



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 24 January 2023

Site visit made on 24 January 2023 and 16 February 2023

by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3289108

Mansfield House, Withyfold Drive, Macclesfield SK10 2BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by 1st Choice Waste & Metals Limited against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1080W, dated 6 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a change of use of site from Vehicle Recovery Depot to Waste Recycling Centre, installation of weighbridge, removal of existing temporary building and erection of two new canopy buildings for the receipt and storage of non-hazardous wastes (temporary for 3 years).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the hearing I heard from a number of local residents who lived in the surrounding area, either close to the site itself or along the appellant's indicated access route to the site, or both. Common amongst their comments were their experiences of existing commercial vehicles accessing the site via the surrounding local road network. An accompanied site visit was conducted on the day of the hearing, to view the site itself, at which time I was accompanied by representatives of the appellant and the Council, and by agreement with local residents during the course of the hearing itself, a representative on their behalf.
3. During the course of the hearing, and prior to the site visit, it was agreed that following representations from local residents that I would also undertake a separate site visit, on an unaccompanied basis, to walk along the indicated intended access route to the site, as well as surrounding residential streets. A number of viewpoints were agreed between the parties and which are set out at DOC3. I proceeded to visit these on foot and by car during this second visit to the site.
4. It was also agreed at the hearing that a set of suggested conditions, agreed between the main parties, would be submitted after the event. I have taken the submitted conditions into account in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties, including but not restricted to properties on Withyfold Drive, Nicholson Avenue and Queen's Avenue, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

The appeal site and the surrounding area

6. The appeal site is a broadly L-shaped site located towards the southern end of the Hursdfield Industrial estate, a designated strategic employment area within Policy EMP1(vi) of the Chester East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) and a 'preferred site'¹ for waste management facilities within the Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan (CRWLP). Principally accessed via Withyfold Drive, historically the site has also been accessed from the north via Snape Road through other neighbouring industrial sites.
7. Most recently used as a vehicle recovery depot, the site is bound to the north and east by industrial units elsewhere within the Hursdfield Industrial Estate and accessed via Snape Road and Queen's Avenue. To the west, lies an embankment to 'The Silk Road' (A523) with extensive and dense vegetation on it and to the south a substantial retaining wall, below which is a recently development retail park. The site lies at the southern end of a broad swathe of largely industrial and commercial uses extending from the northern side of Hulley Road between Queen's Avenue and The Silk Road towards the town centre. By virtue of the recently built retail park to the south of the appeal site and adjoining superstore site, this swathe continues towards the Hursdfield Road / Silk Road roundabout junction.
8. It was agreed that the appeal site has an extant permission² for use as a vehicle recovery depot and that that extant permission makes provision for access to the site via Withyfold Drive. Although conditions 1 and 3 of that permission were subject to a subsequent application³ for their removal, the appeal that followed⁴ upheld the wording of condition 3. Thus, the extant permission and the upheld condition allow for access to the site via Withyfold Drive, unfettered by restrictions on the size or type of vehicle, but restricted by time limitations. A further application for planning permission⁵ established an additional access, via Snape Road, allowing access to the site outside the restricted hours by avoiding Withyfold Drive.
9. Notwithstanding the industrial character of the appeal site, I heard that access to the site has principally been taken via Withyfold Drive, which also serves a small number of other commercial and industrial units adjacent to the appeal site. Although the extent to which the site itself directly borders with residential properties is limited, the nature and character of much of the immediately surrounding area, and thus access to the site, is more mixed. Beyond the residential context of Withyfold Drive, the appellant's proposed access route to the site, itself proposed and confirmed during the course of the application, is largely residential in character. Whilst Hulley Road and the immediate stretch of Queen's Avenue from it are essentially commercial in their nature, the character of Queen's Avenue changes, on one side at first and then to both sides, to become principally residential in its character. The latter, and then Nicholson Avenue, become more constrained with on-street parking the closer one gets to Withyfold Drive.

