

Marple Area Committee

3rd February 2021

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Report of the Corporate Director for Place Management and Regeneration

<u>ITEM 1</u>	DC075491
<u>SITE ADDRESS</u>	Former Compstall Printworks, Andrew Street, Compstall, Stockport, SK6 5HN
<u>PROPOSAL</u>	Demolition (in part) of the former Compstall Printworks and construction of 18 no. dwelling houses and 14 no. apartments with associated car parking and landscaping.

INFORMATION

These applications need to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants [and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations] have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Development and Control has concluded that some rights conferred by these Articles on the applicant(s)/objectors/residents and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. He believes that any restriction on these rights posed by approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

This Copyright has been made by or with the authority of SMBC pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 ('the Act'). Unless the Act provides the prior permission of the copyright owner'. (Copyright (Material Open to Public Inspection) (Marking of Copies of Maps) Order 1989 (SI 1989/1099)

ITEM 1

Application Reference	DC075491
Location:	Former Compstall Printworks Andrew Street Compstall Stockport SK6 5HN
PROPOSAL:	Demolition (in part) of the former Compstall Printworks and construction of 18 no. dwelling houses and 14 apartments with associated car parking and landscape
Type Of Application:	Full Application
Registration Date:	17/12/2019
Expiry Date:	17/03/2020
Case Officer:	Mark Burgess
Applicant:	Andrew Street 2018
Agent:	Studio KMA

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Committee Item. Should Marple Area Committee be minded to agree the Officer recommendation to grant, the application shall be referred to the Planning and Highway Regulation Committee for determination as a Departure from the Development Plan.

BACKGROUND

Members may recall a previous planning application at the site (Reference : DC055286), which sought full planning permission for the demolition (in part) of the former Compstall Printworks and the construction of 18 no. dwelling houses and 14 no. apartments with associated car parking and landscaping.

The application was considered by both Marple Area Committee and the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee. On the 9th October 2014, the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the development, with the decision deferred and delegated to Officers, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure relevant open space provision and Traffic Regulation Orders.

The previous applicant did not complete the Section 106 Agreement and the site was subsequently sold to the current owner. As the Section 106 Agreement was not signed and sealed, the application was formally withdrawn on the 12th March 2019.

The current scheme before Members effectively comprises a re-submission of the previously withdrawn application (DC055286) which Members resolved to grant, other than in relation to the tenure of the proposed development, which will now be solely for the provision of affordable housing delivered by Stockport Homes.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of a number of existing buildings on the former Compstall Printworks site and the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to comprise the erection of 18 no. residential dwellinghouses and 14 no. residential apartments, with associated access, car parking, landscaping and access to the river walkway to the South of the site.

All of the 32 no. residential units proposed would be affordable housing, delivered by Stockport Homes and comprising a mix of shared ownership and social rented units.

The scheme is divided into separate 'Character Areas' which deal with each specific portion of development and are shown on the plans appended to the report. In detail, the proposal would comprise :-

Character Area A

The existing lower ground floor of the Andrew Street building would be utilised to provide communal covered parking to serve 8 no. three bedroomed town houses within two, three storey blocks along the Andrew Street frontage. The buildings would be of gable roof design and constructed with stone walls with a slate roof. Each town house would have a private rear garden.

In addition to the proposed town houses, 2 no. one bedroomed apartments at first floor level would be provided, with access directly from the retained office building fronting Andrew Street to the South Eastern portion of the site.

The proposal would include the retention of the existing boundary wall and railings along the Andrew Street frontage and would incorporate a landscaped buffer between the front of the proposed town houses and the back of the Andrew Street pavement.

The proposed lower ground floor car park would be served from a vehicular access/egress ramp, which would be accessed from the proposed new access road from Andrew Street. Cycle parking and motorcycle/scooter parking would be provided within the lower ground floor.

Character Area B

The existing 'Bleach Croft' building would be retained and converted to 6 no. apartments at ground floor level (4 no. one bedroomed and 2 no. two bedroomed) and 6 no. apartments at first floor level (4 no. one bedroomed and 2 no. two bedroomed). The Western elevation of the building that no longer exists will be reconstructed to match the Eastern elevation. Car parking for the proposed 12 no. apartments (one space per unit) would be provided at lower ground floor of the proposed town houses within Character Area A.

Each apartment would have access to an external seating area to the South and the building would be connected to the riverside walkway along the River Etherow to the South. The proposal would include the retention of the Headrace Arch along the Southern elevation of the 'Bleach Croft' building, incorporated as a feature within the hard landscaping.

Character Area C

3 no. four bedroomed town houses are proposed within a three storey block, of dual gable roof design and constructed in stone with a slate roof. The main elevation of

these properties would overlook the River Etherow to the South and the properties would be provided with garden areas and parking (two spaces per unit) to the North.

Character Area D

2 no. four bed roomed and 2 no. three bed roomed town houses are proposed within a three storey building, of gable roofed design with subordinate gables to the Northern and Southern ends, gable fronted features and front and rear dormers. These town houses would be constructed in brick with a slate roof.

Each property would have a private rear garden to the West. One private parking space would be provided for each of the properties, with an additional space within the communal parking area to the East.

Character Area E

2 no. four bed roomed and 1 no. three bed roomed town houses are proposed within a three storey building, of gable roofed design with a gable fronted element, front and rear dormers with a subordinate gable roofed element to the Southern end. These town houses would be constructed in brick with a slate roof.

Each property would have a private rear garden to the West. One private parking space would be provided for each of the properties, with an additional space within communal parking area to the East.

A landscaped buffer is proposed to the West of these properties, in order to minimise noise created from existing commercial uses to the West of the site.

Character Area F

As part of the proposed highway improvements and the proposed new access road, the access to the car park to the South of the Athenaeum building would be relocated away from the junction with Andrew Street. The existing car park would be reconfigured to provide 21 spaces for the Council and 12 spaces for the Athenaeum.

