

## 19/3098M Objection - Henbury Parish Council

### 1. Executive Summary

This proposal is a 'little sister' development to 19/3097M which, when combined, include 157 houses against the original application for 135. Together with the approved application for 18/0294M (>30 houses) this would far exceed the 150 houses proposed for the site in the Local Plan, and does not consider additional land yet subject to application. The increased housing numbers will result in even less green space and even more habitat destruction.

It is not sustainable development. There are major issues regarding sustainable transport – access is onto the often-congested A537 and through the Broken Cross AQMA. Environmentally, it provides wholesale destruction of valuable wildlife habitat, much of which would qualify as a local wildlife site, and involves the loss of extensive peat bog, vital for carbon sequestration. Surface water runoff is into an ancient woodland site of biological importance. The plans also propose the removal of a community tree planting project which is maturing nicely, despite the fact this was retained in the original masterplan.

In addition, there are serious concerns regarding lack of infrastructure to support the development.

### 2. Evaluation of "Building for Life Criteria"

In their application, Bellway have assessed their proposals against a set of 12 “Building for Life” criteria for residential development. Building for Life is based on the National Planning Policy Framework.

The 12 questions reflect a vision of what new housing developments should be - attractive, functional and sustainable places.

Based on a simple traffic light system developments should ensure that they:

- Achieve as many greens as possible
- Minimise the number of ambers
- Avoid reds

The Cheshire East Design guide also uses the BFL 12 questions as a review tool for proposals.

Bellway have suggested that they have achieved ‘green’ for all criteria, but Henbury Parish Council would dispute this. We have included Bellway's assessment for several criteria, alongside that of Henbury Parish Council (on the right).

## Integrating into the neighbourhood

### FACILITIES & SERVICES

Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs or cafes?

**2a Are there enough facilities and services in the local area to support the development? If not, what is needed?**

Evaluation

The application site lies to the west of Macclesfield town centre. A range of local amenities are available within walking distance from the site illustrated on the adjacent diagram.

**Where new facilities are proposed:**

**2b Are these facilities what the area needs?**

Evaluation

No new facilities are proposed as per the outline approval.

**2c Are these new facilities located in the right place? If not, where should they go?**

Evaluation

No new facilities are proposed as per the outline approval.

**2d Does the layout encourage walking, cycling or using public transport to reach them?**

Evaluation

We are not proposing any new facilities within our application but the layout encourages walking, cycling and the use of public transport to the existing local amenities through the new proposed pedestrian links and routes throughout the scheme.

### HPC View

This is a major flaw in the application, as the local schools are already oversubscribed, and it is very unclear where children from this development can go to school.

Walking or cycling along Chelford Road and through Broken Cross will be an unpleasant and dangerous experience, due to ongoing speeding problems (ref local PCSO), high volumes of traffic (with a particularly high concentration of HGV's), and the fact that Broken Cross is designated an Air Quality Management Area, and has no current Action Plan to improve it.

Outline planning permission has been given to build hundreds of houses in this area, all feeding into Broken Cross traffic volumes.

There are no buses to/from Henbury after around 7pm, and none on Sundays.

HPC Status: **Red**

## BUILDING FOR LIFE OVERVIEW

# Integrating into the neighbourhood

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Does the scheme have good access to public transport to help reduce car dependency?

#### 3a What can the development do to encourage more people (both existing and new residents) to use public transport more often?

##### Evaluation

The site is considered sustainable as the existing bus stops are located in close proximity on Whirley Road and Chelford Road with regular services to the local centres. The development can encourage the use of public transport for both new and existing residents by creating pleasant to use, attractive and safe routes through the new development that connect to the surrounding area through attractive landscaped green spaces, a community trim trail and an ecology enhancement area for both existing and new residents.

#### 3b Where should new public transport stops be located?

##### Evaluation

We are not proposing any new transport stops as per the outline approval.

### HPC View

Public transport options are limited in this area.

There is no direct public transport from Henbury to the centre of Manchester. The 130 bus which used to provide that link now stops at East Didsbury.

There is no bus between Henbury and Manchester Airport.

Buses between Macclesfield centre and Henbury stop running at around 7pm on weekdays. There is no service on Sundays.

