



SHAVINGTON
CUM
GRESTY

**Shavington-cum-Gresty Council
Planning Committee meeting**

Main Road,
Shavington, Crewe
CW2 5DP

www.shavingtononline.co.uk

Minutes of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 23 July 2025 at 7pm

In attendance: Cllrs R Jones, McIntyre, Wain

Also in attendance: H Marshall (Parish Clerk), Cllrs Cruickshank, Randle, B Gibbs and 28 members of the public

ScG/P3/01	To receive and consider apologies for absence Apologies were received from Cllr K Gibbs
ScG/P3/02	To note declarations of Members' interests No declarations of interest were made.
ScG/P3/03	To confirm and sign the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 2 July 2025 (attached) RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 2 July were approved and signed as an accurate record.
ScG/P3/04	Public Participation <i>A period not exceeding 20 minutes for members of the public to ask questions or submit comments</i> <i>Members of the public commented as summarised below on application 25/2405/OUT:</i> <i>28 residents attended the meeting. Residents were generally opposed to the building works. The key issues raised were:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>concern about the location, causing erosion of the green gap.</i>• <i>Environmental issues, mitigation land, concerns about newts, bats, foxes, hedgerows, owls</i>• <i>Traffic on Crewe Rd and Gresty Rd.</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Potentially good farm land being used for housing and eroding food security.</i> • <i>Safety on Gresty Lane. There is currently no walking or cycle path on Gresty Lane and adding more traffic will cause greater risk to the public.</i> • <i>Adding more houses will remove the community feel of the village and merge Shavington-cum-Gresty with Crewe, something residents are opposed to.</i> • <i>There needs to be greater infrastructure, especially places in the GP surgery and school</i> • <i>Flooding on Crewe RD corner and also Gresty Lane, which often has flooding when there is a large downpour. There was a concern that there will be nowhere for the surface water to go.</i> <p><i>Standing orders were suspended at 1921 to allow comments to continue.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Concern that the parking near to the soccer centre on Crewe Rd would make exiting the proposed development difficult.</i> • <i>There was a concern that the proposed entrance to the development would lead to more crashes on that road due to lack of visibility from that point.</i> <p><i>Standing orders were reinstated at 1933</i></p>
<p>ScG/P3/05</p>	<p>To consider making a response to the following planning applications:</p> <p>25/2333/VOC Variation of condition Proposal: Variation of condition 14 relating to air source heat pump on approved application 22/0496N - Detached single dwelling. 27 Crewe Road, Shavington, Crewe, Cheshire East, CW2 5JE</p> <p>RESOLVED: No comment</p> <p>25/2405/OUT Outline Planning: Outline planning application for access of residential development of up to 120 dwellings with public open space, associated landscaping and the formation of new access off Crewe Road. Land West of Crewe Road</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Clerk will be asked to submit comments to summarise the issues raised by residents and Members (see attached)</p>
<p>ScG/P3/06</p>	<p>To consider making responses to any urgent planning application consultations that have arisen since this agenda was published.</p> <p>No additional planning applications have arisen.</p>

ScG/P3?07	To note the date of the next Planning Committee Meeting – 3 September 2025 7:00PM Members NOTED the date of the next meeting

Meeting closed 2017

Chair: Cllr McIntyre
Clerk H Marshall

Planning Application 25/2405/OUT

When determining this application, CE planning, or even the developer, may choose to invoke a *Tilted Balance* approach. Tilted Balance is described in Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This is a policy which states that planning permission *should* be granted unless any adverse effects of the development would outweigh the benefits. This can be applied 1) When there are no relevant policies in the local plan or if the plan is outdated or not applicable to the development in question, or 2) If the policies in the plan are out of date and the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites or that housing delivery has been below requirements.

Any harms from the development must be significant enough to outweigh the benefits for permission to be denied.

Shavington-cum-Gresty Parish Council believe that this proposed development would create significant harm to the local residents of Shavington-cum-Gresty.

The application lies outside the settlement boundary of the Parish and so is in contravention of Policy PG6 of the Local Plan Strategy and Policy HOU1 of the ScG Neighbourhood Plan

This land lies within a Strategic Green Gap as defined in SADPD Policy PG 12 'Strategic green gaps boundaries' and so is subject to LPS Policy PG 5 Strategic Green Gaps and Policy PG 6 'Open Countryside' which prevents development of the land which would :

1. Result in the erosion of a physical gap between any of the settlements named in this policy (Willaston / Rope / Shavington / Crewe)
2. Adversely affect the visual character of the landscape; or
3. Significantly affect the undeveloped character of the Green Gap or lead to the coalescence between existing settlements.

