

Comments on Planning Application 21/2010N

This is a summary of objections from Bunbury Parish Council as agreed at the Parish Council meeting on 5 May.

The major issues are:

- The development is outside the settlement boundary
- 106 homes have already been committed or built which meets the housing requirement set out in the CELPS
- The proposed widening of the footpath and visibility splays will cause significant issues on Bunbury Lane
- The planning application includes numerous incorrect statements which are outlined below.

Document: Design and Access Statement

There is no reference in the Applicant's Design and Access Statement to the **Bunbury Neighbourhood Plan, or the Village Design Guide which is a significant omission,** and we have highlighted the specific issues below:

Section 2.4

Should be school (not schools as there is only 1)

"Further amenities are provided within the nearby small settlements and larger settlements of Tarporley and Crewe and Nantwich, accessible via public transport with bus stops within walking distance of the site entrance".

This statement is incorrect. There are no public transport links to Tarporley or Crewe. As we explained in our comments on the Transport Document, the bus service to Nantwich is not viable for schooling, leisure or employment.

Section 4.1

Planning history. Reference is made to the appeal decision and comments made about the impact on open countryside and views from the local footpath. These still remain even with this 'reduced' scheme.

Section 4.2

Incorrect statement, the site is outside the settlement boundary in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Section 5.1

The development cannot be described as being 'sensitive to the neighbouring development' as it will intrude on their privacy, amenity and outlook.

It fails to mention that any pedestrian links into the village are along a narrow footpath which in parts is only on one side of the road.

There is no reference in this document to climate change, energy efficiency, electric charging points, solar panels or ground source heating, surely all matters which any development should be addressing if it is seeking to demonstrate its sustainability credentials.

Section 5.8

Walking, Cycling and Public Transport - Green Light

This should be a red light. We explained elsewhere there is no viable public transport, the last sentence makes no sense or requires definition - *It is considered the site's permeability and connectivity to neighbouring areas and the wider Bunbury area will be significantly enhanced.*

Facilities and Services

This should also be red, it repeats the untrue statement about a bus service to Tiverton, there is one health centre and a primary school, not plural.

Easy to find your way around

This section is not applicable to a development of 15 homes it makes no sense to state: *The development has a legible layout that promotes way finding through variation in surface treatment and the provision of vista plots at key locations to help people find their way around the development. The house typologies and orientations are matched to the road layout to create a positive relationship with their surroundings.*

--ends--

Document: Planning Application

Section 1.1.4

They set out their argument that the application should be determined in accordance with the development Plan which in this case is the CE Local Plan Strategy and the Bunbury Neighbourhood Plan. In this particular case the proposed development is not in accordance with either the CE Local plan or the 'made' Bunbury Neighbourhood Plan.

Section 1.1.5 - Specific comments on these points:

- *Community Infrastructure Levy contributions of about £100K, of which 25% will be payable to the Parish Council;*
- *Local benefits through investment in the local community;*

These 2 statements are factually incorrect - CE take the CIL payments centrally and Bunbury is zero rated so we get no CIL payments

- *Improvements to biodiversity;*

There is no demonstrable improvement to biodiversity in this proposal

- *District wide benefits in terms of contributing to housing supply and economic objectives; and*
- *National objectives in boosting the supply of homes and delivering sustainable development.*

Cheshire East has got in excess of a 5 year land supply and there is therefore no presumption in favour.

Section 3.3.1

The leaflet repeats the factual inaccuracy identified in 1.1.5 regarding CIL payments and should therefore be disregarded.

Section 5

The minimum of 80 new units was set out in the CELPS up to 2030 and we have consent for 108 to date. The applicant in para 5.36 refers to the SADPD, although this is not yet an adopted planning policy document, however it does, in Policy PG5 refer to '*in the order of 105 new homes in Bunbury*' which of course has been exceeded.

The site could also be assessed against draft policies HOU8 Backland; HOU10 Amenity; ENV7 Climate Change; GEN1 Design Principles; PG9 settlement boundaries and PG5 number of new houses - all of which would, if they were in place, rule against the proposed development.

Cheshire East has got in excess of a 5 year land supply and there is therefore no presumption in favour.

Section 5.2.9

It is not true that most development is outside the settlement boundary, nor is it correct to state *'Development in the open countryside is therefore acceptable in principle in the context of Bunbury'* as development already permitted can deliver the required 108 homes:.

Section 5.3.2

This statement is, to use the language of the applicant, self evidently incorrect. We have accommodated 108 homes without building in open countryside.

Section 7.2

They refer to the presumption in favour in the NPPF however as set out above CE have more than a 5 year land supply, the proposal is contrary to the Development Plan both the CELPS and the BNP, and the applicants have not been able to demonstrate how 15 new houses in the open countryside generating over 60 vehicle trips a day (probably a significant underestimate) is sustainable when there is no public transport in the village and, as we know, people drive from one side of the village to the other to drop their children off at school.

The principle justification in support of this proposal is that other developments have been built in Bunbury outside the settlement boundary however some were already committed before the NP was made and whilst others may have been allowed but that is not a justification to permit other developments that are clearly at odds with the planning policy framework both nationally and locally.