The application is accompanied by the following supporting documents :-

- Planning and Affordable Housing Statement.
- Design and Access Statement.
- Economic Viability Assessment.
- Heritage Statement.
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment.
- Transport Statement.
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, including Designers Response.
- Flood Risk Assessment.
- Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment.
- Arboricultural Report.
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Ecological Report.
- Protected Species Survey Report.
- Noise Assessment.
- Energy Statement.
- Crime Impact Statement.

The scheme has been amended since its original submission in order to address

issues raised by the Council Conservation Officer and Highway Engineer and by the Environment Agency.

Details of the design and siting of the proposed development are appended to the report.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The 0.76 hectare site is located on the Western side of Andrew Street in Compstall and forms part of the wider Compstall Mill complex. The site comprises a number of former industrial buildings which have been vacant since approximately 2007, are in a poor state of repair and have been the subject of vandalism and fly tipping.

Whilst there are no Listed Buildings within the application site, there are buildings and features of heritage interest, the site being located within the Compstall Conservation Area. These include the office building fronting Andrew Street in the South Eastern corner of the site and the 'Bleach Croft' building, a large single storey mill building located centrally within the site. Other elements of heritage interest include the Northern façade of the Andrew Street building and existing walls and boundaries. The Headrace Arch, an ashlar stone arch has previously been identified as having heritage interest. The remainder of the site is made up of various industrial style buildings, some of which are of prefabricated style of construction.

Access to the site is taken from Andrew Street to the North of the existing buildings beyond which is a car park, part of which is included within the application site. The access road/track also provides access to a car repair garage to the West of the site.

Adjoining the site to the North is an area of woodland, a surface level car park and a large detached building (The Athenaeum), which is Locally Listed and is currently occupied by a day nursery, gymnasium and hall. Residential properties on Compstall Road and Redbrow Hollow exist further to the North, at a higher level to the site. To the East of the site is Andrew Street, with the remainder of the Compstall Mills complex on the opposite side of Andrew Street to the East. The site is bounded to the South by the River Etherow, a public footpath/towpath and the Grade II Listed Compstall Bridge. To the West of the site is a car repair garage and further woodland.

Land levels slope down from North to South and levels within the site are generally lower than Andrew Street to the East. Gigg Brook runs through the site in a North to South direction.

POLICY BACKGROUND

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

The Statutory Development Plan for Stockport comprises :-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (saved UDP) adopted on the 31st May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; and

- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy DPD) adopted on the 17th March 2011.

The application site is allocated within a Major Existing Developed Site (MEDS) in the Green Belt, as defined on the UDP Proposals Map. The site is located within the Compstall Conservation Area and the Etherow Parklands Landscape Character Area. The following policies are therefore relevant in consideration of the proposal :-

Saved UDP policies

- LCR1.1 : LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS
- LCR1.1a : THE URBAN FRINGE INCLUDING THE RIVER VALLEYS
- NE1.1 : SITES OF SPECIAL NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE
- NE1.2 : SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE
- HC1.1 : DEMOLITION AND TREE FELLING IN CONSERVATION AREAS
- HC1.3 : SPECIAL CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN CONSERVATION AREAS
- HC1.4 : NEW USES FOR BUILDINGS IN CONSERVATION AREAS
- EP1.7 : DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK
- GBA1.1 : EXTENT OF GREEN BELT
- GBA1.2 : CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT
- GBA1.5 : RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT
- GBA1.6 : RE-USE OF BUILDINGS IN THE GREEN BELT
- GBA1.7 : MAJOR EXISTING DEVELOPED SITES IN THE GREEN BELT
- L1.1 : LAND FOR ACTIVE RECREATION
- L1.2 : CHILDREN'S PLAY
- L1.8 : STRATEGIC RECREATION ROUTES
- MW1.5 : CONTROL OF WASTE FROM DEVELOPMENT

Core Strategy DPD policies

- CS1 : OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES : SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - ADDRESSING INEQUALITIES AND CLIMATE CHANGES
- SD-1 : CREATING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES
- SD-3 : DELIVERING THE ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES PLAN – NEW DEVELOPMENT
- SD-6 : ADAPTING TO THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE
- CS2 : HOUSING PROVISION
- CS3 : MIX OF HOUSING
- CS4 : DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING
- H-1 : DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
- H-2 : HOUSING PHASING
- H-3 : AFFORDABLE HOUSING
- CS7 : ACCOMMODATING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- AED-6 : EMPLOYMENT SITES OUTSIDE PROTECTED EMPLOYMENT AREAS
- CS8 : SAFEGUARDING AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT
- SIE-1 : QUALITY PLACES
- SIE-2 : PROVISION OF RECREATION AND AMENITY OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
- SIE-3 : PROTECTING, SAFEGUARDING AND ENHANCING THE ENVIRONMENT

- CS9 : TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT
- T-1 : TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT
- T-2 : PARKING IN DEVELOPMENTS
- T-3 : SAFETY AND CAPACITY ON THE HIGHWAY NETWORK

Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents

Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents (SPG's and SPD's) do not form part of the Statutory Development Plan. Nevertheless, they do provide non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications. Relevant SPG's and SPD's include :-

- DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SPD
- OPEN SPACE PROVISION AND COMMUTED PAYMENTS SPD
- PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPG
- SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPG
- SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SPD
- TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS SPD.

The 'Compstall Mill Planning Brief' (2008) is also relevant to consideration of the proposal.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF, initially published on 27th March 2012 and subsequently revised and published on 19th February 2019 by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF will be a vital tool in ensuring that we get planning for the right homes built in the right places of the right quality at the same time as protecting our environment.

In respect of decision-taking, the revised NPPF constitutes a 'material consideration'.

Paragraph 1 states *'The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied'*.

Paragraph 2 states *'Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise'*.

Paragraph 7 states *'The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development'*.

Paragraph 8 states *'Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives) :-*

- a) *An economic objective*
- b) *A social objective*
- c) *An environmental objective'*

Paragraph 11 states *'Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means :-*

c) Approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless :-

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii. 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’.

