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**Minutes of the meeting held on 10th September 2019**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***19/4/01*** | Present |
|  | Councillors, Dunlop, Houston, John Rhodes, Roberts, Straine-Francis and Toth.  Rob Mackenzie (Deputy Town Clerk) |
| ***19/4/02*** | To receive apologies for absence. |
|  | Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs Cosby, Flude, Howes and Palin. |
| ***19/4/03*** | To note declarations of Members’ interests. |
|  | There were no declarations of interest. |
| ***19/4/04*** | To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 16th July 2019  Members agreed the minutes as an accurate record. |
|  |  |
| ***19/4/05*** | Public Participation *A period not exceeding 15 minutes for members of the public to ask questions or submit comments*.  There were no questions or statements made. |
| ***19/4/06*** | To consider a response to a consultation on the Cheshire East Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (<https://cheshireeast-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5442084>)  Members reviewed the Policies presented and ***resolved*** to submit the following comments:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **GEN1 Design Principles** | Additional references to climate change and arrangements for recycling and waste management including storage and collection aresupported. | | **ENV12 Air Quality** | Former Policy ENV 12 has now been split between ENV12 (developments likely to have an impact on air quality) and ENV15 (New development and existing uses). The policy makes it clear that new uses likely to be affected by an existing facility must demonstrate that the new development is acceptable and if necessary provide suitable mitigation measures. The policy needs to be clarified to make clear that applies to new development likely to be a receptor for pollution from nearby road traffic particularly but not exclusively in AQMAs (i.e. that roads are “existing facilities”). It must make clear that mitigation must not result in undue loss of amenity for future occupants by explicit cross reference to HOU10, and by making clear that mitigation involving an absence of natural ventilation in habitable rooms is unacceptable. Residents must be able to open a window on a hot day. | | **HER 1 Heritage Assets** | Whilst welcoming the commitment to a review of listed buildings, the Town Council would like to see a commitment to an urgent review of all of Crewe’s heritage and a strategy for its future interpretation and conservation. The town has a rich industrial and architectural heritage which is rapidly vanishing, and has received little protection through the planning system to date, save for the recent Crewe Hub Area Action Plan. | | **HER 3 Non-designated heritage assets** | The increased emphasis on avoiding, minimising or mitigating the impact of development on non-designated heritage assets is welcomed. However, the policy should still make clear that where a heritage asset cannot be saved, it should be replaced by a building of equal or greater architectural quality. | | **EMP 1 Strategic Employment Areas** | Proposals for the re-use of the former MMU campus have progressed since the previous draft of the plan, but there is still a degree of uncertainty about future plans for the whole site. The Town Council, and Cheshire East Council, have expressed a desire to see higher education provision continue on the site. Crewe has a below average participation rate in higher education, and a lower proportion of graduates in the population than average for Cheshire East or the rest of the country. The presence of a university in the town can help to address this, and may also increase the attractiveness of the area for business investment, both through the availability of a more skilled workforce and the other benefits such an institution can bring. If it proves impossible to find a higher education user for some or all of the site, any unused land should be retained for business and business related activities. The last plot of land on the successful Crewe Business Park has now been sold for development, meaning that there are now no available sites for office development in Crewe, despite a steady ongoing demand. This is of critical importance in view of the growth potential brought by HS2. To that end the site should be allocated for use higher educational uses or B1 uses (office) and ancillary activities such as a conference centre and hotel. | | **HOU1 and HOU2 Housing Mix and Specialist provision** | Crewe Town Council welcomes these policies in principle but objects to the current wording. A table has now been added to the text setting out indicative house type tenures and sizes as a starting point for analysis of housing mix. The table is based on a Cheshire East wide average. The policy refers to the need to assess the local housing market. The text should make it clearer what “local” means in this context, and that there are wide variations in need between towns and villages in the Borough. An appropriate mix for Crewe might be very different to an appropriate mix in Wilmslow. | | **HOU4 Houses in Multiple Occupation** | The text supporting this policy now states that “particular scrutiny of the issue of concentration will be made where HMOs comprise more than 10% of properties in any street or road”. The permitted development rights for small HMOs have been clarified; and a sentence has been added stating that the council will consider the use of Article 4 directions in areas where there is clear evidence that a high concentration of HMOs is having an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the area.  