The residents on this development will be compelled to use cars for most journeys, adding to the existing congestion and air pollution.

HPC status: **Red**

## BUILDING FOR LIFE OVERVIEW

### Creating A Place

#### WORKING WITH THE SITE & ITS CONTEXT

Does the scheme take advantage of existing topography, landscape features (including water courses), wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimates?

#### 6a Are there any views into or from the site that need to be carefully considered?

##### Evaluation

The boundaries have been carefully considered in order to soften the impact of the development onto the neighbouring development and potential impact on visual amenity. The landscaping that surrounds the existing boundaries is to be retained to provide natural screening. Due to the placement of the site, the west boundary provides an open view to the neighbouring countryside. This area has been carefully designed to reduce impact through the proposed new tree buffer and placement of the open space that allows the site to integrate into the surrounding area.

#### 6b Are there any existing trees, hedgerows or other features, such as streams that need to be carefully designed into the development?

##### Evaluation

The existing trees and hedgerows surrounding the boundaries have been retained and integrated into the design where practicable. This allows the site to retain its containment from the existing properties surrounding the boundaries.

#### HPC View

This site, along with the “big sister” development 19/3097M, was previously an area of greenbelt land. It offered a habitat that has been largely lost in the surrounding area. These developments will destroy this habitat.

In particular, an area of the two developments identified for on-site water attenuation is one of those with highest biodiversity value.

Additionally the current plans appear to incur destruction of a plantation of 475 trees, planted some years ago by local schoolchildren. These were identified in a previous arboricultural assessment as forming “a valuable landscape and ecological feature within the site”.

HPC Status: **Red**

## BUILDING FOR LIFE OVERVIEW

### Streets And Home

#### CAR PARKING

Is resident and visitor parking sufficient and well integrated so that it does not dominate the street?

#### 10a Is there enough parking for residents and visitors?

##### Evaluation





Accommodating car parking is crucial to the quality of housing and to the choices people make in how they travel. The level of parking provision is influenced by the location of the site. This site is highly accessible to a range of attractions and alternative transport modes ensuring that it is well placed to meet national, regional and local policy.

The scheme has been designed in line with local standards and recommendations set out in the English Partnerships document 'Car Parking - What Works Where'. This development exhibits two car parking types which are promoted in this document as good practice.

OFF PLOT - FRONT COURT – SUBURBAN = AMBER LIGHT

ON PLOT - WITH GARAGE - SUBURBAN = GREEN LIGHT

Car parking has been provided in accordance with the council highways standard as follows;

1 bed - 1 space	
2 bed - 2 spaces	
3 bed - 2 spaces	
4 bed - 3 spaces	

This is including garages at 6m x 3m which we comply with.

#### HPC View

We can see from the site plans of these two sister developments that a large amount of parking has indeed been incorporated. In fact the plans imply parking for a total of 363 cars across the two developments.

The high density of houses means smaller plots with a focus on parking areas in front, rather than gardens. It is likely that parking will indeed dominate the street view.

The density of houses and the reduced plot sizes are in stark contrast to most houses in the surrounding area.

This site is **not** highly accessible to a range of transport modes. It has very limited public transport availability and cycling/walking on congested and dangerous Chelford Road and through an AQMA is not a choice many will make. Most residents will use their cars all the time – adding to the extreme congestion, particularly at peak times.

Queues on Chelford Road at peak time already extend back from Broken Cross roundabout to beyond the proposed entrance to this site. This is without adding in hundreds more vehicles. It is hard to visualize how replacing the roundabout with a signalized pedestrian crossing is going to improve this situation. HPC believe the modelling to support this was highly flawed.

