NOTES OF A PARISH MEETING HELD ON 7 JULY 2014 AT HANKELOW METHODIST CHAPEL

Present: Councillor G Foster

Councillors C Ainley, G Cope, I Jones and A Lee

In attendance: Paul Stewart Director - PSM Ltd

Paul Smith Director - NJL Consulting Martin Gibson Architect – GA Studio

Borough Councillor Rachel Bailey (part of the meeting)

Local residents Approximately 42

Nigel Cassidy, local resident, led the discussion

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF THE LODGE FARM SITE

The meeting was informed that NJL Consulting had now discussed its proposals with Cheshire East Council's (CEC) Planners and Highways Engineers. The purpose of this evening's meeting was to establish parish councillors and residents' views, following which an outline application for the development would be submitted.

The site was a 2.35 acre site (0.94 hectares). The proposal was to use the existing development footprint with an intention not to exceed this.

An original proposal presented to Members had been for 34 units. The Parish Council had been of the view that this was unacceptably high for such a small village and the proposal had now been reduced to 24 units, some of which would be affordable housing.

The following points were made.

- The architect had drawn up plans with the open space visible from the highway to act as a buffer between the road and the development.
- The Planning Officers and Highways Engineers had requested a change to the layout. Their view was that in hierarchical terms, pedestrians took priority, with cyclists and motorists being lower down the hierarchy. The open space had now been moved so that it bordered the fields.
- The plot sizes were described as 'good' and later in the meeting it emerged that the former density provision as outlined in Planning Policy Guidance was a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare. This provision had been removed by the new National Planning Policy Framework. The development proposed represented approximately 25 dwellings per hectare. NJL considered that this represented the most appropriate balance between minimising the number of homes on site and making the most efficient use of a previously developed site, as planning policy required.
- The Parish Council had been adamant that there should be no three-storey dwellings. During the presentation the representatives stated that it was proposed that there would be some 2½ storey dwellings which would have the appearance of two-storeys but would use loft space and have dormer windows. The ridge height would be the same as for a two-storey dwelling.
- Comment was made that the plan as presented (aerial-type photograph) was misleading even though it was to scale. The representatives agreed to forward plans with detailed dimensions.
- The issue of drainage and the water table was raised by residents. NJL would be examining soil structure rather than water tables. They were not required to ameliorate existing drainage problems but were required to 'not worsen the flood situation'.
- Roads (and any footways) would be in permeable materials to assist in drainage.

- There was a discussion about the widths of the roads and their purpose as it appeared that
 the proposal was for roadways which would be shared usage between vehicles and
 pedestrians.
- A company called RSK would be on site in the next week as part of the due diligence arrangements to examine drainage problems.
- Sewage/fuel supply. As the proposals were for an outline application, the exact details of sewage systems and fuel supply would not be considered at this stage.
- Phase 1 of the contaminated land survey had been undertaken. This had been a desktop exercise. The remaining phases of the survey would be carried out in due course. In response to a resident's query, it was confirmed that the survey was not a requirement for planning permission, but the development could not go ahead without it. The desktop report would be submitted with the planning application and would be available via CEC's planning portal. If planning permission were granted, the Decision Notice would include a condition requiring detailed investigations to be carried out and an appropriate remediation strategy to be agreed with the Council before any development could take place. If an appropriate remediation strategy could not be agreed, the development could not go ahead. All the information would be uploaded onto CEC's planning portal as part of the application documentation.
- There was a consensus amongst residents that the provision of children's play equipment would be a benefit but this should be provided within the development site and not on the existing village green.
- A resident asked about the possibility of increasing the amount of open space to the rear of The Nook to provide more privacy.
- Borough Councillor Bailey expressed a view that she had seen many developments across
 the country where there had be a 'cut and paste' approach resulting in houses not being
 sympathetic to the architectural design of the surrounding area. She expressed the hope
 that the designs would fit in with the character of Hankelow.
- Although pressed to give a commitment that what was proposed at this meeting would be transferred to the detailed application, the representatives could not commit to this. This was to be the basis of an outline application only and it was possible that the detailed application might be somewhat different from the outline as this could be influenced by various factors. It was intended to include certain fixed 'parameters' as part of the application though, to control the future form of the development as far as possible.
- Following a resident's comment about the streets/roadways in the development the representatives agreed to contact CEC with a view to asking the Borough Council not to use the Manual for Streets2 guidance. This was the guidance which was normally used to influence highways design; however, its status was 'guidance' only and there was therefore the possibility that some flexibility could be provided. Given the strength of feeling expressed at the meeting, the representatives agreed to contact CEC Highways to ask if they would be able to offer some flexibility in this instance.

Residents and parish councillors were able to ask questions during the presentation and these were responded to by the representatives.

The meeting commenced at 7.30 pm and concluded at 8.55 pm