

**Bollington Town
Council**

**Planning and Town
Development
Committee
Meeting**

15th August 2023

Table of Contents

Item 2 - Planning and Town Development Minutes 25/07/2023	3
Item 3 - 15 Barnfield Road	9
Item 3 - 23/2515M	10
Item 7 - Cheshire East Car Park Consultation	18
Item 9 - Ridley Road	20



Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee of the Town Council

Held in the Town Hall

on Tuesday 25th July 2023 @ 7pm

Present

Cllrs; Mike Broadbent (MB), Ken Edwards (KE), Richard Hardwick (RH), Judy Snowball (JS), John Stewart (JCS), John Withers (JW).

Chair - Cllr J Snowball

Officer – Julie Mason, Town Clerk

Declarations of Members Interests

Cllr JS – 23/2481T 34 Waterwheel Way.

Public Forum Time

Twenty-one members of the public present. Their attendance was to observe and make comments on three items on the agenda – the pre application for Land off Coope Road for houses, 24/2515M 24 Chancery Lane and the lack of completion of new build houses on High Street and their subsequent poor standard.

Plus, Cllr A Williams on 15 Barnfield Road

Land off Coope Road, Bollington for Peaks & Plains Housing Trust

The majority of the attendance was to strongly object to the proposed development for houses off Coope Road. The Chair asked for spokesman from the floor. One spokesperson stated it was a perfect open space and the exchange offer from Peaks & Plains of open woodland was not a good enough compromise. The site would encourage anti-social behaviour and the play area was a marketing exercise. The housing type did not seem to meet the criteria of affordable housing, there should be one bedroomed house and bungalows. There should be a housing needs assessment to establish a requirement for the housing type. There has also been evidence of wildlife e.g., badgers and bats on site which seems to have been overlooked.

The land is a floodplain and has a high risk of flooding He had also set up a Facebook group.

A resident also felt there was a sewage system underneath the site. There were tanks and broken pumps as United Utilities often attended.

It was also noted Peaks & Plains were poor landlords and there was evidence of their properties being empty across the town so that again questioned the need for more housing.

24 Chancery Lane

No comment just an observer.

High Street housing development

There was great concern on the state of the new houses on High Street they were in a state of disrepair. There were 6 buildings and all empty and getting worse. They asked for support from the Ward Cllrs and the Town Council.

There had been a skip on site for three weeks and it had not been removed presumably due to lack of payment.

P/T 77/23 To approve the Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee Meeting 20rd June 2023 (PT 65/23 – PT 76/23).

RESOLVED the minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.

P/T 78/23 Updates from the minutes

The Clerk reported that ANSA would not give permissions for the bin (Youth Council) to be sited by the notice board on Adlington Road. ANSA had given three options.

- In the play area at Adlington Road
- Coronation Gardens
- Play area at Leisure centre.

RESOLVED the bin would be sited in the play area at Adlington Road

P/T 80/23 To note EML-OUT/21-062/20230531- 133218-066 Pre-App Land off Coope Road, Bollington for Peaks & Plains Housing Trust

The Committee supported the residents' thoughts which had been made in the public forum time. It was noted this was a preapplication and not 'live' to comment at this stage. The members were disappointed that Peaks & Plains had never come back to the TC for a meeting and a discussion before this stage had been reached. The use of open space was against the Neighbourhood Plan policy.

6.3.1 Open Space Policies – Policy EOS.P1 Designation of Open Spaces Open Space Policy EOS.P1 – Designation of Open Spaces All currently designated Open Spaces will be maintained as such.

Development will not be supported unless

(a) An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the type of open space to be surplus to requirements,

(b) The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location, and

(c) The development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the needs of which clearly outweighs the loss

RESOLVED the Clerk would write to the Peaks & Plains for a meeting to enable feedback to be given after the meeting. They would also enquire about the housing needs assessment and the consultation they had agreed to with the public.

RESOLVED when the application was 'live' the Committee would set up a group consisting of Chair of Planning, Town Clerk, the Mayor and a Ward Cllr to scrutinise the application. The Clerk was asked to if the application could be 'called in' to the Northern planning as a pre application.