Section 9.1.1

The application claims there is 'no harm' but the application concedes it is outside the Settlement Boundary (9.1.2). The purpose of the settlement boundary is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain the distinct nature of the rural villages in Cheshire. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Settlement boundary

is respected and given the excellent land supply in Cheshire, the already approved 108 homes then this application does indeed cause significant harm.

Section 9.1.2

States *"In this case (although located outside the defined settlement boundary) the proposal accords with the development plan"*. Having conceded that the development is outside the settlement boundary then the application is in contravention of the development plan.

Section 9.1.4

As explained elsewhere this is not a true statement.

--ends--

Document: Transport statement

Section 2.2.2

This section refers to the NPPF and includes the following quote - 'developments focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and (importantly and not dealt with by the applicants) and offering a genuine choice of transport modes! Their transport statement highlights this as supporting the proposal but nowhere do they offer any genuine choice referring in section 4 to 62 daily trips to and from the site over a 12 hour period or an additional 310 additional trips from Monday to Friday each and every day.

Section 2.6.1

This refers to strategic sites and strategic locations however Bunbury has no such sites and is a Local Service Centre where small scale development will be supported to meet needs and priorities where they contribute to the creation and maintenance of the sustainable community. The applicant has failed to demonstrate how an additional 15 dwellings generating 62 vehicle trips every day over a 12 hour period contributes to the sustainability of the local community.

Section: 3.3.1

"Established travel patterns are in place and we believe many people choose to travel via sustainable modes, particularly walking and cycling."

This generic statement overstates what is realistic, there is very little employment in the village and no secondary schooling. There are only 2 shops, a butcher and Coop, so any hardware, clothing or other shopping requires a car. There are no leisure facilities such as a swimming pool, theatre, cinema or spectator sports in the vicinity.

There are no dedicated cycle paths, footpaths are patchy with missing segments such as Vicarage Lane and School Lane. Outside the village there are no footpaths at all to Spurstow or Alraham as mentioned in the document.

The applicants fail to demonstrate how the residents of say a 5 bed roomed house would access the facilities they require by either walking or cycling e.g. to access Public Transport either Crewe Station or indeed the Bus Service from Tarporley to Chester/Crewe.

In this section the description of the location of the village facilities is incorrect as they are not all located in the 'village centre'.

Section 3.3.2

"The road is a single carriageway fronted mainly by residential properties. The carriageway is circa 6m in width with footways circa 1.5m in width being provided on the western side of the carriageway. It should be noted that from the Bunbury Lane/Queen Street junction, circa 100m north of the proposed development, footways are provided on both sides of the carriageway."

The footpath narrows to less than a metre as you walk to the Yew Tree so the statement circa 1.5 is misleading. It is not wide enough for a wheelchair or buggy or indeed 2 people to walk side by side.

Section 3.3.5

We fail to see how you could use a bicycle from the village to access other means of public transport.

Section 3.3.7

"The settlements of Eaton, Alraham, Calveley and particularly Tarporley can be accessed via a circa 5km cycle ride from the proposed development. This mode of transport offers opportunities to access the various employment and leisure opportunities that are provided in these locations."

There are very few employment opportunities in any of these locations and there is no justification for building housing in Bunbury to service these, sufficient housing is available in all those locations for the employment on offer there. There are no additional leisure facilities in the mentioned locations to what is available in Bunbury, they just offer more pubs.

There are no dedicated cycle routes and the roads are narrow lanes and a busy A51/A49 so it is impractical to commute other than by car.

Section 3.3.8

“An informal bus stop is located at the corner of Bunbury Lane/Queen Street, this being within a 100m walk of the proposed development. This provides access to the service number 70 which provides 2 services per day Monday to Saturday and connects Nantwich and Tiverton via Bunbury and Bulkeley.”

This service is impractical for employment or schooling and is only useful for shopping in Nantwich. Although it states 2 services, it is in fact one out and one return, leaving at 10.50 and arriving in Nantwich at 11.28 returning at 13.30. You can't access Tiverton as stated without incurring an overnight stay as the 10.30 service does not call at Tiverton and you would need to leave Bunbury at 10.30, wait in Nantwich for the 13.30 and return the following day.

Section 3.4.1

The survey was done in winter during the height of lockdown so any figures must be questionable. Furthermore, the number of cars parked around the shops in the village centre and along School Lane are symptomatic of the lack of any available choice of transport other than the private car.

Section 3.6.2

“We believe that the site is in a location that is readily accessible via sustainable modes of travel and in an established residential area where the local highway network is appropriate for the land use, this being in accordance with CEC LTP and the Guide.”

We disagree with this statement as outlined above, there is no viable public transport, no safe cycle routes and no viable walking route to secondary schooling, employment or major shopping facilities. The majority of the footpath from the

site to the local shops and primary school is narrow and on one side of the road only. Increased traffic movements to and from this site can only add to the danger to pedestrians using this route.

--ends—

It is for these reasons that we strongly recommend that the application is refused.