

ITEM:

Application Reference	DC/067053
Location:	Offerton Service Station Marple Road Offerton Stockport SK2 5EU
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing Car Wash and Store and 2 no. Jet Wash Bays, extension of existing Garage Shop and relocation of air and water tower. Erection of 1no. Jet wash Bay and additional parking spaces.
Type Of Application:	Full
Registration Date:	12.09.17
Expiry Date:	07.11.17
Case Officer:	Chris Smyton
Applicant:	Mr Peter Brough, Manor Service Stations
Agent:	Mr Graham Cockburn, gc Town and Country Planning

COMMITTEE STATUS

Should Stepping Hill Area Committee be minded to grant permission under the Delegation Agreement the application should be referred to the Planning & Highways Regulations Committee as the application relates to a Departure from the Statutory Development Plan.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

As shown on the submitted plans, the application seeks planning permission to demolish the car wash building/ bins/ pant room and two existing jet wash bays, extend the shop and erect a new jet wash bay. The air-line box equipment would be moved to another part of the forecourt. Five additional parking spaces will be formed in the location of the existing car wash building.

- I. The existing shop building measures approximately 111 sqm or 449.54cum.
- II. The proposed shop extension will measure 10.95m x 6.812m x 3.55m = approximately 74.59sqm or 264.8cum.
- III. The existing car wash building measures 9.3m x 5.2m x 3.55m = 48.36sqm or 171.7cum.
- IV. The existing bins/ plant room measures 9.3m x 2.8m x 3.0m = 26.04sqm or 78.12cum.

TOTAL III. + IV. = 74.4sqm or 249.82cum.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Offerton Service Station fronts the north side of Marple Road A626 at Offerton Green. The service station is long-established (pre1970's) and currently comprises a forecourt with canopy over, detached car wash building, detached garage shop, two jet washes, air-line and vacuum machines.

It is sited entirely within the Green Belt.

POLICY BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications/appeals to be determined in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Statutory Development Plan includes:-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review May 2006 (SUDP) which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: &
- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) adopted 17th March 2011.

Saved policies of the SUDP Review

GBA1.2: CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

SIE-1: QUALITY PLACES

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Document 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' adopted February 2011 following public consultation.

Supplementary Planning Guidance (Saved SPG's & SPD's) does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless it provides non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework issued by DCLG on 27 March 2012 with immediate effect (NPPF).

Paragraph 196 states that: *“The planning system is plan-led. Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions”.*

NPPF Conformity

The Planning Advisory Services' National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Compatibility Self-Assessment Checklist has been undertaken on Stockport's adopted Core Strategy. This document assesses the conformity of Stockport's adopted Core Strategy with the NPPF and takes account of saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan where applicable. No significant differences were identified therefore the development plan is in conformity with the NPPF.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- DC018464 - Extension to shop & additional jet wash with glazed screens; granted 14/04/05.
 - DC060902 - Proposed extension to the existing premises, relocation of jet wash plus new one, hard standing for new parking area, construction of gabion walling and boundary fence, 24 hour operation on the shop; refused 1/4/16.
1. The application site lies within the Green Belt as defined by Saved Policy GBA1.1, "Extent of Green Belt", and the Proposals Map of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review. The proposed development is not permitted by saved Policy GBA1.2, "Control of Development in Green Belt" of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, or in accordance with the relevant advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, and it is therefore inappropriate development. No 'very special circumstances' necessary to outweigh harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm have been demonstrated by the applicant.
 2. Insufficient information relating to highways and transportation issues has been submitted in support of the application, in accordance with the
 3. The proposal will be contrary to Policies T-1, 'Transport and Development' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD 2011 as the development fails to include cycle parking and parking for disabled badge holders in accordance with the adopted standards.

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of ten surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The application was also advertised on site and in the press. The consultation period has expired and no representations have been received.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Drainage Engineer: no representations received.

Highway Engineer:Comments 18/10/17

This application seeks permission for various works at Offerton Service Station, including:

1. Enlarging the existing retail shop (from 99sqm (with a sales area of 56sm) to 173sqm, with a 107 sqm sales area), together with the introduction of a kitchen to allow a Subway franchise to be included in the shop
2. Construction of a new jet wash bay
3. Removal of an existing car wash
4. Provision of a parking area with 8 parking spaces.

The scheme is very similar to a scheme proposed under planning application DC/060902 which was refused in April 2016 on three grounds, including inappropriate development in the Green Belt, insufficient information relating to highways and transportation being submitted and the development failing to include cycle parking and parking for disabled badge holders in accordance with the adopted standards. As with the previous scheme, no changes are proposed to the site's access arrangements or the layout of the main petrol station forecourt. The main difference between the current scheme and the previous scheme is that the current scheme proposes the removal of the existing car wash to the rear of the site and the provision of additional parking spaces in its place.