P/T 81/23 To receive feedback from Cllr K Edwards on the Housing Development at High Street

Cllr KE (Ward Cllr) had been approached by the residents due to the trouble and upset this site was giving to the neighbours. There was six properties and the building company had gone into receivership and was now being managed by a company in Manchester. There had been internal flooding and an insurance company had been instructed to repair damage. Cllr KE had also reported to CE planning enforcement and there had been a reply from Ms D Ackerley had deemed it be an unsafe site.

It was agreed Cllr KE would hold a meeting with the residents and increase dialogue.
RESOLVED the Clerk would write to the company in Manchester who were in receivership of the site and express the major concerns about the site and ask for their intention.

P/T 82/23 To seek permission to make contact at 15 Barnfield Road after a complaint.

There had been pictures circulated that the property had deteriorated in comparison to neighbours houses, and a complaint had been received. The Committee was concerned about the owner/s and if they were any issues which prevented them from keeping the property tidy.

RESOLVED It was agreed the Clerk would contact the Public Health Authority for advice.

P/T 83/23 To receive the Decisions on Planning Applications and Notifications from Cheshire East Council:

- **Planning Applications APPROVED:**

Planning Applications APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS:

- [22/2879M](#)
NAB WORKS, QUIETSTONE, LONG LANE, POTT SHRIGLEY, SK10 5SD
New office/reception building to replace the existing temporary mobile unit.
BTC – NO OBJECTION
- [22/3357M](#)
7 BEESTON MOUNT, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5QY
Proposed loft conversion.
BTC – NO OBJECTION
- [23/0443M](#)
6 BEESTON CLOSE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5RQ
Development of a lean to ground floor single storey rear extension with access steps to the garden.
BTC – NO OBJECTION
- [23/1400M](#)
BOLLINGTON RECREATION GROUND, ADLINGTON ROAD, BOLLINGTON
Replacement of existing cricket training nets with new.
BTC – NO OBJECTION

- **Planning decisions WITHDRAWN: None**

Planning decisions REFUSED: None

Appeals Notified: None

- **Tree 6-week date expired (CA)**
 - [22/2211T](#)

WOODLAND AT PARK STREET, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5PG

T1 Sycamore remove limb over the rear garden of Dean Way, Bollington.

BTC – NO COMMENT MADE

- [22/2770T](#)

2 HIGHER LANE, KERRIDGE, SK10 5AR

T1 a cedar very close to the boundary wall between 2 Higher Lane and Meadow Cottage (also on Higher Lane) fell and remove. T2 a native cherry which is near to the boundary with Higher Lane and is approx 2 metres above road level.

Proposed work to remove lower branches and lower the height of the tree.

BTC – NO OBJECTION

- [23/1281T](#)

24 CHANCERY LANE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5BJ

T1 - Fell T2 - Fell T3 - Fell T4 - Fell T5 - Fell T6 - Fell T10 - Fell T11 - Fell T12 - Fell G1 – Fell

BTC – COMMENT MADE - The committee asked that the tree officer attended site as it was 10 trees in a concentrated area and ask if maintenance could be an alternative option. If this was not the case could replacement trees be planted.

- [23/1447T](#)

68 HIGH STREET, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5PF

T1-Birch.Crown lift to 2.5m.Crown reduce by 2m. T2-Beech.Crown reduce by 3m.Crown lift over highway by 2.5m. T3-Birch.Crown reduce by 3m.Work is requested to let more light into the garden.

BTC – COMMENT MADE - The information was inadequate to make a decision.

- [23/1550T](#)

25 CLARENCE TERRACE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5LD

T1 Oak - 3m reduction on house side of the tree and remove 1 lateral branch.

BTC – COMMENT MADE - The information was inadequate to make a decision.