¹ Site Allocation WM10

² LPA Ref No: 96/1085P

³ LPA Ref No: 97/1953P

⁴ T/APP/C0630/A/290365

⁵ LPA Ref No: 07/1578P

10. I also heard during the hearing that the nature and character of other areas around the appeal site have changed over time and since the designation of the appeal site within the Hursdfield Industrial area, broadly reflecting a pattern of decline in heavy and manufacturing industries. Thus, the area of land immediately to the south of the appeal site has recently been redeveloped as a retail park and I heard too of changing patterns of occupation by the gas and rail related industries on areas of land around the Nicolson Avenue, Withyfold Drive, Garden Street and Corporation Street areas.
11. Nevertheless, the appeal site itself sits quite clearly and comfortably in a commercial and industrial context and as part of the designated Hursdfield Industrial area, albeit that it is located at the southern end of that designation. It is also common ground that the appeal site is within an allocated site for a range of uses including materials recycling within the Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan (WLP)⁶, although it is noted that this allocation includes the whole of the Hursdfield Industrial area and a further area to the north of Hulley Road. It is also equally clear that the sole, practicable and accessible access to the site is via Withyfold Drive which is, other than a few small industrial units, an auction house building and a local electricity board site that are accessed from it, predominantly residential in character.
12. To the south of Withyfold Drive, the residential streets tend to be predominantly terraced, with properties fronting directly on to the pavement. However, Nicholson Avenue and Queen's Avenue, and the residential roads leading off them, are typically comprised of semi-detached houses, set behind small front gardens. These streets feel slightly less cramped in comparison to the terraces but, notwithstanding their pleasant grass verges, the roads are narrow and on-street car parking is prevalent.
13. Withyfold Drive too, is a relatively narrow, predominantly residential, street. Although slightly wider at its junction with Nicholson Avenue, and with an access to a vacant site compound near that junction, it tapers in width between the residential properties further along its length. Here, the properties on the western side of the road are set behind small front gardens and at a slightly lower level than the carriageway. On-street parking along this side of the road was also prevent at the time of my visits and, although I only observed this at limited and particular times, I have no reason to believe that this side of the road is not normally occupied by parked vehicles.

The proposal

14. The proposal seeks permission for the change of use of the appeal site from a vehicle recovery depot to a waste recycling centre. The appellant had, at the time of the hearing, previously operated from a nearby site at Moss Lane, Macclesfield. The purpose of the appeal proposal would allow the appellant to relocate the majority of its operations from the Moss Lane site to the appeal site, retain a proportion of the Moss Lane site for limited operations and the development of the remainder of that site for residential purposes, for which planning permission⁷ has been granted by the Council.
15. Since the previous operator of the appeal site gained planning permission for an entrance and gates elsewhere within the site to facilitate a second access,

⁶ Preferred Site WM10 – Hurdfield Industrial Estate

⁷ LPA Ref No: 15/2010M

developments elsewhere off Snape Road within the industrial area have meant that that access is no longer accessible to the appellant. However desirable a second access might be in providing an alternative to Withyfold Drive, whether that be in terms of its width and ease of passage or as a means to reducing or removing the passage of goods vehicles from Withyfold Drive and its surrounding residential streets, it was agreed that that was no longer within the appellant's gift to reinstate. I heard no further compelling evidence to lead me to conclude otherwise.

16. The appellant's proposed use of the site would entail the receipt of dry, non-hazardous mixed general wastes from a variety of sources, including household, commercial and construction sources for sorting and recycling. Unlike the previous operation of the site as a vehicle recovery depot which had permitted access, if not use, on a 24-hour basis, the proposal's operational hours would broadly follow conventional 'working' hours of 0800-1800 on weekdays, 0800-1300 on Saturdays, with no working on Sundays or bank holidays. In principle therefore, and having regard to the provisions of WLP Policy WM10, the nature of the appellant's proposed use of the site is broadly consistent with the provisions of the policy allocation set out therein for the whole of the wider Hurdsfield industrial area.
17. I heard during the hearing that the numbers of skip vehicle movements proposed had been reduced during the course of the application from a maximum of 70 per day (35 in / 35 out) to 50 per day (25 in / 25 out). This, I also heard, was broadly comparable to an average of 25 vehicle recoveries per day for the previous site operator, which equated to a total of 50 per day (25/25). In both instances I understand that these figures are in addition to other vehicle movements such as staff, deliveries and other non-skip (or non-vehicle recovery, for the purpose of comparison) vehicle movements. From what I heard during the event, I have no reason to believe that there are concerns regarding the levels of traffic, or issues of noise and disturbance, arising from vehicles other than those larger vehicles for the receiving or removing of wastes for sorting and recycling.
18. Given the appellant's stated weekday working hours of operation, these maxima figures would equate to an average of a vehicle entering and exiting the site along Withyfold Drive every 12 minutes. The stated total number of vehicle movements across the working day would be approximately double that of the HGV movements, but it was principally the experiences of residents and the assessment of noise from HGV movements that it seems to me are particularly problematic.

