

## ITEM 2

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/068530</b>
<b>Location:</b>	1 Wellington Road South Stockport SK4 1AA
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Redevelopment of existing building, including partial demolition, to create a mixed-use commercial (A1 or A2) and residential scheme comprising 14 apartments.
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Full Application
<b>Registration Date:</b>	09.02.2018
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	08.06.2018 (extension of time)
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Daniel Hewitt
<b>Applicant:</b>	Uruk Properties Ltd
<b>Agent:</b>	nineteen47 Ltd

### **DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS**

Called up to Central Area Committee by Councillor Harding on 23 February 2018.

### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

This application seeks planning permission for the change of use, partial demolition and the extension of a vacant four-storey building, formerly used as a nightclub and retail unit, to create a mixed-use commercial and residential development scheme comprising 14 apartments (9 one-bed apartments and 5 two bed apartments) and three, small, lower ground floor retail units (A1 shops or A2 financial and professional services).

Members should note that the description of development changed during the application process to explicitly exclude A3 food and drink uses due to unaddressed concerns about the potential for adverse noise, odour and visual impacts (extraction flues etc.).

In terms of physical changes to the building, the rear facing wings of the building (facing Mersey Square) would be demolished to make way for a five storey modern extension whilst the remaining fabric of the building would be retained and renovated including the addition of new timber framed sash windows and the application of new layers of painted render on the building's primary Wellington Road South (A6) facing frontage.

Access to the building is currently gained from Wellington Road South and Daw Bank/Talbot Street/Mersey Square. The proposed development would limit access into the building from Daw Bank/Talbot Street/Mersey Square only.

The development is best understood by referring to the submitted plans appended to this report.

The application is supported by the following documents:

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Heritage Statement
- Structural Survey
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Air Quality Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Land Contamination Assessment
- Crime Impact Statement
- Sustainability Checklist
- Energy Statement

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application property comprises a split level detached building adjacent to Mersey Square and the bus station. It is built into the side of Wellington Bridge which carries Wellington Road South (A6). From Wellington Road South it appears two storeys in scale with a hipped roof. From Talbot Street and Daw Bank the full height of the building is revealed rising to 4 storeys with a two storey rear outrigger and external staircase to the first floor of the 4 storey element. The building's appearance comprises a slate roof with brick and rendered elevations (on its lower half and to the Wellington Road South elevation). The building has been vacant for some time and its former use as a night club ceased approximately 10 years ago. The ground floor retail unit facing to Talbot Street recently ceased trading and this too is now vacant.

Land around the site is hard surfaced with a deep pavement facing Mersey Square and highway access serving Talbot Street runs adjacent to the building, which is a one way route into the bus station continuing under Wellington Bridge.

The application site lies within the St. Peter's Conservation Area and the building was 'locally listed' in 1997. The building is described in the Stockport Historic Environment Database as follows:

*Public house recorded in 1830 which was probably constructed soon after the completion of Wellington Bridge in 1824.*

## **HISTORIC ASSET DESCRIPTION**

*Public House of brick which rises from Mersey Square with the principal front of two storeys to Wellington Bridge. This is symmetrical, stuccoed, with a central arched painted stone doorway with the sides treated as pilasters, quoins and a hipped roof. Side elevations of four storeys have windows with stone sills beneath flat heads of gauged brick. The left hand elevation to Mersey Square has a loading door at first floor level and arched cellar openings. The other side to Daw Bank has a central doorway with an arched entrance and a stone string course. Attached range to the rear with tie plates may have been a coach house or other ancillary accommodation.*

*The building is recorded as having operated as two separate establishments on the two different levels. It had a coach house and there were stables within an arch of the bridge. Infilled arched openings to the bridge on the Daw Bank side may relate to use by the pub.*

The site is adjacent to and affects the setting of the following listed buildings and structures:

- Wellington Bridge (Grade II)
- Plaza Cinema (Grade II\*)
- Steps adjacent to Plaza Cinema (Grade II)
- Wellington Mill (Grade II)

The application site is located in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and is subject to noise from passing road and air traffic. It is also identified as an 'office frontage' in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan (SUDP).