Paragraph 12 states ‘.....Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local Planning Authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed’.

Paragraph 38 states ‘Local Planning Authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way..... Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible’.

Paragraph 47 states ‘Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing’.

Paragraph 213 states ‘existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, 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)’.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

NPPG is a web-based resource which brings together planning guidance on various topics into one place (launched in March 2014) and coincided with the cancelling of the majority of Government Circulars which had previously given guidance on many aspects of planning.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- DC055286 : Demolition (in part) of the former Compstall Printworks and construction of 18 no. dwelling houses and 14 apartments with associated car parking and landscape : Withdrawn – 12/03/19.
- DC053312 : Demolition (in part) of the former Compstall Printworks : Withdrawn – 21/11/13.

- DC053306 : Partial demolition of former Compstall Printworks buildings and erection of 18 no. dwellinghouses and 14 no. apartments, with associated access, parking and landscaping : Withdrawn – 28/01/14.
- DC013652 : Demolish existing 2 garages and rebuild one garage to use as workshop : Granted – 01/03/04.
- DC012737 : Demolish existing 2 garages and rebuild one garage to use as workshop : Granted – 04/11/03.
- J.70338 : New access road to provide access between clients existing site and new site on the old Sigram Flues land : Granted – 26/11/98.
- J.69305 : Change of use and alterations to convert partially enclosed storage building into an enclosed building for general industrial use : Granted – 26/02/98.
- J.65026 : Use of land for parking and maintenance of forestry machinery, storage of woodchip and logs and erection of canopy structure (Retrospective) : Granted – 03/10/96.
- J.61172 : Mould storage cover : Granted – 15/12/94.
- J.60940 : External weatherproof enclosure (Retrospective) : Granted – 13/10/94.
- J.59592 : Extension – Withdrawn – 28/03/94.
- J.59570 : Extension of existing offices, 70 square metres additional floor space, single storey : Granted – 31/03/94.
- J.40424 : Private tipping area : Refused – 08/12/87.
- J.40423 : Pony paddock : Granted – 10/03/88.
- J.40422 : Compound including buildings for maintenance of and storage of contractors plant, for Blair Contractors : Granted – 10/03/88.
- J.40421 : Additional parking for Weirside Garage (Plan C), storage compound for accident damaged car for Weirside Garage (Plan B) : Granted – 10/03/88.
- J.40420 : Storage compound for precision fibre glass moulds : Granted – 10/03/88.
- J.27132 : Pipe Bridge to cross River Etherow and Gigg Brook : Granted – 13/01/83.
- J.25948 : Storage and parking of vehicles : Refused – 17/08/82.
- J.23988 : Construction of warehouse and offices : Refused – 12/11/81.
- J.8036 : Warehousing and distribution : Withdrawn – 16/06/77.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of surrounding properties and units were notified in writing of the application and the application was advertised by way of display of notices on the site and in the press.

Letters of objection from 2 addresses have been received to the proposal. The main causes for concern raised are summarised below :-

- This appears to be a very challenging proposal, given the nature of the land, existing property and access to the site.
- It goes without saying that the land and derelict properties desperately require sympathetic regeneration, taking into account that this is a Conservation Area and country location.
- There is already too much traffic in the village and parking spaces are an issue.
- It appears that appropriate road width access can only be achieved with the sell-off of Council property, namely the car park at Compstall Athenaeum. It will also require appropriate visibility splays at the junction of Andrew Street and Compstall Road and the construction of pavements.
- The traffic survey detailed in a previous application is out of date and does not reflect a true picture of the current flows. Whilst Compstall Road is governed by a 30 MPH limit, in reality speeds at times are far in excess of this, which considerably reduces the reaction time drivers have, particularly approaching Andrew Street over the blind bridge over the River Etherow in the direction of Marple Bridge.
- Adequate parking has to be available for all the properties, whether they be privately owned or communal. 2 vehicles per household is not unrealistic in today's society and it should be noted that there are double yellow line restrictions already in place along Compstall Road. These lines were introduced decades ago because of traffic flow through Compstall Village.
- There is very little within the submitted documents in respect of wildlife. What consideration has been given to protected species? Compstall and the immediate area has a high population of protected species. Has a survey been carried out to reflect this? Moving of protected species requires a license and can only be done at certain times of the year. Has an Ecology Report been submitted and has advice been sought from the relevant Trust? Protected species could cause future problems should the site be regenerated with sub-floor parking. Unless suitable escape gates are installed, protected species could become trapped.
- There are no specifics as to the type/style of boundaries that are being proposed. Is it presumed that a living boundary will be adopted?

A letter of comment from 1 address has been received to the application, which asserts the following :-

- The scheme as a whole is commended, as it will improve this area of Compstall.

- However, deep concerns are raised regarding the impact on traffic and parking in the village.
- Compstall is inundated with visitors to Etherow Park and this brings huge pressure in terms of parking in the village. It is rammed at weekend, with parked cars blocking pavements and making access for emergency vehicles almost impossible. Concerns that the scheme will make things worse.
- Concerns that the entrance onto Andrew Street is a very dangerous junction with visibility hindered by the bridge.
- Concerns that there is no crossing point from Compstall all the way up to the Windsor Castle. As there is no pavement on this side of Andrew Street at the bridge, residents of the development will have to cross over to the other side with no safe crossing.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Planning Policy Officer (Energy)

In terms of the submitted energy statement it is broadly compliant with policy in that it acknowledges the targets and provides assessment of low and zero carbon technologies for their technical feasibility and financial viability. However the Core Strategy target of a minimum 40% improvement over 2006 Part L equates to a 13% improvement over current Part L.

Given that detailed design has not yet been addressed and there is no specific assessment of how the target will be achieved relative to the Building Regulations Target Emissions Rate, I propose the following condition :-

'Before the development is commenced details of the percentage carbon savings (as required by Core Strategy Policy SD3) to be achieved on the development, including details of the methodology that will achieve the target should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.'