Unlike the previous application, a Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted in support of the application to review the impact that the proposals will have on the local highway network, as well as the operation of the revised facility. This outlines, based on a TRICS assessment, that the existing service station would be expected to generate in the region of 102 two-way vehicle movements during the AM peak and 104 vehicle movements during the PM peak (assuming it operates as an average PFS without a significant retail store). Introduction of a retail store, it outlines, is predicted to result in the number of vehicle movements increasing to around 130 during the AM peak (28 additional vehicles) and 149 during the PM peak (45 additional vehicles). This equates to a 27% increase in vehicle movements during the AM peak and a 43% increase in vehicle movements during the PM peak. A large proportion of additional customers, however, are likely to be those already travelling along Marple Road and therefore the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the wider highway network or result in a material increase in vehicles travelling along Marple Road. It will, however, result in additional vehicles turning into and out of the site. The TS therefore includes the results of a junction modelling exercise that has been carried out on the site access. This demonstrates that the site accesses should continue to operate within capacity and minimal queuing is predicted to take place. After reviewing the assessment I would conclude that whilst I would agree with the conclusions of the TS that the site's access should continue to operate within capacity and minimal queuing following the development, as the existing access does not presently have a formal right-turn ghost island and its use will increase as a result of the proposal, in order to ensure that right-turning vehicles pull off the through-lane when turning into the site so as to not block

through traffic and therefore reduce capacity and improve the overall safety of the access, I consider that a formal right-turn ghost island should be provided at the site access as part of the development (this would involve amending the existing carriageway markings on Marple Road in the vicinity of the site). As such, I would recommend that any approval granted is subject to a condition requiring a right-turn ghost island to be provided.

With respect to parking, a maximum of 7 car parking spaces, together with a minimum of 1 space for disabled badge holders and 2 spaces for cycles should be provided for a retail store of the size proposed, based on the adopted parking standards. Whilst the submitted plan shows the provision of 7 standard spaces and 1 disabled space, as well as 3 cycle stands, the disabled space is shown to have a hatched area on one side, rather than on both sides, as guidance advises. In addition, I would recommend that the cycle parking is covered. Whilst the provision of a covered cycle parking facility could be dealt with by condition, the site layout should be amended to show a disabled parking space which meets current design guidance.

With respect to site layout, the proposal will result in customers staying in the shop for longer and people visiting the shop who are not also buying fuel. As such, it will be important that customers can access the parking spaces at all times, that cars parked by the pumps for longer periods of time do not result in vehicles queuing back onto the highway and customers arriving by foot can safely access the site. Consideration of the site layout concludes that whilst the parking spaces will be positioned in a way that should allow them to be accessed independently of the fuelling area, this would be subject to the current one-way system through the site continuing to operate and vehicles waiting to fuel not blocking the access route to the spaces. As such, I would conclude that the existing no entry signage is retained and added to and the access route to the parking spaces is clearly delineated and "Keep Clear" markings provided. In addition, in order that pedestrians can safely access the shop, I would recommend that a defined pedestrian route is provided between the highway and the shop entrance and dropped kerbs and tactile paving are provided across the site entrances. These matters, however, can be dealt with by condition.

To conclude, subject to the receipt of a revised plan showing an amended parking space for disabled badge holders, I would raise no objection to this application subject to conditions.

Comments 31/10/17

A layout plan has been received showing an amended parking space for disabled badge holders. The layout is now acceptable, subject to conditions.

Planning Policy Officer (Retail):

Comments 29/9/17

The information provided indicates 112sq.m. gross of existing A1 use, of which 56sq.m. is net retail sales area. The proposal results in a 'shop area' of 173sq.m – I am unclear whether this figure includes the Subway concession and back of shop area. The

Planning Statement identifies the proposed net sales area excluding the counter as 100sq.m. It is therefore assumed that the 107sq.m. of net sales area proposed as shown on the floorplan includes the counter. The extended shop will include a Subway concession of approximately 34 sq.m. with a pre-counter area of approximately 2sq.m.. The remainder of the proposed building includes an ATM, toilets and back of shop.

The site is out-of-centre. Given the small scale of uplift of A1 use floorspace from the information provided, the likely level of passing trade and that Aldi at Offerton Other Local Centre (approximately 990sq.m. sales area), the Co-op and Costcutter at Offerton Green Other Local Centre are each larger convenience stores, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on these Local Centres, consistent with paragraph 26 of the NPPF and consistent in this aspect with Core Strategy policies CS5 and CS6 and with saved UDP Review policy PSD2.6 criteria iii. The Planning Statement does not include a sequential assessment. It is considered that the applicant should provide a sequential assessment of sites in and edge of Offerton Local Centre and Offerton Green Local Centre. Therefore, it is considered that at this stage, the proposal does not comply with the sequential test, contrary to paragraph 24 of the NPPF and saved UDP Review policy PSD2.6 criteria iv. Thus, the proposal conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS6.