P/T 80/23 To make observations on Planning Applications currently on deposit upon the production of the agenda but to allow consideration of applications submitted in between:

- [23/2373M](#)

WOODEND FARM, KERRIDGE ROAD, RAINOW, SK10 5TA

Prior approval proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20m high Valmont climbable monopole on screwpile grillage (details TBC) with config 2 circular headframe for 6 no. antenna apertures at 350, 180 and 270 degrees and 4 no. 600 dishes. MHAs and active routers to be fixed to headframe behind antennas and associated ancillary works.

RESOLVED OBJECTION

- [23/2394M](#)

21 SOUTH WEST AVENUE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5DX

Two storey side and porch canopy extension and single storey rear extension with associated improved car parking provision to frontage and widened vehicle access.

RESOLVED NO OBJECTION

- [23/2494M](#)
14 COOPE ROAD, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5AE
Taking down and rebuilding side conservatory on piled raft foundation.
RESOLVED NO OBJECTION
- [23/2515M](#)
24 CHANCERY LANE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5BJ
Rear/side extension to property with associated internal remodelling and formation of a new driveway and landscaping.
RESOLVED NO OBJECTION with conditions
A Conservation Report and a Heritage Report to be requested from CE.
- [23/2692M](#)
LOWER BARN, COCKSHEADY ROAD, BOLLINGTON SK10 5QZ
Two storey side extension.
RESOLVED NO OBJECTION

P/T 81/23 To make observations on Planning Applications (Trees) currently on deposit:

- [23/2405T](#)
BROOK COTTAGE, 1A RAINOW ROAD, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5QP
Removal of branch.
No Comment
- [23/2446T](#)
MILLENNIUM CROSS, KINGSWAY, BOLLINGTON
Removal of holly bush that is being crowded out by the larger sycamore tree and deterring growth of the sycamore tree.
This was an application from BTC.
- [23/2481T](#)
34 WATERWHEEL WAY, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5DQ
T1, Ash - Fell. The tree is located on the raised bank immediately behind and overhanging the formal garden area of the property. The applicant wishes to remove the tree due to concerns that overhangs the garden and sheds dead branches. All deadwood was removed from the tree within the last 18 months indicating a deterioration in health. It is retrenching, has a smaller than normal leaf size and shows both signs of ash die back and also cancer. There appears to have been historical damage to the root systems of many of the trees on the bank, presumably caused during the development process, which has resulted in a deterioration in the canopy of many of the trees. T2, Ash - Fell as T1.
RESOLVED NO OBJECTION
The TC ask for more tree planting.

- [23/2536T](#)
BOBBIN COTTAGE, OAK LANE, KERRIDGE, SK10 5AP
 1x Mature Ash reduce to ground level, tree is displaying advanced signs of Ash die-back and requires removal before branches and limbs are shed into the garden below.
RESOLVED NO OBJECTION

P/T 82/23 To note an appeal to the refusal of a Planning Application:

- [22/2921M](#)
12 ELMSWAY, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5NP
 Proposed alterations and extensions
 This was noted as BTC had submitted NO OBJECTION.

P/T 85/23 To receive the notes from the Footpath Officers meeting on 7th July.
RESOLVED the minutes were accepted.
RESOLVED Cllr KE would meet with the landowner about the improvements to the gritstone trail after his comments to the Clerk that there were no issues with the PROW.

P/T 86/23 To receive feedback from the Clerk from a meeting with New Life Church
 The New Life Church had approached BTC about advice on the land use at the adjacent land to the church. The Clerk had attended a meeting and it was noted there was a follow up meeting with Cllr KE, the Chair of Planning – Cllr JS and the Clerk on Friday 28th July.

P/T 87/26 To receive an update for the Clerk and Cllr K Edwards on Section 106 monies.
 It was noted CE had taken no actions.

PT 88/23 To note the date of the next Planning and Town Development Committee Meeting on Tuesday 25th July 2023 at 7.00pm at Bollington Town Hall.

Meeting Closed at 9.05 pm

Signed:

Dated:

From [REDACTED]

Sent: 02 August 2023 12:48

To: Julie Mason, Town Clerk <clerk@bollington-tc.gov.uk>

Subject: CASE REF: 23/00587e 15 Barnfield Road Bollington

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Julie,

Thank you for raising this case with us.