These changes are supported, but the commitment to “consider” Article 4 Directions is too weak. The policy should state that if there is clear evidence of unacceptable impact on amenity, the council **will** use Article 4 directions. | | **HOU 6 Optional Technical Standards** | Policy HOU6 now includes requirements for accessibility and wheel chair access  New housing development should meet the nationally described space standards. Whilst this does not cover conversions of existing buildings, but HMOs will be covered by the licencing minimum space requirements. These additions are supported. | | **HOU 7 Subdivision of dwellings** | The Town Council supports the addition of requirements relating to parking and waste. | | **RET 6 Neighbourhood Parades of Shops** | The Town Council supports the addition of Crewe’s local parades to the policy. | | **RET 8 Residential accommodation in the town centre** | The Town Council supports the addition of references to safe access, bin and cycle storage. | | **RET10 Crewe Town Centre** | The policy should include specific reference and commitment to both a public realm strategy and a heritage strategy for Crewe Town Centre.  An additional sentence should be added to Para 6(i) to make it clearer that additional green spaces, and the use of features such as green walls will be supported. | |
|  |  |
| ***19/4/07*** | To consider making a response to the following planning applications:  There were no applications to be considered. |
|  |  |
| ***19/4/08*** | To consider making responses to any urgent planning application consultations that have arisen since this agenda was published. It was **resolved** to submit the responses set out in italics below:   * **19/4112N** Proposed Change of Use of Existing Joinery Workshop (Use Class B1 and B8) to Builder's Hardware Store and Storage Yard (Use Class A1 and B8) 247, BROAD STREET, CREWE   *The Town Council objects to a change to A1 retail use unless permission can be strictly restricted to the narrow range of trade only products described in the design and access statement. The site is unsuitable for general retail use because of the poor access and lack of parking.*   * **19/0249N** Demolition of existing motor repair and MOT workshop and redevelopment with erection of 5no. dwellings and parking. EDWARD STREET GARAGE, EDWARD STREET, CREWE, CW2 6HQ   *No objection to the revised plans.* |
| ***19/4/09*** | To note responses approved under delegation since the previous meeting.   * **19/3772N** - Prior approval for change of use 22 Gainsborough Road Crewe   *This is not a valid application for prior approval.  The last use of the premises was as a café (A3) as permitted by application 17/0852N, trading as “Milkshakes and More”. This is referred to in the delegated officer report on application 18/0241N (Change of use from A3 to pre-school and out-of-school club), and confirmed by local residents.  Contrary to the applicant’s Design and Access Statement, there is no uncertainty at all as to whether permission reference 17/0852N was implemented.  It was.  As such, the building does not benefit from any permitted development rights for change of use to apartments (Class A3 to C3), and a full planning application is required.*  *In the event of a planning application for the scheme as now submitted, the Town Council will raise the following objections and concerns:*   1. *There is no provision for bin storage, and this is likely to result in bins being left on the pavement or at the front of the property, to the detriment of the appearance of the area and the amenity of local residents..* 2. *There is no off-street parking provision for these additional units. On street parking is already over-subscribed in this area, and funding has been approved for double yellow lines at the junction of Gainsborough Road and Stamford Avenue* 3. *There is no amenity space for the residents of the apartments.*  * **19/3529N** - Outline application for 5 pairs of semi-detached dwellings with vehicular access off Lewis Street. The Yard, Land off LEWIS STREET, CREWE   *Crewe Town Council has no objection in principle to the residential development of this site. However, the illustrative layout fails to demonstrate that this number of dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated. The main concerns are:*   1. *Parking provision. Flag Lane and Wistaston Road have extensive parking restrictions (double yellow lines) which force residents to park on adjoining streets such as Lewis Street.  During evenings and weekends there are no available on–street parking spaces in Lewis Street, and residents have to drive around other streets to find a space.  It is therefore imperative that the new development has adequate parking for residents and visitors. The illustrative layout shows 2 spaces per dwelling.  In all but one instance, these are laid out in tandem.  