Reason - In the interests of evidencing policy compliance in terms of achieving carbon emission targets on site as required by Core Strategy Policy SD3.'

Conservation Officer

I confirm that the amended plans are now acceptable from a conservation perspective.

Detailed matters relating to architectural features such as windows and doors; external materials; methodology for dismantling/re-erection of the historic gable within Character Area A; and landscaping can be dealt with by condition.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service

An archaeological desk based assessment has been submitted in support of the application (Dr Pete Arrowsmith July 2019) along with a Heritage Statement by Munteer (July 2019). The application is similar to that submitted in 2013 (DC/053306) and the following comments reflect our previous consultation response.

The archaeological study describes the historical development of the printworks and the function and date of its various components. This is a useful study that allows a good understanding of the character and archaeological potential of the site. The printworks was founded in 1801-2 and closed in 1901. This period incorporated a number of phases of rebuilding and expansion. Most of the buildings have been demolished with the Bleach Croft being the only surviving printworks building. A later structure, of 1916, located next to Andrew Street and on the site of a former reservoir, was used for warp-sizing and is associated with the nearby Compstall Mill. The extent of survival of below-ground archaeological remains is not known. Figure 19 provides an excellent composite plan of the location of former buildings and power features in relation to the modern landscape.

Relative significance of the various components of the site is discussed on pages 25-28. The report concludes that there are no remains within the application site that are considered to be of national significance. The standing buildings make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and GMAAS are pleased to note that key early buildings and walls are to be retained. Below-ground archaeology is likely to range between local and regional significance.

Archaeological recommendations are set out on pages 30-31 and GMAAS concur with these. For standing buildings and walls an archaeological record should be made (Historic England level 3) before development/demolition commences. There will need to be a watching brief during stripping out of key areas of the building interiors and clearance of rubble. For the below-ground archaeology it will be necessary to undertake an archaeological evaluation exercise which should comprise trial trenches targeted on potentially significant parts of the former printworks, such as power features (water wheel pits, engine and boiler house, chimney based etc) and processing areas. Where significant archaeological remains are identified that will be destroyed or damaged by development ground works further, more detailed, archaeological excavation will be required. Following completion of site investigation and recording, GMAAS can recommend release of the site for development ground works; however the condition should not be discharged until post excavation analysis, a report on the investigations, deposition of the archive and dissemination of the results to the local and wider community have been completed. Dissemination might include information boards or a popular publication but will be informed by the results of the investigations.

The archaeological works should be secured through a condition attached to planning consent. The condition should be worded as follows :-

No demolition or development works shall take place until the applicant or their agents or their successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The WSI shall cover the following :

- 1. A phased programme and methodology to include:*
 - targeted archaeological trial trenching*
 - depending on the results of the above, a programme of more detailed archaeological excavation*
 - an archaeological survey of extant buildings and walls (Historic England Level 3)*
- 2. A programme for post investigation assessment to include:*
 - analysis of the site investigation records and finds*
 - production of a final report on the significance of the heritage interest represented.*

3. A scheme to disseminate the results that is commensurate with their significance
4. Provision for archive deposition of the report, finds and records of the site investigation.
5. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved WSI.

Reason: In accordance with NPPF policy 16, paragraph 199, To record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible and SIE-3 "Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment" of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

The work should be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified archaeological contractor, funded by the applicant, and in accordance with guidance provided by GMAAS who would also monitor the implementation of the works on behalf of Stockport MBC.

Highway Engineer

Original Comments of 22/01/20

This application, which seeks permission for the part demolition of former industrial buildings on land to the west of Andrew Street, Compstall, and the erection of 18 no. houses and 14 no. apartments, is essentially a resubmission of a scheme which was submitted in 2014 under application DC/055286. That application was considered by the Council's Planning and Highways Committee in October 2014 where Members resolved to approve the application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to the payment of monies relating to open space and a traffic regulation order. The Section 106 Agreement, however, was not completed and the application was subsequently withdrawn. From a highways perspective, the application is no different to the previous scheme, which was considered acceptable from a highways perspective, subject to conditions and the applicant funding a traffic regulation order.

As with the previous scheme, the development will be accessed via a new access road, which will take access from Andrew Street in approx. the same location as an existing access and car parking will be provided for the houses and apartments in a number of parking areas. As with the previous application, a Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted in support of the planning application. Unlike with the previous application, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has not been submitted.

- *Accessibility*

With respect to accessibility and sustainability, the TS outlines that the site is within reasonable walking distance of Compstall Post Office, a number of pubs, and Ludworth Primary school and is within reasonable cycling distance of locations including Romiley, Woodley, Bredbury. It also outlines that there are various cycle routes in the local area and the site is located close to bus stops served by a fairly frequent bus service (it fails to refer to a similar service that operates in the other direction, however). It does not, however, outline whether the site's location and local transport infrastructure and services will ensure that the site is adequately accessible by sustainable modes of transport or whether the occupiers of the development and their visitors will reasonably be able to travel by sustainable modes of transport.

Consideration of the site's accessibility using the Council's accessibility model (which considers a site accessibility in relation to employment, retail, schools, health centres, hospitals and evening economy uses), however, concludes that it scores 37, which indicates a fairly low level of accessibility. In addition, Marple Station is beyond the distance which most people would walk, the schools are beyond the distance younger children are likely to walk, the nearest high school is a fair distance away, the local bus services only provide public transport links to some nearby towns / villages and a number of walking and cycling routes in the area are sub-standard (e.g. footways are sub-standard, notably across at Compstall Bridge, it can be difficult to cross Andrew Street and the route between the site and Marple / the station through Brabyns Park is unlit, not signed and is poorly surfaced in places).

As such, and as outlined in respect to the previous application, it is considered that routes and infrastructure in the area are such that occupiers of the development could be prevented or discouraged from travelling by sustainable modes of transport unless improvements are carried out to address the deficiencies and improve the site's accessibility. Consequently, it is considered that it would be appropriate and in line with policy for the applicant to fund / carry out off-site transport improvements so as to improve the site's accessibility. As outlined at the time of the previous application, based on similar residential developments in the area, it could be argued that a contribution in the region of £2400-£3200 per unit would be appropriate.