## **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 (SUDP) adopted 31<sup>st</sup> May 2006 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 17<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

N.B. Due weight should be given to relevant SUDP and CS policies according to their degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') issued on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012 (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given); and how the policies are expected to be applied is outlined within the Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG') launched on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

## **Saved policies of the SUDP Review**

TCG2.1 Central Shopping Area  
HC1.3 Special control of development in conservation areas  
HC1.4 New uses for buildings in conservation areas  
MW1.5 Control of waste from development  
EP1.10 Aircraft noise  
HP1.5 Living over the shop  
PSD2.2 Service uses in the Town Centre, District and Large Local Centres  
PSD2.3 Use of upper floors in Shopping Centres

## **LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies**

SIE-1 Quality Places  
SIE-2 Provision of Recreation and Amenity Open Space in New Development  
SIE-3 Protecting Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment  
CS2 Housing Provision  
CS3 Mix of Housing  
CS4 Distribution of Housing  
CS5 Access to Services  
CS6 Safeguarding and Strengthening the Service Centre Hierarchy  
AS1 The Vitality and Viability of Stockport's Service Centres  
CS9 'Transport and Development  
T-1 Transport and Development  
T-2 Parking in Developments  
T-3 Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network  
H-1 Design of Residential Development  
H-2 Housing Phasing  
H-3 Affordable Housing  
CS11 Stockport Town Centre  
SD3 Delivering the Energy Opportunities Plans – New Development

## **National Planning Policy Framework Conformity**

The Planning Advisory Services' National Planning Policy Framework 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 more recently published NPPF and takes account of saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan where applicable. No significant differences were identified.

## **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

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

- Design of Residential Development SPD
- Recreational Open Space and Commuted Payment SPG

- Town Centre Housing SPD
- Sustainable Transport SPD

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

Paragraph 6 states: *“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”.*

Paragraph 7 states: *“There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental”.*

Paragraph 11 states: *“Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.*

Paragraph 13 states: *“The National Planning Policy Framework constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and decision-takers both in drawing up plans and as a material consideration in determining applications”*

Paragraph 14 states: *“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking”.*

*For decision-taking this means (unless material considerations indicate otherwise):*

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted”.*

Paragraph 17 states: *“Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:*

- *be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;*
- *not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;*

- *proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities;*
- *always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;*
- *take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;*
- *support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy);*
- *contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework;*
- *encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;*
- *promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production);*
- *conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;*
- *actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable; and*
- *take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs”.*

Paragraph 49 states *“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.”*

Paragraph 50 states *“To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:*

- *plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)*
- *identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand*
- *where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time”*

Paragraph 56 states *“The government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”*

Paragraph 132 states that *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”*

Paragraph 135 states that *“The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”*

Paragraph 187 states *“Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area”.*

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

Paragraph 197 states *“In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development”*.

Paragraph 215 states *“.....due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)”*.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

### **Planning Application No: DC/061476**

Address: THE ARCHES, 1 WELLINGTON ROAD SOUTH, STOCKPORT, SK4 1AA

App Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Change of use from vacant nightclub and retail unit (Sui Generis) to a 20 ensuite bedroom licensed HMO (Sui Generis), alterations to elevations and erection of a single storey extension.

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 29/07/2016

### **Planning Application No: DC/058692**

Address: THE ARCHES, 1 WELLINGTON ROAD SOUTH, STOCKPORT, SK4 1AA

App Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Change of use from vacant nightclub and retail unit (Sui Generis) to 11 residential units (C3) with associated external alterations

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 26/05/2016

### **Planning Application No: J/47427**

Address: "Ups and Downs", Mersey Square/Daw Bank, Stockport.

App Type: 74 - 99 Application

Proposal: Erection of offices (Outline Application).

Final Decision: Refuse

Decision Date: 26/02/1990



**Planning Application No: J/38063 J/38063**

Address: The Ups N Downs, Mersey Square, Stockport.

App Type: 74 - 99 Application

Proposal: New canopy over entrance

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 05/01/1987

**Planning Application No: J/38063 J/38063**

Address: The Ups N Downs, Mersey Square, Stockport.

App Type: 74 - 99 Application

Proposal: New canopy over entrance

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 05/01/1987

**Planning Application No: J/37697**

Address: The Ups N Downs, Mersey Square, Stockport.

App Type: Advertisement

Proposal: Individual letters fixed to wall (static illumination)...

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 05/01/1987

**Planning Application No: J/31842**

Address: The Wellington Boot, Wellington Road, Stockport.

App Type: Advertisement

Proposal: Proposed non illuminated sign

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 03/09/1984

**Planning Application No: J/18903**

Address: 1 Wellington Road South, Mersey Square, Stockport.

App Type: 74 - 99 Application

Proposal: Change of use of ground floor premises to Luxury Amusement Centre

Final Decision: Grant

Decision Date: 06/03/1980

**Planning Application No: J/12479**

Address: Daw Bank, Swain Street, Chestergate and Mersey Square, Stockport.

App Type: 74 - 99 Application  
Proposal: Bus station and ancillary facilities  
Final Decision: Grant  
Decision Date: 20/07/1978

**Planning Application No: J/8523**

Address: The Wellington Hotel, Mersey Square, Dawbank, Stockport.  
App Type: 74 - 99 Application  
Proposal: Licensee's flats, club and pub  
Final Decision: Grant  
Decision Date: 05/04/1977

**NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

22 neighbour notification letters were sent on 15 February 2018.

