

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF HANKELOW PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD IN HANKELOW METHODIST CHAPEL SCHOOLROOM, HANKELOW  
ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2014**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Foster Chairman  
Councillor C Ainley  
Councillor G Cope  
Councillor I Jones  
Councillor A Lee

**42 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare any non-pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest which they had in any item of business on the agenda, the nature of that interest, and in respect of disclosable interests to leave the meeting prior to the discussion of that item.

Councillor G Foster declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in planning application No. 14/4164N, on the basis that the development was in close proximity to her home.

**43 LODGE FARM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE – OUTLINE APPLICATION**

Members had received a copy of a letter from NJL Consulting informing the Parish Council that its outline application had been lodged with Cheshire East Council but had not yet been submitted to the Parish Council for consultation.

Residents had made comments prior to the commencement of the meeting, and Members now agreed to take those comments into account when the planning application was submitted to the Parish Council.

**44 PLANNING APPLICATION 14/4164N – LAND OFF LONGHILL LANE**

Note: Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item, Councillor G Foster withdrew from the meeting at this point in the proceedings. Councillor G Cope assumed the chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Members were invited to comment on planning application No. 14/4164N which was an outline application for five dwellings, installation of package treatment plant and creation of access road on land off Longhill Lane, Hankelow.

**RESOLVED:** (a) The Parish Council's objections to the application, as follows, be submitted to Cheshire East Council, as the local planning authority:

- (i) The applicant did not enter into pre-submission consultation with the Parish Council;
- (ii) The applicant had previously made presentations to the Parish Council for much larger schemes than the subject of this application and Members were surprised that he had not made contact about this much smaller application;
- (iii) The Parish Council had previously been given to understand that the Borough Council gave priority to developments which were either (a) infill; or (b) brownfield sites. This application was for development on a greenfield site and the Parish Council considered that priority for infill and brownfield should be maintained;
- (iv) The applicant had referred to the '*poor quality marginal land with poor drainage*'. Members disputed this. The land was Grade 3 agricultural and was capable of delivery for agricultural use;

- (v) Traffic impact: Longhill Lane was extremely narrow with no footway and no capacity for expansion; the increase in traffic would be dangerous for residents. Members were concerned about the method by which residents would gain access to and from the site. The junction with the A529 had already been acknowledged by Cheshire East Council as a dangerous junction;
- (vi) There appeared to have been no traffic impact assessment carried out to establish the impact of heavy commercial vehicles which would need to service the site; for example, refuse vehicles, oil-delivery vehicles;
- (vii) The applicant had confused the issue of the requirement for 2000 homes. This was not a proposal for **Hankelow**, but had arisen out of Cheshire East Council's proposal that Hankelow should be one of 20 'sustainable villages' and the 2000 homes, if distributed equally, would result in five dwellings per year, per village. (Paragraphs 3.9 and 5.0 Affordable Dwellings of the Planning Statement submitted by the applicant);
- (viii) Drainage was a general problem in the village and would be a particular problem on this site because of the topography. Foul water: after treatment in the proposed plant, the outflow would enter the ground-water system which, because of a high water table could not cope currently, and the situation would be exacerbated by the development;
- (ix) Additional water usage by each home would have an adverse impact taking into account the topography of the land behind the application area which rose so that the natural fall was to the road and pond, with no drainage; and
- (x) Permissions for 20 dwellings had already been granted in the last 5 years. This was a small village and there was no demonstrable requirement for these extra houses.

.....Chairman

The meeting commenced at 8.15 pm and concluded at 8.45 pm