When the previous application was considered, however, the applicant submitted an Economic Viability Appraisal that indicated that the development would not be economically viable if a financial contribution to fund accessibility improvements were required. It is understood that the conclusions of the appraisal were accepted and, as such, I understand that it was agreed that no contribution to fund works to improve the site's accessibility would be sought, with measures to improve the site's accessibility and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport limited to:

- 1) The provision of cycle parking within the development
- 2) Improvement of the Riverside Walk to the south of the development (widening and surfacing of the path)
- 3) The provision of a cycle link from the site access road to the Riverside Walk (in accordance with objectives of the Compstall Mills Planning Brief)
- 4) The provision of signage on routes to / from the site (e.g. to sign the route through Brabyns Park to the station)
- 5) Implementation of Travel Plan Measures (to make residents aware of sustainable travel options in the area etc.)

An Economic Viability Appraisal, however, has not been submitted in support of this current application to demonstrate that the scheme would not be viable if contributions were required. I am not aware, however, that there has been a significant change in circumstances since the previous application was considered and, as such, I would envisage that the scheme would still be unviable if contributions were sought (notably as the development will now comprise of 100% affordable housing). This, however, will need to be clarified and therefore I would recommend that the application is deferred and the applicant requested to clarify whether they would be in the position to make contributions to sustainable transport improvements (and submit an Economic Viability Appraisal to demonstrate that contributions would make the scheme unviable if this is the case). If, however, the development can sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements, I will review and provide further comments on this issue.

- Access

With respect to access and the impact on the local highway network, the development is proposed to be accessed via an access road with a 6m carriageway and 2m footways on both sides, which will take access from Andrew Street in approx. the same location as an existing access. This road will also serve a number of existing uses, including a vehicle repair garage to the west of the site and a children's nursery and public car park to the north of the site. To enable its construction, part of the existing public car park will be required, but this will be reconfigured and improved (including the provision of an improved access) with a similar number of parking spaces (34 no.) provided.

Consideration of the impact on the local highway network concludes that the proposal should not have a material impact upon the local highway network. I would also conclude that the proposed new junction should operate satisfactory in capacity terms, with minimal queuing and note that information submitted in support of the previous application outlined that an adequate level of visibility (2.4m by 55.0m visibility splays) will be able to be provided at the site access (having regard to the results of a speed survey that was carried). It should be noted, however, that a slightly longer section of the existing wall will need to be removed than that indicated on drawing P006 so as to allow the required visibility to be provided to the south of the junction. This issue, however, can be dealt with by condition / at detailed design stage.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for the site access and access road, however, has not been submitted in support of the planning application. Chapter 3 of the Sustainable Transport SPD and Section 3.2.1.1 of the Transport and Highways in Residential Areas SPD outline the need for a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to be produced and submitted in support of any planning application that includes a new highway. This is to ensure that the design of new and amended highway infrastructure is assessed from a highway safety perspective at planning stage so as to ensure that any issues are identified prior to the issue of any planning approval and schemes are not approved which are subsequently determined to be unsafe. As such, I consider that there is a need for a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to be carried out at this stage and therefore recommend that the application is deferred to enable such an audit (and associated Designer's Response) to be produced and submitted.

- *Site Layout*

Regarding the site layout, whilst I consider it generally acceptable, I would recommend that the bell mouth accesses to the underground car park and Units 30-32 are replaced with dropped kerb footway crossings, the bell mouth access into the access drive that will serve Units 25-29 (which will also function as a turning area) is surfaced in tarmac (as block paving is likely to be damaged by turning vehicles), a direct pedestrian link is provided from the access road to the public car park and the footway to the north of the access road is widened a little (if possible). These issues, however, can be dealt with by condition / at detailed design stage.

- *Parking*

In terms of parking, 54 parking spaces are proposed to be provided to serve the proposed development, in the form of:

- 1) A 30-space underground car park (with 4 disabled spaces) under Units 1-10 to serve 18 units (1-22)
- 2) 16 surface level spaces (inc. 1 disabled space) by Units 23-29 to serve those

- units and 2 visitors
- 3) 8 surface level spaces (inc. 1 disabled space) by Units 30-32 to serve those units and a visitor

This equates to a level of parking of 169%, which accords with the adopted standards, and the applicant indicates that 2 spaces will be allocated to each house and 1 space to each apartment, with 3 spaces provided for visitors. In addition, although the existing public car park is proposed to be amended, a similar number of spaces will be retained. Also, parking for motorcycles and cycles is proposed to be provided for occupiers of the apartments within the underground car park.

Although the proposed level of parking accords with the adopted parking standards, it is likely that drivers may try and park on the proposed access road. This could have safety implications and affect access to the uses to the west of the site. As such, I would conclude that parking restrictions are required on the access road and therefore I recommend that any approval granted is subject to a condition which requires the applicant to arrange the provision of parking restrictions on the site access road. The provision of such restrictions will require a Traffic Regulation Order, which will need to be implemented by the Highway Authority at the applicant's / developer's expense. The estimated cost of this (at the time of writing) is £7500.

With respect to parking for disabled badge holders, whilst the submitted plans show parking being provided for disabled badge holders, some of the spaces are sub-standard in design (e.g. they do not all have an access area on both sides). This issue, however, could be addressed at detailed design stage / by condition (although it may require some of the disabled parking spaces to be relocated).

Charging points for electric vehicles should also be provided for each dwelling, as well as ducting / cabling to allow charging points to be provided at all other parking spaces in the future. This matter, however, can be dealt with by condition.

Finally, with respect to cycle parking, a secure cycle store is proposed to be provided within the underground car park for occupiers of the apartments. Subject to detail, I would consider this acceptable. Cycle stores / sheds will also need to be provided for the houses, along with short-stay visitor cycle parking, although this can be dealt with by condition.