Site notices were posted immediately adjacent to the site on 16 February 2018

A notice was published in the Stockport Express on 21 February 2018

No comments or representations have been received.

**CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

**SMBC Planning Policy (Retail)**

The site is located in the Business Frontage (Type A) within the TCG2.1 area of Stockport Town Centre. Therefore, the site is in-centre for the purpose of the NPPF paragraph 24 sequential test for A1 use, A2 use and A3 use, consistent in this aspect with saved UDP Review policies TCG2.1 and TCG3 and Core Strategy policies CS5 and CS6. The proposed uses in this Business Frontage (Type A) location are consistent with Saved UDP Review policy PSD2.2.

The proposed A1/A2 use is consistent with Saved UDP Review policy TCG2.1. The proposal would contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre and will encourage the occupation of a vacant site.

**SMBC Air Quality**

Agree with the findings of the submitted air quality assessment, the proposed mitigation and recommend that the mechanical ventilation proposed as mitigation is installed.

**SMBC Noise & Odour**

I have assessed the noise report and the report assesses the background noise levels and the impact upon internal noise levels. The development can meet recommended internal noise levels with windows closed and other mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified within the noise report are a higher

specification of windows and a mechanical ventilation system with purge capabilities to allow for rapid cooling.

No objection in principle subject to planning conditions ensuring:

- the mitigation measures recommended in the submitted noise report are implemented in full
- measures are included to prevent odour from bin stores penetrating into residential accommodation above
- adequate noise insulation between the commercial and residential uses
- opening hours of the A1/A2 uses being limited to 07:00 to 23:00 daily

### **SMBC Contaminated Land**

No objection

### **SMBC Highway Engineer**

#### Initial comments 06 March 2018

This application seeks permission for the conversion, extension and alterations of 1 Wellington Road South, which has previously housed a nightclub and retail unit, so as to create a mixed-use development comprising of 3 commercial units (A1, A2, A3 use) and 14 apartments. The three commercial units will be located in the basement of the building (ground floor level from Mersey Square) fronting Mersey Square and Daw Bank and the apartments will occupy the 3/4 floors above the commercial units, with access to these also gained from Mersey Square and Daw Bank. Cycle and bin stores will be provided within the basement of the building accessed from Daw Bank. No car parking, however, is proposed to be provided or on-site servicing facilities.

Before considering this application, it should be noted that two other applications for the conversion of the building have been considered in recent years; application DC/058692 for the change of use of the building to 11 apartments which was approved in May 2016 and application DC/061476 for the change of use to a 21-bed HMO which was approved in July 2016. An objection to neither proposal was raised on highway grounds and both schemes were approved subject to conditions relating to cycle parking, opening doors and windows and how the development would be constructed and serviced.

With respect to the principle of the development, the proposal should not result in a material increase in vehicle movements on the local highway and the site is highly accessible, scoring 94 on the Council's Accessibility Model, which considers a site's accessibility in relation to employment, retail, schools, health centres, hospitals and evening economy uses. In addition, the site is located within Stockport Town Centre and close to Stockport Bus Station and Stockport Railway Station. As such, I would have no objection, in principle, to locating either residential or commercial uses in this location.

With respect to parking, although no parking is, or can be provided within the site, as the site is highly accessible, the building has historically been used for commercial use, the conversion of the building to residential use has already been accepted and 14 apartments and 3 small commercial units are unlikely to generate a parking

demand which is materially different to that of the consented schemes, I would consider a recommendation of refusal on the grounds of lack of parking would be hard to justify. The applicant, however, should note that in accordance with the Council's current Town Centre Parking Policy, occupiers of the approved development would not be eligible for a resident's car parking permit.

With respect to cycle parking, the submitted plans show proposals to provide a cycle store within the basement of the building for 14 cycles. Whilst this will meet the demand of the occupiers, 2 spaces should also be provided for staff of the retail units. In addition, the rack indicated on the plan is substandard. It would, however, be possible to provide cycle parking for 16 cycles if the store is reconfigured along the lines indicated below. I would therefore recommend the applicant is advised to submit a revised plan which shows the cycle store amended along these lines. In addition, I would recommend a small amount of cycle parking for visitors / customers be provided outside the building. This could be provided in the form of Sheffield stands in an agreed position on the highway. This matter, however, can be dealt with by condition.

Regarding servicing, 2 refuse stores are proposed to be provided within the basement of the building, accessed from a new doorway on Daw Bank. Although the submitted plans show these both accommodating 6 Eurobins, it does not appear that sufficient space will be available within the stores and one of the corridors to move the bins and the doorways do not large enough for the bins. I therefore consider that the design of the bin stores and access routes to the stores needs to be reviewed. The applicant should also ascertain from the Council's Waste and Recycling Department whether the number of Eurobins indicated will be sufficient.