Living conditions

19. Access to the site along Withyfold Drive is long established by virtue of the operation of the vehicle recovery depot. By association and proximity, use of the surrounding roads by goods vehicles accessing the site is also long established, albeit that varying routes through the surrounding residential streets would have had the effect of dispersing, to an extent, that traffic until reaching the focus point for that access along Withyfold Drive.
20. I heard that the previous operators of the appeal site, when in use as a vehicle recovery depot, had the benefit of a secondary access to the site via Snape Road. For most of its length, I saw that Snape Road is an access road serving a number of commercial and industrial units within a much larger industrial

estate. Significantly, most of the length of road from the Silk Road dual-carriageway to Snape Road is along the predominantly commercial setting of Hulley Road and a short stretch of the northern portion of Queen's Avenue. However, the route along Snape Road appears to peter out amongst the commercial units, confirming discussions during the hearing whereby it is no longer within the appellant's gift to be able to gain access to the appeal site via this route.

21. Thus, the appeal site would be solely accessed from Withyfold Drive. Despite its residential nature, goods vehicles travelling along Withyfold Drive are not uncommon. Whilst Snape Road may have provided a secondary point of access to the appeal site in a previous incarnation, it did not entirely remove such vehicles from Withyfold Drive. Nor, given the presence of other existing and current commercial and industrial uses at its end, adjacent to the appeal site, are such vehicles absent from Withyfold Drive presently.
22. However, the type and nature of vehicles proposed to access the site as part of the appellant's proposal would differ from those likely to currently access the smaller industrial and commercial units that exist and which take access from Withyfold Drive. Larger tipper-type vehicles and skip-wagons would likely be larger and slower moving along Withyfold Drive than those that might typically access existing sites, even if there are, as I heard, elements of meaningful comparison with the vehicle recovery lorries that the previous use of the appeal site employed.
23. Withyfold Drive is a relatively narrow and principally residential street notwithstanding the presence of the appeal site and small group of commercial and industrial buildings located at its end. With the exception of the appeal site, the remaining majority of the Hurdsfield Industrial area has little, if any, influence over the residential character of the Withyfold Road / Nicholson Avenue / Queen's Avenue area. On the former street, residential properties are principally, but not exclusively, located on the western side of the road. A small number of houses, towards the northern end of the street, are however located on the eastern side. With vehicles parked on one side of the road, the carriageway width is effectively reduced so that moving vehicles are unable to pass each other.
24. It is not disputed, between the main parties at least, that Withyfold Drive is of sufficient width to accommodate the type of tipper wagons and skip vehicles that the appellant operates. However, whilst sufficient carriageway width exists if existing resident parking patterns are maintained, for those commercial vehicles to pass along Withyfold Drive it is inevitable that care would, and indeed should, have to be exercised while passing. Although only a short residential street with a modest number of properties, pedestrians and children stepping out behind and between cars cannot be discounted.
25. As a consequence, it is likely that vehicle movements, particularly vehicles of the type used by the appellant, would inevitably be slow moving along Withyfold Drive. Movements would be likely to be undertaken in a low gear, particularly when negotiating passes of parked vehicles and at junctions, as well as being a responsible measure of anticipating hazards typical in residential streets. As such, slow vehicle movements would be likely to result in prolonged exposure to noise and vibration for the residential properties given the proximity of those movements. Such movements would also be likely to be

accompanied by the revving of engines in low gears that face on to Withyfold Drive.