Unfortunately, the garden does not meet the criteria for Enforcement to serve a section 215 Notice.

We will now close the case.

Kind regards

[REDACTED] Cheshire East Council

Planning Enforcement Officer

Macclesfield Town Hall, Market Place, Macclesfield, SK10 1EA

Mobile [REDACTED]

www.cheshireeast.gov.uk

Listed Building, Conservation and Design Service: Comment on planning application

Date: 27th July 2023

Application no: 23/2515M

Planning Officer: Joseph Laughton

Re: 24 Chancery Lane Bollington

This property lies within the Kerridge Conservation Area and under an Article 4 Direction, it is also adjacent to the Bollington conservation area, the main consideration is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal is for rear/side extension to property with associated internal remodelling and formation of a new driveway and landscaping.

The work would involve:

- A new extension to the rear and sides of the property, using render to match the colour of the local sandstone.
- Tanking to the basement to create a habitable space.

Repairs and Alterations to Existing Fabric:

- Re-pointing of all elevations where necessary, using lime mortar.
- Installation of sheep's wool to interior of walls.
- Replacement of single glazed timber windows with slim double-glazed units of the same style and arrangement using hardwood and painted.
- Stone cleaning to elevations.
- Repairs and redecoration to front door and fanlight above.

External Works:

- Stone gate piers to be removed and set back within existing driveway to identify new pedestrian entrance.
- New driveway created on west side of property, involving removal of part of boundary wall.
- External works to create new access for the property and new hard and soft landscaped areas.
- Outbuildings and shed.

The repairs to the existing fabric as detailed above I would consider to be acceptable with the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed external works to the existing wall I would consider to be detrimental to the conservation areas character and appearance, stone walls are an important contribution to the conservation areas character and appearance. Section 5.3.3 of the heritage assessment acknowledges that there will be harm from this wall removal.

The tanking of the basement would be acceptable, however the proposal to add a new extension to the rear and sides of the property, to be finished in a

OFFICIAL

OF
FIC
IAI

render to match the colour of the local sandstone would not be acceptable with the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The design, mass and materials of this propose extension would be out of keeping with the existing nature of the area, additionally the long-distance views of this property (into the conservation area) would also be adversely affected by this large modern extension.

I take note of the following:

Paragraph 190 of the NPPF. Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

Paragraph 195 of the NPPF. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 206 of the NPPF. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favorably.

OFFICIAL

OF
FIC
IAI

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies SE1 and SE7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan which indicates that development should promote high standards of design which reflect local character and respect surrounding buildings and their setting and should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas and the historic fabric.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 indicates that the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area is a matter of considerable importance and weight. I consider that they would not outweigh the substantial harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Development with CELPS policy SE1 states that 'development proposals should ensure a retained sense of place and management of design quality'. CELPS Policy SD2 further details the design matters that should be considered, including height, scale, form and grouping of development, choice of materials, external design features, massing of development and impact upon the street scene. SADPD Policy HOU11 states that extensions or alteration to existing dwellings and construction of ancillary outbuildings in residential curtilage should be consistent with the Cheshire East Borough Design Guide supplementary planning document.

Policy SE 1

Design

Development proposals should make a positive contribution to their surroundings in terms of the following:

1. Sense of place
 - i. Ensuring design solutions achieve a sense of place by protecting and enhancing the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements;
 - ii. Ensuring sensitivity of design in proximity to designated and local heritage assets and their settings;
 - iii. Ensuring that places are designed around the needs and comfort of people and not vehicles, so that layout, street design and parking is in accordance with the principles set out in Policy CO 1 and Manual for Streets;
 - iv. Ensuring that proposals are underpinned by character and design assessment commensurate with the scale and complexity of the development;
 - v. Encouraging innovative and creative design solutions that are appropriate to the local context; and
 - vi. Ensuring a high quality public realm that enhances conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and creates opportunities for social interaction.
2. Managing design quality
 - i. Ensuring for larger scale and more complex developments that design proposals have positively responded to the Design Review process(62);