Notwithstanding this, servicing of the development has the potential of affecting the operation of the local highway network (depending on when servicing takes place and where service vehicles park), notably following the redevelopment of the adjacent bus station (which is likely to involve the closure of Talbot Street). As such, as with the previous schemes, I would recommend that any approval granted is subject to a condition requiring the submission and implementation of a servicing method statement to ensure the development can be safely serviced.

With respect to other matters of detail, the submitted plans do show the amended building in the context of the existing highway network. As such, it is not clear from the submitted plans how close the balconies will be to the kerb line of the adjacent carriageways, if any parts of the extension encroach on the existing public highway or exactly how certain aspects of the scheme relate to existing street furniture. It does, however, appear that the entrance into Retail Unit 2 will conflict with a United Utilities equipment cabinet and the balconies of a number of the apartments will conflict with an existing street lighting column (see image below). I therefore consider that there is a need for plans to be produced and submitted, based on a topographical survey, which shows the building in relation to the existing highway (both at basement level and to show how the balconies relate to the nearby kerb line). If there is a conflict between existing street furniture and the building, the applicant will need to either amend the scheme to address the conflict or confirm that they would seek permission to relocate the street furniture as part of the scheme. Any relocation street furniture could then be dealt with by condition in the event that

the application was to be approved. In accordance with Paragraph 5.30, 'Post development footway reinstatement' of the Sustainable Transport SPD, any approval granted should also be subject to a condition requiring the reconstruction of the footways fronting the site following completion of the development, with such works being carried out in accordance with the Council's Town Centre Palette.

The applicant should also note that in the event that the application is approved and implemented, a licence (under Section 177 or 178 of the Highways Act 1980) will be required in respect to the balconies that will overhang the highway.

Finally, as the building is to have extensive reconstruction and bearing in mind its position in between Mersey Square and vehicular access to the bus station I would also recommend that any approval granted is subject to a condition requiring the submission of a construction method statement to ensure the impact of development on the highway network is kept to a minimum during the construction period.

To conclude, whilst I have no objection, in principle, to the proposed development, there are a number of issues relating to cycle parking, bin storage and how the development relates to the adjacent highway which need further consideration / additional plans. As such, I would recommend that the application is deferred and the applicant is requested to revise the scheme and submit the additional drawings requested with the aim of addressing the points that I have raised.

#### Further comments 23 May 2018

I write with reference to the revised drawings submitted on the 16th May 2018 with the aim of address the comments raised in my consultation response of the 6th March 2018, as well as the comments of other consultees. I note from the plans that:

- 1) The door to retail unit 2 has been moved away from the existing UU cabinet
- 2) Balconies have been removed from the lower ground and ground floors of the building with the aim of ensuring they do not conflict with an existing street lighting column.
- 3) The bin stores have been amended
- 4) The cycle store has been amended

With respect to these amendments, whilst the relocation of the door to retail unit 2 has addressed the issue with respect to conflict with the UU cabinet, there will still be a conflict between one of the balconies and the street lighting column (the street lighting column is 10m in height, not 9m as shown on the plans and requires 1.5m clearance above for maintenance). The first floor balcony therefore also needs to be removed. In addition, whilst one of the bin stores has been enlarged and access doors to the stores have been enlarged, there doesn't appear to be sufficient space within the stores to manoeuvre bins and 2 of the doorways will be too narrow for standard size (1100mm by 1370mm) Eurobins. As such, I would conclude that the design and access routes to the bin stores needs further review. In addition, one of the bin stores has been enlarged at the expense of the cycle store and examination of the cycle store that is now proposed concludes that it would not be able to accommodate the 16 cycles that it needs to accommodate in order to comply with the adopted parking standards. As such, the design of the cycle store also needs to

be reviewed. Finally, I note that the submitted floor plans (drawings 04 and 05) are not at the correct scale, scaling off at approx. 2/3 of the stated 1:100 scale, and therefore revised plans that are correctly scaled are required.

To conclude, whilst the revised drawings address the issue with respect to conflict with the UU cabinet, they do not address the issues relating to conflict with the street lighting column nor cycle parking and bin storage. As such, I would recommend that the application is further deferred and the applicant is requested to revise the scheme and submit further revised drawings (to scale) with the aim of addressing these issues.