This is always an unpopular and impractical arrangements because of the need to shuffle cars around (for example if 2 adult occupants work different shifts). This tends to result in one car being left on the road. The illustrative layout leaves little space for safe on-street parking, which will also be required for visitors.* 2. *Vehicle turning.  There is no turning head in Lewis Street, so it is important that the layout provides adequate turning for all vehicles using the street.  This needs to be kept free of parked cars.* 3. *Bin storage.  There must be provision for bins to be stored in a suitably screened location, preferably to the rear of the houses, with provision for them to be wheeled out for collection.* 4. *Amenity Space. It is important that each dwelling has sufficient private amenity space in accordance with the policies in the local plan. This should take into account overhanging trees etc.*  * **19/2849N** - Change of use of retail unit to retail unit, hot food takeaway and two flats 123-125, EDLESTON ROAD, CREWE –   *Crewe Town Council welcomes the proposal to bring this disused property back into use, and is pleased to see that there is access from the residential units to both the front and rear of the property, with bin and cycle storage to the rear. Bin storage for the takeaway and the retail unit are also to the rear. The only access for refuse to be removed from the rear is along a narrow alley, access to which depends upon the consent of a neighbour. If this is not forthcoming or sustained, it would result in bins being left on the pavement which would be unacceptable. Therefore any consent must be subject to a condition or legal agreement ensuring that there is adequate access to the rear of the property for the removal of waste, and that it can be guaranteed that this access will be maintained for the life of the property.*  *The Town Council also notes that the photographs included in the design and access statement show vehicles parked on the pavement in front of the shop units.  Is this consistent with pedestrian safety?*  Members noted and approved the above responses. |
| ***19/4/10*** | To note the response submitted to the draft Crewe Hub Area Action Plan (*see footnote 1****)*** AND Southern Link Road Bridge Consultation. |
|  | Response to Southern Link Road Bridge Consultation:  *The Town Council supports the provision of the SLRB to alleviate congestion on the Nantwich Road Bridge, and reduce pollution in that area.   However, the information in the consultation leaflet is not detailed enough to enable a considered choice between the junction options.  The Town Council’s main priorities for the choice of route are that the impact on nearby residential and business properties be kept to the minimum possible.*  Members noted and approved the above responses. |
| ***19/4/11*** | To consider a street naming consultation for new streets off Sydney Road (SNN000001953). Correspondence circulated relating to planning application  18/4050N (Land off Sydney Road) requesting eleven names for streets/roads.  Members considered the request for street names and ***resolved*** to propose the following names:  Ada Nield Chew  Charles Sullivan  Members would like to draw up a list of potential names in advance of future requests. |
|  |  |
| ***19/4/12*** | To note a response to a street naming consultation for New streets off West Street submitted under delegation.  Members noted the response submitted. |
|  |  |
| ***19/4/13*** | To consider member requirements in relation to training needs. Training has been provisionally booked for Monday 7th and Monday 14th October between 19.00 and 21.00. (Note that each session will cover different topics).  Members noted the date of the training sessions. |
|  |  |
| ***19/4/13*** | **To note the date of the next meeting – 15th October 2019**  Members noted the date of the next meeting. |

**Meeting Closed: 21.55 pm**

**Footnote: 1 – CREWE HUB ACTION AREA PLAN: CREWE TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Crewe Town Council welcomes the latest version of the CHAAP. HS2 provides a unique opportunity to re-energise the local economy and to attract investment and jobs to the town. The CHAAP sets out a framework for this which respects the heritage of the town, ensures that local residents will benefit, and promotes sustainable development with improved pedestrian, cycle and public transport facilities. The Town Council has the following detailed comments:

* 1. **Policy GD 1: Plan Boundary**. In order to create a comprehensive scheme for Mill Street and Gresty Road, the western frontages of these streets should be included within the plan boundary, so that Design and Heritage policies would apply to these frontages.
  2. **Policy GD2: Development Strategy.** The Town Council supports the growth ambitions in the Constellation Growth Strategy and the Crewe Masterplan Vision for the Crewe Hub “Campus”. It would like to see more detail on how the proposed additional housing and employment will be accommodated with in the AAP, given that the AAP boundary has been quite narrowly defined, the campus could extend further if there is insufficient capacity within the AAP boundary.
  3. **Policy DH2: Safeguarding Crewe’s Railway and Built Heritage**. Support the emphasis on the town’s heritage.
