the proposed development would intensify the issue of on street parking on Rydal Avenue. In response, Members were advised that the application included the provision of two parking spaces per dwelling, which accords with the council's maximum parking standards and guidelines.
- Members queried whether the proposed access arrangements would be suitable for emergency service vehicles at the property. In response, it was commented that a condition was recommended requiring the provision of a sprinkler system to each dwelling to operate in the event of fire to mitigate against any potential difficulties in direct access.
- It was queried whether consideration had been given in relation to construction vehicular access to the site. In response, it was stated that a condition was

recommended requiring a pre-commencement construction management plan to ensure that the development was constructed in a safe way and in a manner that would minimise disruption during construction.

- It was noted that two trees on site were proposed to be felled as part of the proposed development. In response, it was stated that the trees were not subject to a Tree Protection Order and a replacement landscape scheme would be provided to mitigate the loss.
- It was queried whether there were any issues raised in relation to privacy. In response, it was stated that the layout of the proposed development exceeded all privacy and minimum separation distances.
- It was queried whether parking lines could be added to prevent vehicles parking in a way which blocked the access to the proposed development.
- It was noted that the application related to outline permission for two developments and if the applicant wished to increase the number of properties on the site they would have to reapply for planning permission.

RECOMMENDED – No recommendation was made.

(ii) DC/088293 – HAZEL GROVE HIGH SCHOOL, JACKSONS LANE, HAZEL GROVE, STOCKPORT, SK7 5JX

Western parcel: Demolition of existing garages on site; removal of existing tennis/netball courts; erection of a two storey educational facility (use class F1(a)), creation of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access and egress off Jacksons Lane; car park with drop off bay; new hard and soft landscaping including a MUGA; erection of PV canopies; and Eastern parcel: erection of replacement tennis/ netball courts; fencing; two garages and resurfacing of existing hard standing to create a formal car parking area.

Members conducted a thorough site visit and considered the proposed access arrangements and impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties, potential noise and the protected species within the area.

Members made the following comments/ observations:

- In relation to a query around the badgers, Members were advised that a mitigation strategy and license from Natural England was required prior to commencement of works in order to safeguard the badgers in the surrounding area.
- Clarification was requested in relation to whether the proposed development would be available for community use. In response, it was commented that Sport England's objection was withdrawn based on the need for a community use agreement and as such, a condition was being suggested in relation to the community use of the sports facilities.
- It was noted that no floodlighting was being proposed at the relocated tennis and netball courts.
- Members queried the nature of the proposed educational facility in the western parcel due to fears of neighbours that it would be a facility for excluded children who may cause issues regarding criminal damage. In response, Members were advised that the facility was to be used as an alternative provision school for children who

experience social, emotional and mental health needs who were not engaging with mainstream education and would provide a placement to meet their needs.

- Members noted that the land was currently unused and in need of development.
- It was advised that a 2.4 metre mesh fence was proposed around the perimeter on the school site in order to maintain security.
- It was queried which trees would be felled as part of the proposed development. In response, Members were advised that a number of trees and hedging would be lost as part of the proposals, however a condition was proposed to replace the trees at a 2 to 1 ratio.
- It was queried whether all alternative sites had been exhausted prior to the consideration of Hazel Grove High School. In response, it was confirmed that alternative sites had been considered and Hazel Grove High School had been identified as an existing education facility with unused land in an area identified as in need of an alternative provision.
- In relation to a query around access to the proposed development and impact on traffic, it was stated that the school was proposing a staggered start time, there would be a separate drop off/ pick up area for children attending the alternative provision school and generally these pupils were likely to arrive by bus or taxi.
- In response to a query in relation to windows and privacy concerns, it was commented that the proposed development at the western edge included two windows on the upper floor for daylight purposes, one in the main hall which would be at a level inaccessible for pupils and the second on the stairwell which would be fitted with a privacy screen.

RECOMMENDED – No recommendation was made.