#### Further comments 29 May 2018

I note from the plans that an additional balcony has been removed from the building (from the first floor) so as to avoid conflict with a street lighting column. The cycle store, bin store and accesses to these, however, have not been enlarged to ensure that the cycle store will be large enough to accommodate the required number of cycles (16 no.) or that sufficient space will be available to manoeuvre bins. Whilst the proposed bin and cycle storage facilities are not acceptable in their present form, it would be possible to address the issues by reconfiguring the internal floor layout of the ground floor so as to provide bin and cycle stores and corridors to them of adequate size (although this would need to be at the expense of some of the retail floor space). As such, I would consider that this matter can be dealt with by condition. I therefore raise no objection to this application, subject to conditions.

A series of conditions and informatives are recommended covering the following:

- Construction method statement
- Details of balconies overhanging the highway
- Footway reconstruction details
- Servicing details (notwithstanding the submitted plans)
- Secure cycle parking details (notwithstanding the submitted plans)
- Bin store details (notwithstanding the submitted plans)
- No windows or doors to open onto public highway

#### **SMBC Waste and Recycling**

No objection but suggest that communal steel bins would be most appropriate.

#### **Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS)**

1 Wellington Road South, Stockport, Greater Manchester is a substantial four-storey property dating from circa 1824-1826 and is locally-listed by Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council. It was built as an inn adjoining the Wellington Bridge, which also dates from this time and is nationally-listed at Grade II. The site also stands within St Peter's Conservation Area, and within the setting of four other listed buildings. At some point a three storey extension was added to the rear of the building.

The application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) produced by Gary Miller Historic Building Consultancy. GMAAS broadly concur with the assessment of the buildings significance and the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets. The building represents a classic example of the "*..split-level townscape created following the construction of the Wellington Bridge.*" The exterior

analysis provided in the HIA suggests that the structure of the building contains a number of construction phases perhaps reflecting the buildings adaptation to the requirements of multiple occupancies and functions.

In 2005 GMAAS carried out an enhancement of the Sites and Monuments Record for Stockport which means that the entries for Stockport in the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record are amongst the most comprehensive and detailed. Late 18th and late 17th century maps of Stockport brought to light during the enhancement programme suggest that there were buildings on the site prior to the construction of Wellington Bridge.

Consequently GMAAS recommend that a phased programme of archaeological work is implemented. This would involve-

- A Historic England Level 3 Archaeological Building survey is undertaken on the property prior to any work commencing. The survey should contain a strong element of historical research.
- A Watching Brief during redevelopment and demolition works to record any areas inaccessible during the building survey which were identified as significant to the development and function of the building.
- An Archaeological Watching Brief during groundworks associated with the construction of the new extension. This Watching brief would be informed by the historical research carried out during the building survey.

The programme of archaeological work would be provided in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that would be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and their archaeological advisors, GMAAS for their approval and could be secured as a condition of planning permission.

The resulting record would advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets that are affected as a result of the Project, in a manner that is proportionate to their importance and impact. Any recovered evidence would be made publically available through reporting and an archive commensurate to the findings.

GMAAS recommend a condition to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a suitable WSI.

The programme of work should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeological contractor, funded by the applicant. GMAAS will advise on the archaeology programme and monitor its implementation of the work on behalf of Stockport MBC.

### **SMBC Nature Conservation**

I have considered the above application and submitted information (Day Time Bat Survey, Rachel Hacking Ecology (July 2017)). The survey appears to have used reasonable effort to assess the structures for the presence of bats and their potential to support bats at other times.

The Report concludes that there is negligible potential for the structure to support roosting bats. I know of no current reason to contradict these findings. It is noted that the report indicates that bats may be found unexpectedly even when an adequate survey has been conducted.

In the event that bats are unexpectedly encountered or suspected all works should cease and advice sought and implemented from the bat consultant.

Given the location of the proposal in a densely urban location with little scope for landscaping, biodiversity enhancement will also be limited. I would suggest that the development if possible incorporates the provision of swift boxes with the roof line on two elevations. This would be in-line with Stockport LDF para 3.345 and the NPPF and could be implemented via a condition appended to any approval if granted.

### **SMBC Planning Policy (Energy)**

Confirm that the submitted Energy Statement complies with Policy SD3.

### **Historic England**

Chose not to offer any comments but recommended that the advice of the Council's specialist conservation and archaeological advisors is sought.

### **SMBC Conservation Officer**

Verbally confirmed they have no objection following revisions to the proposed development subject to planning conditions requiring the submission, written approval and implementation of detailed design elements.

### **Environment Agency**

We have no objection in principle to the proposed development, but would wish to make the following comments.

We have reviewed the following report with respect to potential risks to controlled waters from land contamination:

- Phase I Geo-Environmental Desk Study. 1 Wellington Road South Stockport. Prepared by Earth Environmental and Geotechnical. Report Ref: A2254/17. Date: December 2017.

Based on the information provided to date the report does not indicate that the site is likely to pose a significant risk to controlled waters. Therefore, we have no requirements for additional works at this time or recommendations for planning conditions to be imposed in respect of controlled waters at this current time.