  4. **Policy TH1: Accessible Car Parks**. The design and appearance of new car parks is an important consideration, and the Town Council would like to see this emphasised in the policy with a reference to DH1.
  5. **Policy TH5: Car Parking Standards.** The Town Council has serious concerns about Policy TH5. The wording of the policy does not make clear whether the parking ratios are maxima or minima, although the supporting text implies that they are maxima. The Local Plan sets minimum standards. Moreover, the provision proposed is much lower than that in the Local Plan. For example, office provision is set at a maximum of 1 space per 40 sqm. In a call centre, 40 sqm would accommodate 5 staff, and in a financial services office it would accommodate 4 staff.[[1]](#footnote-1) Whilst the Town Council supports efforts to increase the use of sustainable modes of transport, and decrease car use, it is evident from existing developments close to the station and well served by public transport (e.g. Crewe Business Park) that the Local Plan parking ratios for office use (a minimum of 1 space per 30 sq m) are inadequate and lead to overflow parking on pavements, verges, and in nearby residential areas. Further, enforced reduction in the standards of provision would create serious problems in the local area. The number of proposed additional jobs inevitably means an increase in inward commuting, much of which may come from areas not well served by train or bus services to the station area. Crewe Station is not a commuter hub. The advent of HS2 will improve inter-regional services rather than local commuter services. The number of proposed jobs will far exceed the local labour supply, so a significant element of car use is inevitable.

Similar concerns apply to the proposed imposition of reduced parking standards to residential development. Provision for a 2 bed house or apartment is set at a maximum of 1 space, whereas the Local Plan standard is a minimum of 2 spaces. On street parking in the nearby residential areas is already at a premium, and under-provision for new dwellings in Mill Street for example would cause serious problems. The CBRE report (paras 2.90 and 2.91) refers to 2011 car ownership in Crewe being lower than the Cheshire East average, and uses this as justification for low parking provision. This is a simplistic approach. The occupational profile of the Crewe population in 2011 does not match the type of business that it is hoped to attracted to the commercial hub. Moreover, it is a key premise of the growth strategy that there will population growth through inward migration. For the same reasons, Jacobs’ use of 2011 modal share (Transport Evidence Base section 4.10) is inappropriate, and the adoption of Milton Keynes and Reading’s residential parking standards is arbitrary. Parking provision should look at the characteristics of intended occupiers (both employment and residential) not the existing profile.

* 1. **Policy DA1: Mill Street**. The policy (para 2 second bullet) refers to a non-existent Policy TH6. Para 3, first bullet refers to the “west of the site closer to the railway lines”. Should this be the east of the site?
  2. **Policy DA2: Gresty Road.** The Town Council would like to see reference to redevelopment of Nantwich House as well as to Rail House (section 3, third bullet). Consideration should be given to an Article 4 direction to withdraw future permitted development rights to change these buildings from B1 to C3 uses.
  3. **Policy DA5: Commercial Hub.** Section 2 refers to a multi storey car park on the eastern edge of the area. Should this be the western edge (nearer to the station)? In section, 3 reference is made to landmark buildings on the frontage of University Way. This is welcome, but it is outside the plan boundary.
  4. **Nantwich Road Retail Area.** The Town Council would like the plan to include some reference and consideration to the retail area of Nantwich Road west of the station but outside the proposed CHAAP boundary, in the same way that consideration is given to the Town Centre which is also outside the plan boundary. The retail area along Nantwich Road west of the station can potentially benefit from the new development. However, the greater part of it, west of the Mill Street Junction is outside the plan boundary and so not covered by policies within the plan. Unlike the Town Centre, there is no policy or commentary within the plan aimed at protecting and enhancing this locally valued shopping area, and it is not clear how it might be affected by the retail provision within the plan. Further consideration is needed as to how this area might develop
  5. **Southern Link Road Bridge** The Town Council supports the provision of the SLRB to alleviate congestion on the Nantwich Road Bridge, and reduce pollution in that area. However, the information in the consultation leaflet is not detailed enough to enable a considered choice between the junction options. The Town Council’s main priorities for the choice of route are that the impact on nearby residential and business properties be kept to the minimum possible.

1. CHAAP Delivering Employment, Skills and Training July 2019 Appendix C – Employment Densities [↑](#footnote-ref-1)