OFFICIAL

- ii. Ensuring for major developments that Master planning and Design Coding forms an integral part of the design process;
 - iii. Ensuring that housing developments achieve Building for Life 12 (or as updated) standard; and
 - iv. Encouraging sustainable construction practices including the use of appropriate recycled and sustainable materials of high quality.
3. Sustainable urban, architectural and landscape design
- i. Encouraging the introduction of passive environmental design principles and climate change adaptation features in the orientation of buildings and spaces and detailed design;
 - ii. Encouraging sustainable modes of travel through appropriate design;
 - iii. Reducing energy and water usage through appropriate design;
 - iv. Encouraging the use of renewable/low carbon energy technology, as appropriate; and
 - v. Encouraging the use of green infrastructure.
4. Liveability / workability
- i. Ensuring appropriate level of privacy for new and existing residential properties;
 - ii. Ensuring appropriate external storage;
 - iii. Ensuring a high quality internal and external working environment commensurate with the type and nature of business, particularly for new build development or conversions to office space;
 - iv. Ensuring appropriate provision for waste storage allowing for its sustainable management; and
 - v. Ensuring appropriate access for the mobility impaired or partially sighted.
5. Designing in safety
- i. Ensuring high levels of passive surveillance of streets, spaces and parking including appropriate lighting;
 - ii. Incorporating Secured by Design principles, provided that these are adequately balanced against other design considerations and do not undermine the quality of the development; and
 - iii. Ensuring that site layout and design minimises the opportunity for crime

In respect of the consideration of the impact of the development on built heritage CELPS policy SE7.

Policy SE 7

The Historic Environment.

1. Cheshire East has an extensive and varied built heritage and historic environment, described in the justification text to this policy. The character, quality and diversity of the historic environment will be conserved and enhanced. All new development should seek to avoid harm to heritage assets and make a positive contribution to the character of Cheshire East's historic and built environment, including the setting of assets and where appropriate, the wider historic environment.
2. Proposals for development shall be assessed and the historic built environment actively managed in order to contribute to the significance of heritage assets and local distinctiveness. Where a development proposal is likely to affect a designated heritage asset (including its setting) the

significance of the heritage asset, including any contribution made by its setting, must be described and reported as part of the application.

3. The council will support development proposals that do not cause harm to, or which better reveal the significance of heritage assets and will seek to avoid or minimise conflict between the conservation of a heritage asset and any aspect of a development proposal by:

a. Designated Heritage Assets:

i. Requiring development proposals that cause harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset and its significance, including its setting, to provide a clear and convincing justification as to why that harm is considered acceptable. Where that case cannot be demonstrated, proposals will not be supported.

ii. Considering the level of harm in relation to the public benefits that may be gained by the proposal.

iii. The use of appropriate legal agreements or planning obligations to secure the benefits arising from a development proposal where the loss, in whole or in part, of a heritage asset is accepted.

b. Non-Designated Assets:

i. Requiring that the impact of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be properly considered, as these are often equally valued by local communities. There should be a balanced consideration, weighing the direct and indirect impacts upon the asset and its setting, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss. The presumption should be that heritage assets should be retained and re-used wherever practicable and proposals that cannot demonstrate that the harm will be outweighed by the benefits of the development shall not be supported. Where loss or harm is outweighed by the benefits of development, appropriate mitigation and compensation measures will be required to ensure that there is no net loss of heritage value.

4. For all heritage assets, high quality design should be achieved. It should aim to avoid poorly executed pastiche design solutions and should foster innovation and creativity that is sensitive and enhances the significance of heritage assets in terms of architectural design, detailing, scale, massing and use of materials. 5. Cheshire East Council will seek to positively manage the historic built environment through engagement with landowners/asset owners and other organisations and by working with communities to ensure that heritage assets are protected, have appropriate viable uses, are maintained to a high standard and are secured and have a sustainable future for the benefit of future generations. Proposals that conserve and enhance assets on the Heritage at Risk register will be encouraged.