26. The residential properties along Withyfold Drive, particularly those on the western side, have only short driveways and restricted front garden areas. They are also set at a slightly lower level than the road itself. These property facades, behind which typically are living rooms and bedrooms, do not therefore benefit from much in the way of intervening mitigation to the noise of slow moving, low geared goods vehicles.
27. The appellant has proposed a range of measures in an attempt to mitigate the effects of goods vehicles, principally tippers and skip-lorries, upon residential properties. These measures include, I heard at the hearing, the installation of 'skip socks' on the skip-lorries to cushion the chains used to lift the skips on to the back of the skip lorries. As vehicles of this type accessing the site would be under the control of the appellant the implementation of such measures could reasonably be ensured.
28. With the installation of 'skip socks' the appellant has sought to demonstrate⁸ that vehicles of this nature would not be any noisier, and indeed may be quieter, than recovery vehicles. The comparison in this instance, was provided utilising recovery vehicles operated by the appellant. It is broadly accepted that skip socks can be a beneficial factor in reducing aspects of the noise of passing vehicles. However, their effectiveness is limited to the noise emanating from the chains themselves and not from other aspects of the skip vehicle movements, such as the skips themselves, particularly when empty. Nor do they mitigate the effects of the skip vehicles themselves, nor other vehicles such as the tipper vehicles also operated by the appellant.
29. I share the Council's concerns regarding aspects of the appellant's Environmental Noise Assessment (ENA) with regard to passing vehicle traffic along Withyfold Drive. It is not clear exactly where the ENA assessments have been taken from along that road. Thus, as noted elsewhere, the character and nature of Withyfold Drive differs along its length in terms of gradient, width and surrounding buildings. Thus, the nature of the ENA's findings if conducted towards the top of Withyfold Drive closest to the site where the road is at its flattest with less in the way of closely sited buildings would be likely, in the manner explained by the Council, to exhibit different characteristics, and therefore impacts, to its mid-portion where it has more of a gradient and is flanked on both sides by houses of differing scales, and different again closer to its junction with Nicholson Avenue.
30. Moreover, it was explained to me that the basis upon which the ENA's acoustic survey was taken was not wholly representative or sufficiently accurate to understand the effects of a 'drive-by' pass on those residential properties in terms of either height or proximity of the monitoring to the noise source. I understand that both variables are likely to have some effect on the level of noise experienced by these closest properties which, on the eastern side sit above the carriageway level and those on the west generally below. Nor is it clear whether the effects of parked vehicles in channelling and deflecting the noise from the skip and tipper wagons, and upon the ability of those wagons to simply 'drive-by', have been taken into consideration in assessing the noise

⁸ Section 5.5 and Table 5.4 – Oaktree Environmental Ltd 'Environmental Noise Assessment' v1.1

associated with those vehicles, and that received by these residential receptors.

31. It is clear that the Withyfold Drive access has historically been used, and continues to an extent, to be used by commercial and goods vehicles. The previous use of the appeal site also entailed using Withyfold Drive, and other surrounding streets, for access and egress, at a wide range of hours, by recovery vehicles. However, this was offset to an extent by arrangements to use Snape Road as an additional, and often out of hours, access.
32. The latter option no longer exists and it is agreed between the main parties that there is presently no restriction on vehicle routing, vehicle type or hours of access to the appeal site. Nor, following an exercise of considering alternative routes agreed between the main parties, does one exist to the appeal site. Thus, Withyfold Drive would provide sole access and egress to the site. Whilst the numbers of skip and tipper wagon movements would, I am led to believe, be broadly similar to that generated by the previous use, Withyfold Drive would be the sole focus of access.
33. These concerns are not limited solely to the immediate access to the site from Withyfold Drive. Whilst I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to limit the wider implications of the routing of the company's vehicles, particularly in relation to the narrow, terraced and one-way streets of Black Lane, Garden Street and Steeple Street, I have similar concerns regarding the implications of such vehicles accessing Withyfold Drive from Nicholson Avenue. Although the houses along the latter street are themselves set further back from the carriageway than those of Withyfold Drive, the nature of Nicholson Avenue, with its prevalent on-street car parking and its busier and more general 'through-route' nature, is likely to encourage more stop-start manoeuvring of vehicles. As a consequence, low-speed manoeuvring of all vehicles, whether directly, indirectly or unrelated to, the appellant's proposed operations are likely to be felt along Nicholson Avenue and, to a lesser extent, that stretch of Queen's Avenue that is closest to the junction with Nicholson Avenue and is more residential in character than other parts of it. The misgivings set described above are as applicable in this context as they are in respect of Withyfold Drive.
34. For the above reasons, I conclude that it has not been adequately or satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of occupiers of residential properties along Withyfold Drive or, to a lesser degree, those of Nicholson Avenue between its junction with Withyfold Drive and Queen's Avenue. This is with particular regard to noise and vibration from, particularly, skip and tipper wagons entering and leaving the appeal site along Withyfold Drive and Nicholson Avenue. I am not persuaded that conditions, particularly with regard to the installation of 'skip socks' would entirely mitigate the broad range and nature of noise arising from the passing of skip and tipper wagons along these streets. Nor, whilst the appellant's access routing plan is noted and welcomed insofar as it would encourage vehicles to avoid routing via Garden Street, Steeple Street or Back Lane, it would do little to alleviate the harm that I have identified in respect of properties along Withyfold Drive and Nicholson Avenue.
35. Whilst access to the site would, more widely, also involve these vehicles passing along Queen's Avenue and Hulley Road, their residential character is