- *Conclusion*

I consider this application, which is essentially a resubmission of a scheme which was considered in 2016, generally acceptable from a highways perspective, noting that that the vehicles movements generated by the development should not have a material impact on the local highway network and an adequate level of parking is proposed to be provided. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, however, has not been submitted in support of the application as is required, to review the design of the site access and access road from a safety perspective. In addition, due to the site's poor accessibility, it is considered that improvements to transport infrastructure in the area are justified. The applicant, however, has not submitted an Economic Viability Appraisal in support of the application to outline whether the development can sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements (an Appraisal submitted in support of the previous application outlined that the previous scheme would not be viable if contributions were sought) and, as such, it is considered that further details on this issue are also required. I therefore recommend that the application is deferred and the applicant is requested to submit:

- 1) Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response
 - 2) Confirmation (e.g. an Economic Viability Appraisal) on whether the development can sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements
- Recommendation : Defer

Further Comments of 15/04/20, following submission of amended plans and Road Safety Audit

I write with reference to the revised drawings / information submitted on the 19th March 2020 in response to comments made in my Consultation Responses of the 22nd January, as well as by other consultees.

The submitted information includes a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, as was requested. This raises two issues. Firstly, it outlines that it is not clear whether an acceptable level of visibility can be provided from the proposed junction. Secondly, it notes that a pedestrian crossing facility is not proposed to be provided at the junction. The applicant, however, has not submitted a formal Designer's Response to the Audit as was requested / is required, although they have outlined in the covering e-mail that the issue of visibility at the access has been reviewed and the scheme has been amended, with an addition 1m section of boundary wall removed for visibility purposes. A visibility splay plan has also been submitted to outline the level of visibility that will be afforded at the junction. This shows 2.4m by 55.0m visibility splays (measured to 1m out from the kerb line) can be provided at the junction, which was the level of visibility that was determined to be required at the time of the previous planning application (having regard to the results of a speed survey that was carried). Exact details of the visibility splay would need to be agreed at detailed design stage, although this can be dealt with by condition. No reference, however, has been made in the e-mail to the second issue raised in the RSA and, although the requirement to provide a pedestrian crossing facility (e.g. dropped kerbs with tactile paving) at the junction, could be dealt with by condition, I consider that a formal response to the RSA should be produced (covering both issues raised in the Audit).

In my original comments on the application, I outlined that due to the site's poor accessibility, it was considered that improvements to transport infrastructure in the area were justified but noted that when the previous application was considered, the applicant submitted an Economic Viability Appraisal that indicated that the development would not be economically viable if a financial contribution to fund accessibility improvements was required. The applicant, however, did not submit an Appraisal in support of this application to outline that the current scheme could not sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements and, as such, I outlined that further details on this issue were required to enable this issue to be reviewed as part of this scheme. The additional information that was submitted on the 19th March did not include such information and, as such, this information still needs to be submitted.

To conclude, whilst the applicant has submitted a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, as was requested, they have not submitted a Designer's Response to the Audit, as was also requested, nor confirmation (e.g. an Economic Viability Appraisal) on whether the development can sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements. I therefore recommend that the application is deferred for a further period of time and the applicant is requested to submit this outstanding information.

- Recommendation : Defer

Further Comments of 10/09/20, following submission of amended Road Safety Audit and Viability Appraisal

I write with reference to the Designers Response to Road Safety Audit (T780: Compstall - Andrew Street) and Financial Viability Assessment submitted on the 6th August 2020 in response to comments made in my Consultation Response of the 15th April 2020, as well as others.

In my comments of the 15th April I outlined that the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit raised two issues. Firstly, it outlined that it was not clear whether an acceptable level of visibility could be provided at the proposed junction. Secondly, it noted that a pedestrian crossing facility was not proposed to be provided at the junction. In response to these issues, the Designer's Response has outlined that the scheme has been amended to ensure that the required visibility splays will be able to be provided. In addition, the Response outlines that the applicant has agreed that dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be installed at the junction. As such, the issues highlighted in the audit will be addressed.

In my original comments on the application, I outlined that due to the site's poor accessibility, it was considered that improvements to transport infrastructure in the area were justified but noted that when the previous application was considered, the applicant submitted an Economic Viability Appraisal that indicated that the development would not be economically viable if a financial contribution to fund accessibility improvements was required. The applicant has now submitted a Viability Assessment for this scheme and I note that this highlights that this will also be the case with this revised scheme, with the Assessment noting that the scheme *"will deliver a negative development profit margin [which] justifies a zero Section 106 agreement"*. I will obviously leave it for others to fully review the Viability Assessment, but if the conclusions of the Assessment are accepted and it is concluded that it is not possible for applicant to make such a contribution to fund off-site transport improvements, as with the previous scheme, I would suggest that the measures that were agreed as part of the previous scheme to permit and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport (e.g. cycle parking and Travel Plan Measures) are implemented. This, however, can be dealt with by condition.

- *Conclusion*

As previously outlined, I consider this application, which is essentially a resubmission of a scheme which was considered in 2016, generally acceptable from a highways perspective, noting that that the vehicles movements generated by the development should not have a material impact on the local highway network and an adequate level of parking is proposed to be provided. The applicant has now submitted a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit which has not raised any safety issues with the scheme and a Viability Assessment has also been submitted which demonstrates, as was the case with the previous scheme, that the development cannot sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements. As such, I raise no objection to this application subject to conditions and the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement requiring the applicant to make a financial contribution of £7500 to the Council to fund the provision of a parking restrictions (a Traffic Regulation Order) on the site access road (whilst it is accepted that the scheme cannot fund accessibility improvements, it is considered that a TRO needs to be funded as this is safety critical).

- Recommendation : No objection, subject to :-

- 1) Conditions listed below; and
- 2) The applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement requiring the applicant to make a financial contribution of £7500 to the Council to fund the provision of parking restrictions (a Traffic Regulation Order on the site access road).