(iii) DC/085975 – THE FARMERS ARMS, 209 STOCKPORT ROAD, CHEADLE HEATH, STOCKPORT, SK3 0LX

Demolition of vacant public house and development of a single restaurant with drive-thru lane (Class E).

Members conducted a thorough site visit and considered concerns in relation to the access arrangements to the proposed development and impact around congestion on the adjacent junction and surrounding roads.

- Members discussed the impact on the highway network including the potential of an increase in congestion on the surrounding roads. In response, it was commented that the data provided by the TRICS database and surveys requested from Greggs suggested that the additional traffic would not be of a volume to result in a significant adverse impact on the highway network.
- In response to a query in relation to the merits of the site, it was commented that the merits included regeneration of the site, 16 new trees and extra local employment opportunities.
- Members queried the use classification in relation to public health. In response, it was commented that the proposed development had been determined to be Class E due to the sale of food and drink for consumption (mainly) on the premises and following research including classifications of similar operations across other local planning authorities.

- Members commented that there was both a primary and secondary school nearby to the site and felt that the proposed development may encourage fast-food consumption in children.
- Members commented that due to the nature of the development as a drive-thru, those right-turning out of the car park would cause further congestion on an already busy road.
- Members were advised that the Council aspired to improve the adjacent junction including the widening of the junction and a small section of the site would be dedicated to the Council for these improvements.
- It was queried what action could be taken if the proposed development resulted in a significant impact on the highway once complete. In response it was stated that the data suggested that there would be no discernible impact on the highway, however the Council was the local highway authority and would continue to monitor the impact of the development.
- It was commented that whilst the improvements to the site were welcomed, there was a number of concerns in relation to the use and category of the development based on highways and health grounds.

RECOMMENDED – No recommendation was made.

(iv) DC/087432 – LAMBERT HOUSE, STOCKPORT ROAD, CHEADLE, STOCKPORT, SK8 2DY

Change of use from Office use (Class E(g)i) to up to 98 residential units (Class C3) with associated external alterations.

Members conducted a thorough site visit and considered the impact of the proposed development in relation to concerns around adequate parking for any future occupants, and how this might affect parking on nearby roads.

- Members noted that parking was an issue for the building when it was used as an office space. In response, Members were advised that parking provision would be greater if used for commercial purposes rather than residential purposes, as there would be fewer residents than there were employees.
- Members viewed the proposed development from Cuthbert Road and commented that due to the lack of available parking on Cuthbert Road, it would be difficult for any overflow parking to find a space.
- Members were advised that a commercial building could convert to a residential building without prior approval, however the development application was before Members as external alterations had been requested such as the removal of the link bridge

RECOMMENDED – No recommendation was made.

(v) DC/088470 – 20 FULLERTON ROAD, HEATON NORRIS, STOCKPORT, SK4 4EN

Single storey rear extension to bungalow. Internal alterations and replacement windows and doors.

Members conducted a thorough site visit and considered the impact of the proposed development in relation to concerns raised by residents around privacy and overlooking concerns and suggestions that it was built unlawfully.

- Members queried the unlawful nature of the building of the extension. In response, members were advised that although the completed work was unlawful, it was not illegal and work had stopped whilst an application seeking planning permission had been submitted.
- Members visited neighbouring residents gardens at No. 18 Fullerton Road and No. 58 Wittenbury Avenue in order to view how the extension may overlook into their properties.
- In response to a query in relation to why a retrospective application had been submitted, it was commented that the applicant had originally believed they were able to complete the extension under permitted developments rights, however the permitted development allowance for a single storey rear extension does not allow for development greater than 4m in height.
- In response to a query in relation to windows and privacy concerns, it was commented that the proposed extension included a high level window for daylight purposes and as no mezzanine floor had been proposed there were no privacy concerns in respect of this window. However, a condition was being suggested requiring that the high level window be opaquely glazed.
- In response to a query in relation to separation distances and amenity space, Members were advised that the proposal met the Council standards and was policy compliant.

RECOMMENDED – No recommendation was made.

Visit ended at 13.46 pm.