either diluted or absent due to the more overt presence of commercial and industrial uses along the whole or parts of their length. This is not to say that the harmful effects of the noise and vibration arising from these vehicles as felt elsewhere would not be experienced by occupiers of properties along Queen's Avenue, particularly close to its junction with Nicholson Avenue, but rather that these effects have not been determinative in this instance.

36. Nevertheless, I conclude that in the absence of compelling evidence to demonstrate that the proposal, by virtue in particular of access to the site along the residential and predominantly residential streets of Withyfold Drive, Nicholson Avenue and parts of Queen's Avenue would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and vibrations from skip and tipper wagons accessing the site, and significant harm to the living conditions of residential occupiers of properties on Withyfold Drive would arise. Nor, given the misgivings set out above, has it been adequately demonstrated with any confidence that measures could appropriately mitigate the effects of noise and vibration from passing skip and tipper wagons upon those residential properties and the living conditions of occupiers thereof. The appellant's undertaking to seek to control the access route to the site, whilst welcomed in respect of nearby terraced streets and offering a degree of control by virtue of the appellant's fleet of vehicles, would not wholly address the harm to living conditions I have found above.
37. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would be contrary to CELPS Policy SE12, CRWLP Policy 23 and Macclesfield Borough Local Plan Policies DC3 and DC13 which recognise the importance of residential amenity and living conditions and their sensitivity to forms of pollution including noise and vibration, whether they arise directly from the operations proposed or, as in this instance, from the effects of vehicles accessing and exiting the site. Given the site's residential context, and notwithstanding the in-principle support offered elsewhere within CELPS Policy SE11 and CRWLP Policies 4 and 12, the designations laid out within CELPS Policy EMP1(vi) and SADPD preferred site allocation WM10 and the economic benefits that would arise from the operation of the appellant's business, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the skip and tipper wagons accessing and exiting the site would not cause unacceptable levels of noise and vibration, to the detriment of the living conditions of residential occupants of Withyfold Drive, Nicholson Avenue and Queen's Avenue. The proposal would also be in conflict with the provisions of paragraphs 130 and 174 of the Framework. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development, through planning policies and planning decisions, create places that have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and that the local environment should be protected and enhanced by preventing new development contributing to, and existing development being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of, amongst other factors, noise pollution.

Other Matters

38. The appeal site is part of a wider allocated area⁹ to which Policy 4 of the CRWLP and Policy EMP1 of the SADPD provide support in principle for waste management facilities and as strategic employment areas, subject to compliance with other policies of the development plan. It is agreed as a point

⁹ Preferred Site WM10 'Hurdsfield Industrial Estate'

of principle that the appellant's proposed operations at the appeal site would satisfy the broad provisions of RWLP Policies 4 and 5, as well as its designation by way of Preferred Site WM10. Nor would there be conflict with the provisions of Cheshire East Local Plan Policy SE11 in the context of the principles of the waste hierarchy.