- *Conditions*

No development shall take place until a method statement detailing how the development will be constructed (including any demolition and site clearance) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include details on phasing, access arrangements, turning / manoeuvring facilities, deliveries, vehicle routing, traffic management, signage, hoardings, scaffolding, where materials will be loaded, unloaded and stored, parking arrangements and mud prevention measures. Development of the site shall not proceed except in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To ensure that the approved development is constructed in a safe way and in a manner that will minimise disruption during construction, in accordance with Policy T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD. The details are required prior to the commencement of any development as details of how the development is to be constructed need to be approved prior to the commencement of construction activities.

No work shall take place in respect to the construction of the site access, site access road or paths within the site until detail drawings of:

- 1) the access road and associated junction on Andrew Street that will serve the approved development; and
- 2) The cycle and pedestrian link paths between the access road and the "Riverside Walk" / footpath that abuts the southern boundary of the site

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, together with a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, Designer's Response and details of how the road and paths will be managed and maintained. The drawings shall include the following details:

- i. A general arrangement / layout, based on a topographical survey and to a scale not less than 1:200, showing the carriageway, footways, footpath, cycle path, accesses, service margins and visibility splays;
- ii. Details of 2.4m by 55.0m visibility splays to be provided at either side of the Andrew Street junction, including details of how these will be formed and retained;
- iii. Details of proposals to provide a turning head at the end of the access road, which shall make use of the access that will serve the access drive serving Units 23-29;
- iv. A general site layout, showing the proposed buildings and boundaries, together with existing and proposed levels;
- v. Longitudinal sections along the centre line and channel lines of the road, showing the existing ground level and proposed road / path level;
- vi. Typical highway cross-sections, showing a specification for each type of carriageway and footway;
- vii. Full details of the surface water drainage proposals (including details of the main drainage system and any sustainable urban drainage or attenuation systems);

- viii. Details of all proposed street lighting, signage, markings, structures, access controls and street furniture and amendments to existing structures, features and infrastructure;

No part of the development shall be occupied until the access road, junction and cycle and pedestrian link paths have been constructed in accordance with the approved drawings and are available for use. All visibility splays formed shall thereafter be kept clear of any structure, object, plant or tree exceeding the height specified on the approved drawings. The access road, junction and cycle and pedestrian link paths shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have an appropriately designed highway layout so that it can be safely accessed by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', CS9 'Transport and Development', T-1 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD, supported by the 'Sustainable Transport' and 'Transport and Highways in Residential Areas' SPDs.

No work shall take place in respect to the construction of any access within the approved development until a detailed drawing of the access arrangements for each plot within the site, which shall include:

- 1) Details of proposals to provide 1m by 1m pedestrian visibility splays at either side of the accesses
- 2) Details of proposals to provide vehicular visibility splays at each of the accesses
- 3) Details of proposals to provide dropped kerb footway crossings

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each plot within the approved development shall not be occupied until the access/s that serves that plot has/have been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing and is/are available for use. No structure, object, plant or tree exceeding 600mm in height shall subsequently be erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 600mm within the pedestrian visibility splays. No structure, object, plant or tree exceeding 1000mm in height shall subsequently be erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 1000mm within the vehicular visibility splays.

Reason: In order that the site will benefit from safe and practical access arrangements in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', CS9 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

A detailed drawing outlining a scheme to reconstruct the existing footway on Andrew Street that abuts the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the footway has been reconstructed in accordance with the approved drawing.

Reason: In order to ensure that there are safe and high quality pedestrian facilities adjacent to the site and ensure that development can be accessed in a safe manner in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', CS9 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD, supported by paragraph 5.30, 'Post development footway reinstatement', of the SMBC Sustainable Transport SPD.

Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 no gate or other means of obstruction shall be erected across the site access road or across any vehicular access that will serve any plot within the approved development at any time.

Reason: In order to ensure that vehicles can enter and exit each plot within the site unhindered so that they are not required to stop of the highway and therefore be a threat to highway safety and / or affect the free-flow of traffic in terms of Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', CS9 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

No work shall take in respect to the proposed amended public car park until detailed drawings (based on a topographic survey) of the proposed amended public car park to the north of the site access road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the how the car park will be accessed, surfaced, drained, marked out, signed and illuminated, together with details of landscaping, boundary treatments and any street furniture. The scheme shall also include proposals to provide a direct pedestrian link from the site access road to the public car park. The approved development shall not be occupied until the car park has been amended in accordance with the approved drawings and is available for use. The car park shall thereafter be retained and shall remain available for use.

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking facilities are provided and that they are appropriately located and are of a safe and practical design, in accordance with Policies SD-6 'Adapting to the impacts of climate change', SIE-1 'Quality Places', T-1 'Transport and Development', T-2 'Parking in Developments' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD, supported by Chapter 10, 'Parking', of the SMBC 'Sustainable Transport' SPD.

No work shall take place in respect to the construction of the parking facilities to be provided for the approved development until a detailed drawing of the car and motorcycle parking facilities (and associated paths / access routes) to be provided for and within the approved development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, together with details of how parking spaces will be allocated. Details shall include how the parking facilities will be surfaced, drained, marked out, signed and illuminated. Each unit within the development shall not be occupied until the parking facilities for that unit have been provided in accordance with the approved drawings and are available for use. The parking facilities shall thereafter be retained and shall remain available for use. The car parking facilities shall be illuminated at all times during the hours of darkness that the car park is in use (either permanently or using motion-controlled lighting).

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking facilities are provided and that they are appropriately located and are of a safe and practical design, in accordance with Policies SD-6 'Adapting to the impacts of climate change', SIE-1 'Quality Places', T-1 'Transport and Development', T-2 'Parking in Developments' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD, supported by Chapter 10, 'Parking', of the SMBC 'Sustainable Transport' SPD.