### **Greater Manchester Police - Design for Security**

Voiced concerns initially that were addressed when the applicant commissioned GMP to undertake a Crime Impact Statement – received 16 May 2018. Their comments are recommendations are set out in that Statement that has been submitted in support of the application.



## **ANALYSIS**

### Principle of proposed residential use

The principle of the proposed change of use to residential has previously been accepted following the grant of two extant planning permissions for residential use - conversion of the building to 11 flats in May 2016 (planning permission ref: DC/058692) and a 20 en-suite bedroom house in multiple occupation in July 2016 (planning permission ref: DC/061476).

Whilst residential development is not listed as an acceptable use in SUDP Policy TCG2.1 and SUDP Policy PSD2.2 identifies the site's A6 frontage for office use only, Core Strategy Policy CS4 states that up to 50% of the overall housing provision in the plan period should be within the Central Housing Area and Town Centre and that up to 2000 dwellings should be provided in the TCG2 and TCG3 policy areas. Policies CS2 and CS3 also make clear that a balanced mix of new housing will be focused in accessible urban areas such as the Town Centre and identifies these areas as being most suitable for higher housing densities such as this. Policy CS4 emphasises the clear benefits of this strategy as follows:

"New housing development will boost the Town Centre economy, making it a vibrant place to be during the day and in the evening. It will improve the built environment by regenerating vacant and under-used sites in and around the centre, and provide homes in a location readily accessible to jobs and services within Stockport and Manchester City Centre."

As a more recent development plan document, the Core Strategy should take precedence where conflicts with the UDP arise. It should also be acknowledged that Stockport currently suffers from a significant housing undersupply (taking the Core Strategy target as the basis for the five year supply figure and applying a 20% buffer to that and related backlog, the Council has 3.9 years of supply) and given the site's highly sustainable location (the site has an accessibility score of 94/100 that is significantly in excess of the 45/100 score currently required for flats/apartments) – the 'tilted balance' or strong presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is engaged.

It is therefore considered that the principle of the proposed residential use of the upper floors is acceptable in planning policy terms.

### Principle of proposed A1 shops and A2 Financial and professional services use

The principle of the proposed introduction of three new A1/A2 at lower ground floor level is fully supported by the development plan. The new A1/A2 units would make a positive contribution to the vitality and viability of the town centre, encourage the occupation of a vacant site and animate the street scene in Mersey Square.

It is therefore considered that the principle of the proposed A1/A2 use of the lower ground floors is welcomed in planning policy terms.

### Impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets

As mentioned above, the existing building is a locally listed (non-designated) heritage asset that is currently vacant and in a poor state of repair. The building has also been significantly altered over the years particularly to the rear facing Mersey Square where a series of unsympathetic alterations and outriggers detract from its significance. The proposed redevelopment, extension and reuse of the building, including the demolition of the rear outriggers, would enhance the asset's appearance, intrinsic interest and streetscene presence and is therefore welcomed in heritage terms.

The proposed development will also affect the setting series of statutory listed buildings and structures (designated heritage assets) as follows:

- Wellington Bridge (Grade II)
- Plaza Cinema (Grade II\*)
- Steps adjacent to Plaza Cinema (Grade II)
- Wellington Mill (Grade II)

The submitted Heritage Assessment considers the development's impact on these assets and concludes that overall, the setting of these assets would be enhanced by the development. The only exception to this otherwise positive impact would be the slight masking of part of the Plaza in certain viewpoints from Wellington Bridge owing to the greater scale and mass of the new-build extension, however, that impact is assessed as negligible.

Overall, the impact of the development on heritage assets is considered to be positive and therefore would enhance the character and appearance of the St Peter's Conservation Area in full accordance with national and local planning policy.

It should be noted that Historic England have no objection to the application and the Council's Conservation Officer is now supportive of the proposals subject to conditions controlling detailed design matters.

### Design

As noted above, the proposed development is considered to enhance the character and appearance of the St Peter's Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings and structures in the vicinity of the application site. This has been achieved through the development of a sensitive design solution for the site, developed with input from the Council's planning and conservation officers.

The proposed renovation and reuse of the existing building, including the removal of the rear outriggers and alterations, will significantly enhance the appearance of the existing building that is currently vacant and in a poor state of repair. This will in turn significantly enhance the appearance of the wider Town Centre given the site's very prominent location. Windows would be replaced with new timber sash windows with many boarded up windows reinstated. The front A6 elevation would be recoated with painted render given the poor condition of much of the brickwork to the rear. The A6 timber entrance door would be refurbished and repairs as necessary would be made to the existing natural slate roof. Currently, the building's unsightly but very prominent and largely blank

elevation has a negative impact on the character and appearance of Mersey Square with the building effectively turning its back on this strategically important area of public realm. The removal of the rear outrigger and projecting additions to be replaced with an outward facing and animated façade is a welcome improvement. A traditional shopfront would be provided on the existing building's lower ground floor level fronting Talbot Street that would stand in stark contrast to the more modern shopfronts in the proposed new build extension to the rear. This juxtaposition is a deliberate intervention to ensure the new-build extension reads as a separate building to the locally listed asset and therefore the building's development is clearly understood and honestly delineated.