Comments 3/11/17

A sequential assessment has been submitted. This is satisfactory and the proposal complies with the paragraph 24 NPPF sequential test and saved UDP Review policy PSD2.6 criteria iv. In this respect, the proposal complies with Core Strategy policy CS6. Furthermore, the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on these Local Centres, consistent with paragraph 26 of the NPPF and consistent in this aspect with CS5, CS6 and with saved UDP Review policy PSD2.6 criteria iii.

Planning Policy Officer (Green Belt): no representations received.

United Utilities: no objections, subject to the following conditions;

Condition 1

Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.

Reason: To secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.

Condition 2

Prior to the commencement of any development, a surface water drainage scheme, based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The surface water drainage scheme must be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards and unless otherwise agreed in writing by

the Local Planning Authority, no surface water shall discharge to the public combined sewerage system either directly or indirectly.

The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. This condition is imposed in light of policies within the NPPF and NPPG.

ANALYSIS

Following the refusal of application DC060902, the current application now proposes the removal of the existing car wash building and bins/ plant room to the rear of the site and the provision of additional car parking spaces in its place. Additional highways supporting information has also been received, as requested by the Engineer (see 'Consultee Responses' above). The planning considerations are as follows.

Residential amenity

The site is a long standing petrol filling station, and it is physically separated from neighbouring dwellings by Marple Road and a landscaped embankment to the east. No representations to the application have been received.

Retail impact

No objections have been raised by the Planning Policy Officer (see 'Consultee Responses' above).

Highways Impact

No objections have been raised by the Highway Engineer, subject to conditions (see 'Consultee Responses' above).

Design

The proposed shop extension is of a design and scale which is in keeping with the existing building. This and the jet wash bay are of typical appearance for a petrol filling station, and no objections to the design of the development could be sustained.

Green Belt

The site as a whole falls within the designated Green Belt. The existing petrol station site is, clearly, previously developed (brownfield) land.

Paragraph 79 of the NPPF emphasises how the Government attaches great importance to the Green Belt and how the essential characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness and permanence.

Paragraph 89 sets out that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt but lists a number of exceptions, the following of which are relevant to this application:

- The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; and
- Limited infilling or the partial redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- I. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- II. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- III. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- IV. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- V. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

In consideration of the first bullet point above, the proposed extension to the shop would be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. It would result in an approximately 60% increase in the floorspace and volume of the existing building in a prominent location. The glossary to the NPPF defines 'original building' as *"A building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally"*, and it is noted that this building has also previously been extended. Furthermore, saved UDP Review policy GBA1.2 classes this extension as being inappropriate development. It is therefore a departure from the development plan. In these circumstances it should only be granted where very special circumstances exist that justify the development, and outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

The second of the above paragraph 89 bullet points (the NPPF post-dates policy GBA1.2) states that limited infilling, or the partial redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development, is not inappropriate Green Belt development. In the application of this test it is pertinent to note the following:

- The application proposes the removal of the car wash/ bins/ plant room building to compensate for the extension to the garage shop. The volume of the extension will be greater than that of the building to be demolished, however its floorspace will be approximately the same.
- The extension will arguably be sited in a less prominent location on the site than the car wash/ bins/ plant room building. It will be positioned to the east side parallel to the raised embankment.
- Although car parking will take place in lieu of the removed car wash/ bins/ plant room building, the removal of this building will lead to a less "spread out" form of built development on the site; and

- one jet wash enclosure is to be provided in lieu of the existing two.

Members must decide if the development will have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. However, balancing the above issues, this is not considered to be the case.

Although the proposal constitutes inappropriate development when assessed against UDP policy GBA1.2 and the first of the NPPF paragraph 89 bullet points listed above, it is considered to comply with the second of the above bullet points. This is a significant material consideration amounting to 'very special circumstances' in support of the development. On balance it is recommended that permission is granted, subject to appropriate planning conditions.

Recommendation

Grant - with conditions

UPDATE STEPPING HILL AREA COMMITTEE 12/12/17

The Officer introduced the report. Committee debated the application and recommended a site visit by the Visiting Team. This is to assess the traffic impacts of the development. The Visiting Team should consider concerns that Marple Road is already heavily congested, and the development will exacerbate this and lead to traffic queuing from the site back onto the road. The proposed parking arrangement should also be evaluated as Committee considered the site was constrained. Committee did not make a recommendation for or against the application.