HPC Status: **Red**

### 3. Review of Transport Plan

Service No	Route	Monday – Friday Frequency per hour				Sat	Sun
		AM Peak	Midday	PM Peak	Eve		
130	Piccadilly Gardens - Macclesfield	1	2	0	0	2	0
27	Knutsford – Macclesfield	0	0	1	0	0	0
27a	Knutsford – Macclesfield	0	0	1	0	0	0
27b	Macclesfield – Knutsford	0	1	0	0	0	0
19	Prestbury - Macclesfield	2	1	1	0	1	0

**Table 3.6 - Existing Bus Services Operating Past the Site**

- 3.4.1 As can be seen from Table 3.6, the nearest bus stops to the site provide access to up to 4 services in peak periods to Macclesfield, Wilmslow and Cheadle.
- 3.4.2 It is noted that the above services provide a choice of how people travel with the bus services operating from around 5am to around midnight, making travel by public transport a real alternative to travelling by car for commuting trips.
- 3.4.3 It is therefore concluded that the proposed development site is accessible by bus.

#### HPC View

This table is trying to suggest public transport accessibility from Henbury.

It contains a number of errors.

1. The 130 bus no longer runs to Piccadilly Gardens. There is no direct bus route to central Manchester.
2. The 27 bus service no longer exists.
3. As the table shows, there are no bus services at all to/from Henbury on Sundays
4. Buses do not operate from 5am to midnight. There are no buses after 7pm to/from Henbury.  
First morning bus to Macclesfield: 7:30am
5. Maximum service frequency is 1 per hour.

HPC Status: **Amber**

#### 4. Excerpts from the National Planning Policy Framework

##### "Habitats and biodiversity

***NPPF Para 177. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.***

HPC View:

The site has had little agricultural improvement and offers habitat that has largely been lost in much of the surrounding area. The wet areas are used by waterfowl, and at the relevant periods by migratory birds. A variety of wild flower and rush species are present, which are generally not found on the more agriculturally-intensive areas of Henbuy Parish. The area of the site identified for on-site water attenuation is one of those with the highest biodiversity value, and this is recognised in the original Ecological Assessment (4.18) *"Another section of marshy grassland is present along the south-eastern boundary of the site [...] Rarer species in this sward include water mint *Mentha aquatica*, lesser spearwort *Ranunculus flammula* and meadowsweet *Filipendula ulmaria*".* The loss of this feature is therefore wholly undesirable.

Birds of prey hunt over the area – kestrel, buzzard plus barn, tawny and little owl, as do bats. Reed bunting have also been present on the boundary of this and an adjacent field in each of the previous five years. Account must be taken of the presence of Great Crested Newts on an adjoining pond, as confirmed in the Ecological Assessment.

The development of this site will therefore lead to a significant degradation of wildlife habitat at a local level.

##### "Ground Conditions and Pollution

***NPPF Para 181. Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas.***

In their application documents, Bellway have stated:

"6.3 An air quality screening assessment was undertaken in accordance with IAQM and EPUK Guidance to determine the requirement for a detailed road traffic emissions impacts assessment. The trip generation for the proposed additional 23 residential units was compared to the criteria detailed in the guidance. The proposed development did not exceed any of the Stage 2 criteria, therefore the impact was considered to be 'insignificant' in accordance with IAQM and EPUK guidance. A detailed road traffic emissions impact assessment was therefore not undertaken. "

## HPC View:

Bellway are using this application to increase the total number of houses on the site to 157. The area into which traffic from this development will feed is already an AQMA, and has no action plan to address the problem. It is disingenuous to say that the impact of the extra 23 homes will be "insignificant". Bellway should be required to do a proper assessment of the cumulative impact of 157 homes (with parking provision for 363 cars).

## 5. Conclusion

- Henbury Parish Council have produced concrete reasons why this site (and sister site 19/3097M) are not suitable for development. This has followed on from a high level of objection from local residents and the Henbury Society, to both this and previous consultations.
- The proposed development is unsustainable, will put the health of CEC residents at increased risk of air quality-related disease, exacerbate an already dangerous travelling environment and cause the expansion, and further degradation, of an AQMA for which there is currently no Air Quality Action Plan.
- There will be wholesale biodiversity loss and extensive areas of peat – vital for carbon sequestration – will be impacted and possibly removed. The application contradicts the original application that led to the site being incorporated into the Local Plan by removing a community woodland when it was stated that all trees would be retained.
- The infrastructure, including schools, are simply not there to support this volume of building.
- Much of the key evidence base on which the supporting transport and air quality documents are produced is deeply flawed, using unrealistic data.
- The development fails to meet local and national guidance on many key points.

**This application should be rejected**