39. It is also accepted that the appellant has demonstrated extensive consideration of alternative sites, notwithstanding the current operation of an additional site at Moss Lane. The proposal would provide in the region of 40 full-time equivalent positions operating from the appeal site and, together with the support that waste management and recycling facilities provide for the local construction industries, the proposal's benefits to the local economy in these respects carry considerable weight in support of the proposal.
40. During the hearing I heard at length from local residents of concerns regarding the access to the site through an area of predominantly residential character. Those concerns were wide in their nature, from fears of an increase in vehicle movements compared with previous site operations, the speed of passing vehicles, noise and vibration arising from vehicle movements, and the effects of large vehicles using narrow streets and passing other parked (and moving) vehicles.
41. Notwithstanding the concerns I heard regarding the residential nature of Withyfold Drive, Nicholson Avenue and Queen's Avenue, it was broadly agreed between the main parties at least that the use of these roads to access the site was not unsafe, per se. It was evident at the time of my visits to the site the grass verges along Nicholson Avenue in particular, were prone to having vehicles cross them. Whether the results of that were due to the normal flow of traffic, vehicles accessing the site or roadworks (as there were at the time of my second visit to the site) is not clear. Whilst I sympathise with the views expressed by local residents regarding the effect of the conditions of verges it is not clear whether this was attributable to the appellant's operations but, as I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, I have not considered this matter further.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

42. The proposal would support the existing business operations of the appellant and allow them to develop the business following developments at and adjacent to its nearby site at Moss Lane. The proposed development is also of a nature broadly supported in principle within the wider Hurdsfield Industrial area, albeit that the appeal site is located towards its extremities and accessed via an almost exclusively residential context.
43. The numbers of vehicle movements, both skip and tipper wagons, and non-HGV type vehicles would not be dissimilar to the site's previous use as a depot for a vehicle recovery business. However, circumstances previously allowed the vehicle movements associated with that use to be diffused by a secondary access. Whilst the appellant has committed to an access route to the site that would avoid narrower, terraced streets, vehicle movements would nevertheless be focused on the residential streets of Withyfold Drive, Nicholson Avenue and, to a more limited extent because of its more mixed character along its length, Queen's Avenue.

44. In these locations, on-street parking is commonplace and whilst it is an agreed point between the main parties that highway safety would not be prejudiced by the proposal or access to it, care and caution would be required by drivers of the large, skip and tipper wagons. The stop / start nature of low-speed manoeuvring of large goods vehicles past and around parked cars on a narrow carriageway is likely to give rise to noise and vibration for which it has not been robustly demonstrated that harm to the living conditions of residents of properties along those streets would be avoided.
45. Whilst there are factors that weigh in support of the proposal, and others that have a neutral position within the planning balance, the harm to living conditions is a matter to which I give significant weight, and for which it has not been demonstrated that the proposal, and mitigation measures, would adequately address. Thus, for the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR

LIST OF APPEARANCES:

For the Appellant:

Gary Grant

John Groves

Thomas Benson

Peter Todd

Kathryn Lucas

Lee Henshaw

Richard Simms

Kings Chambers instructed by Groves
Town Planning

Groves Town Planning

Oaktree Environmental Ltd

SCP Transport

The Environment Practice

1ST Choice Waste & Metals Ltd

Oaktree Environmental Ltd

For the Local Planning Authority:

Matthew Fraser

Emma Williams

Andrew Raymond

Paul Hurdus

Landmark Chambers, instructed by
Cheshire East Council

Principal Planning Officer, Cheshire East
Council

Acoustic Design and Control Ltd

Highways Development Manager

Interested Persons:

Bob Phillips

Jo Gregory

Councillor Sarah Bennett-Wake

Keith Williams

Martin and Hillary Raymond

Rosie Hallam

Tony Marshall

Richard Nuttall

Chris Andrew

Annie Brown

Jess Fannon

Arndt Pedersen

Edward Wolfe

Gary Arden

Sarah Miles

Peter Mille

Gabrielle Parker

Sue Hulme

Gordon Hulme

Bethany Nuttall

Neil O'Connor

Simon and Rachel White

Dom Findon

Plus one interested party whose name
on attendance sheet was illegible

Urban Imprint

Urban Imprint

Local councillor

On behalf of Macclesfield Civic Society

Local residents

DOCUMENTS:

Submitted at the Hearing

DOC1 Attendance List

Submitted by:

Submitted after the Hearing

DOC2 Site Allocations &
Development Policies

Document policies:
HOU12, EMP1 & ENV15

DOC3 List of suggested points of
interest / walking route for
unaccompanied site visit

DOC4 Conditions agreed between
appellant and Council

Submitted by:

Cheshire East Council

Cheshire East Council

John Groves

(Groves Town Planning on behalf of the
appellant)

Bob Phillips

(Urban Imprint on behalf of local
residents)

Cheshire East Council

and

John Groves (Groves Town Planning on
behalf of the appellant)