Despite this contrast, the proposed new build extension is considered to be a high quality and sympathetic contemporary design solution that should secure a viable future for the building into the future. The use of complementary materials, the vertical nature and rhythm of its openings and its sympathetic scale is considered to complement rather than detract from the existing buildings significance despite being deliberately distinct. The extension's curved façade following the boundaries of the application site at a 'back of pavement' position with regular windows and door openings on all sides ensures opportunities to animate this part of the town centre are optimised. The addition of balconies for all apartments wherever possible add further depth and interest to the elevations whilst providing valuable outdoor space for future residents. In terms of facing materials, complementary red brick would predominate with facing brick soldier courses acting as lintols above window openings together with stone cills and stone coping at roof levels. All new aluminium windows would be set back by 100mm in reveals to give depth to the elevations whilst the main entrance would be emphasised with a zinc surround.

Overall, the development is considered to be high quality design solution that will significantly enhance the appearance of the building and the wider Town Centre in full accordance with local and national planning policy. It is however considered necessary to impose a series of conditions requiring materials and detailed design elements to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and implemented in full to ensure a positive outcome.

#### Residential amenity

The nearest existing residential buildings are the flat above the Chestergate Tavern (No. 68 Chestergate); the apartments within the Grade II listed Wellington Mill and the relatively new apartments in the upper floors of Douro House following its recent conversion. All are of sufficient distance away to ensure compliance with the Council's adopted separation distances.

As regards the provision of private outdoor amenity space for residents, there is no useable, available space around the building given it is an 'island site' bound on all sides by roads. Small balconies are however provided for five of the eight apartments contained in the new build extension (the position of a lighting column currently prevents their use in the other three) but this nonetheless fall short of current policy requirements. There are many other examples elsewhere within the Town Centre where conversion to residential use has been undertaken in order to bring a redundant building back into beneficial use, but where the

building would not be able to provide amenity space for residents. The lack of amenity space in this case must be balanced against returning a long time vacant building back into productive use especially having regard to its locally listed status and its impact on designated heritage assets. These merits are considered to outweigh the requirement to provide the minimum requirement in terms of amenity space set out in the Council's SPD "Design of Residential Development" Supplementary Planning Document. It should also be noted that the developer has agreed to pay commuted sums for the off-site provision or improvement of formal outdoor recreation and children's play facilities to meet the needs of future residents in full accordance with adopted policies (see below).

Noise, odour and air quality issues are considered below.

### Access

The application site is located in a highly accessible and sustainable Town Centre location (scoring 94/100 when using the Council's accessibility model), being located immediately adjacent to the bus station and within comfortable walking distance of Stockport railway station. It is however an 'island' site being bound by public highway and occupying a 'back of pavement' position on all sides leaving no scope for the provision of on-site car parking. It is therefore critical that adequate provision is made for secure cycle parking to meet the needs of future residents and businesses and encourage sustainable transport choices in accordance with Policy T1. A condition is therefore recommended in accordance with the Highway Engineer's advice. Similarly, details of bin stores and servicing also need to be refined and can be adequately controlled by condition.

It is also necessary to impose the other conditions requested by the Highway Engineer's in the interests of highway safety and to adequately control the impact of construction on the highway network.

### Crime prevention

Given the site's prominent and relatively vulnerable position with no defensible space around it, a detailed Crime Impact Statement (CIS) prepared by Greater Manchester Police has been submitted in support of the application. The CIS highlights the positive security aspects of the proposals in terms of increased natural surveillance on all sides, the removal of the rear elements and redundant additions that serve as climbing aids; secure cycle storage; and building edges free of significant recesses that could serve as concealment aids and limit sight lines. The report goes on to make a series of detailed security recommendations and as a result the applicant has committed to the following:

- Access controlled doors included at basement level to create greater separation between commercial and residential elements
- A residential lobby included at basement level
- Post will be located within the newly formed secure residential lobby
- There is controlled access between the bin storage areas and residential areas
- The windows and doors specification will be in accordance with GMP recommendations

- Dusk 'til dawn lights will be installed on external doors
- CCTV will be installed

This should result in a secure design solution that will minimise opportunities for crime to take place and is a policy compliant response to the specific challenges the site may face. It is therefore recommended that a condition be imposed to secure such a positive outcome.