SADPD
Policy HER1

Heritage Assets:

1. All proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings must be accompanied by proportionate information that assesses and describes their impact on the asset's significance. This must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, including (but not limited to) its historic form, fabric, character, archaeology

OFFICIAL

OF
FIC
IAI

and any other aspects that contribute to its significance. This should have regard to and reference, where relevant:

- i. the Cheshire Historic Environment Record;
- ii. relevant conservation area appraisals;
- iii. the Cheshire Historic Landscape Assessment;
- iv. the Cheshire Historic Towns Survey;
- v. national sources; and
- vi. original survey and field evaluation.

2. Where works of structural alteration to a heritage asset are proposed, the application must be accompanied by an adequate structural engineer's report and method statement of the impact of the works and how it will be carried out.

SADPD Policy HER3:

Conservation areas:

1. Development within or affecting the setting of a conservation area must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Proposals should take account of the established townscape and landscape character of the area and its wider setting, including (but not limited to):

- i. local topography, landscape setting and natural features;
- ii. existing townscape, local landmarks, views and skylines;
- iii. the quality and nature of material, both traditional and modern;
- iv. the established layout and spatial character of building plots, the existing alignments and widths of historic routes and street hierarchy (where physically and historically evident);
- v. the contribution that open areas make to the special character and appearance of the conservation area;
- vi. the scale, height, bulk and massing;
- vii. architectural historical and archaeological features and their settings;
- viii. the need to retain historic boundary and surface treatments;
- ix. the local dominant building materials;
- x. the building typology that best reflects the special character and appearance of the area, features and detailing;
- xi. minimising and mitigating the loss of trees, hedgerows and other landscape features; and
- xii. any positive improvements in the quality of the historic environment as a result of the development.

2. Proposals for the demolition of a building or group of buildings that positively contribute to the character or appearance of a conservation area will not be supported unless the harm or loss is outweighed by the public benefits of an approved replacement scheme.

Policy HER 7:

Non-designated heritage assets:

When considering the direct or indirect effects of a development proposal on a non-designated heritage asset (including locally listed buildings), a balanced

OFFICIAL

judgement will be required, having regard to the significance of the heritage asset and the scale of any loss or harm.

Bollington:

Policy BE.P1 of the BNP supports proposals where they conserve and enhance Bollington's historical assets and their settings, maintaining local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. This policy also makes reference in paragraph 4 to the typical facing materials in the area '4. The positive contribution to local character made by the dominance of natural stone in Bollington's built environment must be respected in the choice and quality of building materials in new development'.

With regards to the key building materials for properties in this area of Bollington paragraph 2.4 of the Bollington Conservation Area Appraisal states 'Bollington and Kerridge are located on deposits of Sherwood Sandstone found in the carboniferous Coal Measures that lie in the hills around the two settlements. These provide stone for roofing tiles, paving, walling and boundary treatments and these are the predominant materials found throughout the two conservation areas.' This is further expanded on in paragraph 5.12. The guidelines for extensions to existing buildings in the conservation area at paragraph 8.9 states new extensions should:

'Achieve a high standard of design.

- Should respect the height, bulk and general form of the original building
- Should be secondary in character to the original building
- Roofs will normally be pitched, and covered using reclaimed Kerridge stone slate or Welsh slate
- Chimneys should be provided where appropriate
- Matching materials must be specified
- External joinery details should match existing'

The proposals include the introduction of unsympathetic, contemporary, modern external facing materials on a traditional stone terrace property within Bollington Conservation Area, where new extensions are expected to be executed in materials to match the existing traditional materials which are a key characteristic of the designated heritage asset. The development is therefore considered to be detrimental to the character of the host property, that of the immediate area and of the Conservation Area. There are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the heritage asset. The development is considered to be contrary to policies SD1 (Sustainable Development in Cheshire East), SD2 (Sustainable Development Principles), SE1 (Design) and SE7 (The Historic Environment) of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy; GEN1 (Design Principles), HER3 (Conservation Areas) and HOU11 (Extensions and Alterations) of the Cheshire East Site Allocation Development Plan Document, BE.P1 (Historic Town) of the Bollington Neighbourhood Plan, the Supplementary Planning Document for Bollington and the National Planning Policy Framework.