Green Gaps are there to prevent the coalescence of villages and to prevent urban sprawl. Once Green Gap is lost, it cannot be replaced – its gone forever.

For an exception to be made, CE Planning would need to demonstrate that no suitable alternative location is available and that there is a demonstrable need for more housing in Shavington.

Shavington-cum Gresty Parish Council believe that housing requirements for the parish have already been met as noted in the Neighbourhood Plan. Shavington-cum-Gresty has already absorbed major growth: c. 370 new homes to the east of Crewe Road and c. 50 homes off Gresty Lane were completed in the early 2010's. The marginal benefit of an additional 120 units is limited, whereas the policy harm to the Green Gap is direct, irreversible and contrary to the development plan as a whole.

The Parish fought against the boundary shift back in 2021 as there was a strong feeling that we did not want to merge with Crewe. This proposal would erode the Green Gap and go against the strength of feeling that the village hold. Of the whole

of CE. 4824 responses were received, with 907 coming from Shavington-cum-Gresty 18.8%, objecting to the boundary shift which would have led to a blurring of boundaries between Shavington-cum-Gresty and Crewe. The proposed development would erode these boundaries.

No provision has been made to mitigate the effect of the increase in residents on local services including doctors, dentists, schools and leisure facilities. The Rope Green Medical Centre, which the majority of residents of Shavington-cum-Gresty use as their GP Surgery would need to have additional capacity to deal with the increase of approximately 260 additional residents. In a recent review by the Care Quality Commission the percentage of respondents to the GP Patient Survey who responded positively to how easy it was to contact their GP practice on the phone at this practice was 34.2% in March 2024 which was below the national average of 49.7%. The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of contacting their GP practice was below the national average.

Schools in Shavington-cum-Gresty are also at capacity. Shavington Primary School have recently reduced their catchment area from 0.8 miles to 0.7 miles, and 8 appeals were rejected for this school year due to capacity constraints. If the proposed development were to go ahead, provision would be necessary to expand school places.

In addition to the concerns about school places, traffic and safety is a key concern. Without significant improvements to infrastructure and roads, particularly Gresty Lane, there are significant safety implications for children travelling to local schools, either on foot or cycling. Most of Gresty Lane has no footpath and is often used as a 'Rat-run' between Gresty and Rope.

It also happens to be the most direct route between the proposed development and Rope Green Medical Centre and Shavington Academy. It is interesting to note that in the Travel Plan provided by the applicants, the distances to local facilities, on page 12, does not mention Shavington Academy or Rope Green Medical Centre. Crossing points along Crewe Road are identified in the application along with a shared footway/cycle path and these should be included should approval be given.

The proposed entrance to the estate on Crewe Rd has insufficient sight lines for the road and will cause additional safety issues.

There is significant, documented flooding on Gresty Lane and Crewe Rd and ice patches in the winter on the corner of Crewe Rd. There are confirmed surface water issues in the flood risk assessment which would need to be addressed. Flooding on Gresty Lane is a regular occurrence, with one house known to have been flooded twice in recent years. There is no mitigation in place in these plans to address this issue.

In order to maintain the visual integrity of the site, it is important that any developer preserves as much of the existing hedgerow and trees as possible.

Should this outline planning application and any subsequent full applications be approved, the Parish Council believe that S106 and CIL levies should be used to address these issues and the current CIL charging zone map for Shavington shows this site to be in Zone 2 at £22 per sqm.

In light of the above, Shavington-cum-Gresty Parish Council urges Cheshire East Planning to give full weight to the adopted Local Plan, the Shavington-cum-Gresty Neighbourhood Plan, and the protections afforded by Strategic Green Gap policies. The adverse impacts of the proposed development are numerous, demonstrable, and irreversible: it would undermine the distinct rural identity of the parish, strain already overburdened local services, compromise road safety, and breach multiple established planning policies. Even under the Tilted Balance approach, the cumulative harm clearly and significantly outweighs any limited benefits the scheme might provide. Planning permission should therefore be refused in order to preserve the integrity of the Green Gap, uphold the will of the local community, and protect the long-term sustainability and character of Shavington-cum-Gresty.