#### Air Quality

The application site lies in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) designated for exceedances of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) arising from road traffic along the A6 corridor. The applicant has therefore submitted an Air Quality Assessment that considers both the effect of elevated NO<sub>2</sub> levels and also particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). It concluded that PM<sub>10</sub> exceedances would not occur around the application but NO<sub>2</sub> exceedances would occur albeit limited to the A6 facing western side of the development. Mitigation in the form of a mechanical ventilation system is therefore recommended for all A6 facing units. The assessment has been reviewed by the Council's Air Quality officer who agrees with its findings (see above). A condition is therefore recommended requiring details of a mechanical ventilation system to be submitted, approved in writing by the local planning authority and implemented in full prior to first occupation of the A6 facing units.

#### Noise and odours

A noise assessment has been submitted in support of the application based on survey of background noise levels outside the application site. The assessment found that road traffic was the predominant noise source in area. Noise from passing air traffic was recorded as not noticeable above noise from road traffic. The assessment concluded that a standard glazing specification would fail to provide future residents with acceptable living conditions and therefore recommends high performance double glazing together with mechanical ventilation to ensure British Standard BS8233:2014 outcomes are achieved.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the noise assessment and raises no objection subject to the imposition of conditions securing the outcomes outlined above. Conditions are recommended accordingly.

#### Ecology

A bat survey of the existing building was submitted in support of the application. All species of bat are European protected species. No evidence of bat activity or evidence of nesting birds was found. The Council's ecologist has reviewed the assessment and supports its findings but makes a series of recommendations. It is therefore recommended that an informative note is added to any consent reminding the developer of their legal obligations should evidence of bats be revealed during construction together with a condition requiring the provision of swift boxes in the roof line on two elevations to deliver biodiversity enhancements in accordance with local and national planning policies.

### Energy efficiency

The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement in accordance with Policy SD3 that duly considers the inclusion of renewable energy sources. It is considered that all renewables have been fairly discounted on either suitability or financial viability grounds e.g. solar panels on the roof of such a prominent heritage asset would not be supported even if financially viable. No further action is required.

### Archaeology

GMAAS (see above) believe the application site has the potential to contain remains of buildings on the site prior to the construction of Wellington Bridge and therefore recommend that phased programme of archaeological work is undertaken based on a written scheme of investigation (WSI) including desktop research and a watching brief. A condition is therefore recommended in accordance with GMAAS' advice.

### Contaminated land

As can be seen from the comments of the Environment Agency and the Council's Contaminated Land officer there are not considered to be any risks to human health or development arising from contaminated land on the application site and therefore no further action is required. An informative note is however recommended relating to any unforeseen contamination should it be discovered during construction.

### Waste and recycling storage and collection

Waste Management officers have been consulted and offer no objection to the development but the Council's Highway Engineer has raised some concerns about the adequacy of bin storage and servicing arrangement making clear that further revisions are required to ensure effective and practicable waste & recycling storage and collection arrangements are in place (see above). The imposition of an appropriate condition that requires the formal submission, written approval and implementation of a more refined waste management plan is therefore recommended to ensure no adverse impacts on the highway or practical obstacles to collection arise and the proposed development accords with SUDP Policy MW1.5.

### Planning obligations

The development proposes the creation of 14 new homes that falls below the threshold for the provision of affordable housing set by policy H3 (15 dwellings or more on sites less than 0.5 hectares in size).

As mentioned above, the applicant has committed to pay commuted sums for the provision or improvement of formal outdoor recreation and children's play facilities to meet the needs of future residents in full accordance with adopted policies. This equates to £17,329.46 split as follows:

- £13,199.01 for the provision and maintenance of formal recreation facilities; and
- £4,130.45 for the provision and maintenance of children's play and casual recreation facilities.

Officers in the Council's Greenspace Team have indicated that the money would be allocated to toddler improvements at Heaton Norris Park and fencing improvements of the cycle speedway at St Thomas' Recreation Ground.

#### Overall conclusion

The proposed conversion and extension of this vacant, locally listed building will return this heritage asset back into productive use that will in turn enhance the character and appearance of the building itself, the St. Peter's Conservation Area and the setting of nearby nationally listed buildings. The proposed development will also help Stockport meet its housing needs in accordance with the spatial strategy embodied in the Core Strategy whilst improving the vitality, viability and animation of the Town Centre in this very prominent location. Following revisions to the plans and through the imposition of conditions, it has been demonstrated that the development will be able to successfully function in this highly sustainable location without any adverse on residential amenity or highway safety.

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the statutory development plan and therefore it is recommended that conditional planning permission be granted accordingly.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant** subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure a commuted sum to meet the formal recreation and children's play needs of future residents.