I am not able to support this application.

For the above reasons I am unable to support this application and consider that it fails to comply with SE7 of the CELPS, BE15 of the MBLP.

OFFICIAL

OF
FIC
IAI

Overall, I consider that the harm from this proposal would be less than substantial able it at the higher end, I have to disagree with the heritage assessment in this regard section 5.4. This does not mean it is minor and unimportant and it will therefore need to be weighed against the associated benefits being put forward in support of this application, in accordance with para 202 of the NPPF.

Regards

Andrew Ramshall
Conservation Project Office

This consultation reply represents the opinions of the Conservation and Design Service only and is without prejudice to other Planning Department views.

OFFICIAL

OF
FIC
IAI

4 August 2023

TO ALL CHESHIRE EAST COUNCILLORS / TOWN AND PARISH CLERKS

On Thursday 20 July, Cheshire East Council's Highways and Transport committee agreed a recommendation to consult the public on changes to car parking across the borough.

The Committee delegated authority to finalise proposals relating to a set of parking initiatives and to complete public and statutory consultation.

We are writing to advise you of the background to these proposals, the timescales for consultation, as well as to seek your views on current parking issues in your local area which you would want us to consider as we prepare proposals for public consultation.

Cheshire East Council is responsible for the operation, management and civil enforcement of on-street and off-street parking regulations in Cheshire East.

Current parking provision reflects legacy arrangements dating from before the formation of Cheshire East Council. These arrangements do not reflect the needs of all towns, they can be difficult for customers to understand and may not be considered to be fair across the whole borough.

The council faces significant financial pressures and must look to reduce budget pressures so that it can continue to provide essential frontline services. The Council's adopted budget includes efficiencies gained from a review of car parking.

In summary, the measures that would likely affect parking in your local area are:

- To implement pay and display parking charges on a more consistent basis across the borough, on a town-by-town basis, including the need for measures to manage any displacement of parked cars.
- To review parking tariffs at council-operated car parks and adjust for inflation since tariffs were last changed in 2018/19.

Your feedback:

We understand that there may be local issues affecting the use of car parks that can inform our approach. We invite you to advise us of these issues to inform the development of proposals for public consultation.

Examples of issues that may be relevant are the facilities in car parks, the balance between short/ long stay parking places, residents' concerns about inappropriate parking or on-street parking problems.

Please can you provide any comments by 5pm on Friday 25 August 2023 via email to consultationsparking@cheshireeast.gov.uk

This will provide officers with sufficient time to consider your comments and, as far as practical, make refinements to our proposals before the start of the statutory public consultation in September 2023.

OFFICIAL

Statutory Public Consultation

We intend to run the statutory public consultation from Wednesday 6th September 2023 to Wednesday 18th October 2023.

The proposals will be on display at each car park as well as in local newspapers, and on the council's website.

The proposals will also be available to view in local libraries and further information will be provided as part of press releases issued to the local media and promoted by the council.

During the six-week statutory public consultation period, every ward Councillor, town and parish council will be invited to make representations, alongside other stakeholders and the wider public.

Formal objections to any proposals should be made during the statutory consultation period.

This pre-consultation engagement is intended to capture any local considerations that you want us to be aware of prior to the statutory consultation period.

Kind regards,

**Parking Services
Cheshire East Council**

Ridley Road

First and foremost thanks to both Ken and Julie for your attendance at the site meeting to discuss the highway boundary for the above location with the Bollington Town Council area. It is as always far easier to see these enquiries in person and we can discuss it too. Thank you.

I can confirm that the highway boundary for the location that we looked at yesterday is to the wall as I pointed out. Therefore the chain, 4 metal poles and bags of garden waste need to be removed by those responsible for these being placed in the highway. It should be noted that if Cheshire East Highways have to move them there will be a charge to those responsible for them.