No work shall take place in respect to the provision of cycle parking within the site until details of proposals to provide long-stay (a covered and secure cycle store for a minimum of 1 cycle per unit) and short-stay (Sheffield stands, or similar, for a minimum of 6 cycles) cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each unit within the development shall not be

occupied until the cycle parking facilities for that unit have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The facilities shall then be retained and shall remain available for use at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that safe and practical cycle parking facilities are provided so as to ensure that the site is fully accessible by all modes of transport in accordance with Policies CS9 'Transport and Development', T-1 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD and the cycle parking facilities are appropriately designed and located in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD, supported by paragraph 5.6, 'Cycle Parking', of the SMBC Transport and Highways in Residential Areas SPD.

Charging points for the charging of electric vehicles shall be provided for each of the approved dwellings. Prior to their provision, details of the charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each dwelling within the development shall not be occupied until the charging point for that dwelling has been provided in accordance with the approved details and is available for use. The charging points shall thereafter be retained (unless they are replaced with an upgraded charging point in which case that should be retained).

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking with facilities for the charging of electric vehicles are provided in accordance with Policies SD-6 'Adapting to the impacts of climate change', SIE-3: Protecting, Safeguarding and enhancing the Environment, T-1 'Transport and Development', T-2 'Parking in Developments' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD and Paragraphs 110, 170 and 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

No work shall take place on the Riverside Walk (the footpath that abuts the southern boundary of the development and runs along the side of the River Etherow) until a drawing illustrating a scheme to widen and improve the Riverside Walk along the site's southern boundary has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include proposals to widen the path a minimum of 3m (unless otherwise agreed), hard surface it and provide access controls and signage. The development shall not be occupied until the Riverside Walk has been widened and improved in accordance with the approved drawing and is available for use.

Reason: To ensure that the development has safe and good quality pedestrian access arrangements in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', CS9 'Transport and Development', T-1 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD

Details of a scheme to provide direction signs between the site and Marple Bridge and Marple Station (via existing paths through Brabyns Park), so as to sign the route to / from the site and Marple Bridge and Marple Station for pedestrians and cyclists shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the signs have been provided in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure that the development has safe and good quality pedestrian / cycle access arrangements in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', CS9 'Transport and Development', T-1 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD

The approved development shall not be occupied until details of measures to be provided and implemented to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and have been implemented. Measures shall include:

- 1) Providing information on sustainable travel in sales / marketing literature
- 2) The provision of Travel Information Packs to the occupiers of each dwelling which includes information on local transport routes and services (including maps and timetable information) and details of local facilities, taxi services, cycle shops and car hire/clubs
- 3) Offering occupiers personalised travel planning and cycle training

Reason: To ensure that measures are implemented that will enable and encourage the use of alternative forms of transport to access the site, other than the private car, in accordance with Policies CS9 'Transport and Development', T-1 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD, supported by Chapter 4 'Travel Plans' of the SMBC Sustainable Transport SPD

- *Informatives*

In addition to planning permission, the applicant / developer will need to enter into a Section 38 Agreement, under the Highways Act 1980, with respect to the construction and adoption of the approved highway and junction. The Agreement will need to be in place prior to the commencement of any works. The applicant / developer should contact the Highways Section of Planning Services (0161 474 4905/6) with respect to this matter.

A condition/s of this planning consent requires the submission of detailed drawings / additional information relating to the access arrangements / parking / works within the highway. Advice on the discharge of highways related planning conditions is available within the 'Highways and Transport Advice' section of the planning pages of the Council's web-site (www.stockport.gov.uk). The applicant is advised to study this advice prior to preparing and submitting detailed drawings / the required additional information.

A condition of this planning consent requires the submission of a Construction Method Statement. In order to ensure that the statement includes all the required information the applicant / developer is advised to use the Council's template Construction Method Statement. This can be obtained from the 'Highways and Transport Advice' section within the planning pages of the Council's web-site (www.stockport.gov.uk).

Arboricultural Officer

The proposed development site is located within the former commercial/factory site predominantly on the former hard standing areas and commercial buildings. The plot is comprised largely of formal commercial/factory infrastructure and hard standing.

The proposed development is within a conservation Area (Compstall).

There are legally protected trees within this site or affected by this development (Compstall Mills Estate, Romiley 1987).

The buildings footprints predominantly sits within the hard standing and former buildings area of the site and the proposed new developments will impact on the trees. A full tree survey has been supplied which clearly shows the condition and location of trees and the proposed level of tree removal, which are categorised as low amenity trees that are not worthy of protection, but they do offer an overall screening and biodiversity benefit so will need to be off-set as part of a landscaping scheme. The site plans will need to show where applicable which trees could be retained to highlight the root protection areas so securing the amenity levels of the site with retained mature trees.

In principle the design will have a negative impact on the trees on site and within neighbouring properties, therefore it could be accepted in its current format with some detailed and improved landscaping design that includes a greater number of new trees to improve the amenity and aesthetics of the site within the scheme making sure a percentage of these are native large species, as well as increased native hedgerows at every opportunity.

The style of landscaping will need to consider the local environment and local community with replacement trees being of appropriate species to suit their locations, numbers of trees to suit the site so not to overcrowd when developed and levels of species to be native and levels to be fruit bearing to improve access to fruit in all rear garden areas as the site is semi-rural so that it improves greenery through the site.

The following conditions would be relevant to any planning application relating to the site :-

Condition Tree 1

- No existing tree within the site shall be cut down, topped, lopped, uprooted, wilfully damaged or wilfully destroyed without the prior written approval of the local planning authority, with the exception of those indicated otherwise on the approved plan. Any hedgerows, woody plants or shrubbery removed without such consent or dying or being severely damaged or being seriously diseased, within 5 years of the development commencing, shall be replaced within the next planting season with trees of such size and species as may be approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Condition Tree 2

- No development shall take place until all existing trees on the site except those shown to be removed on the approved plans, have been fenced off in accordance with BS 5837:2012 "Trees in relation to construction - Recommendations". The fencing shall be retained during the period of construction and no work, excavation, tipping or stacking of materials shall take place within any such fence during the construction period.

Condition Tree 3

- No development shall take place until details of all proposed tree planting, including the intended dates of planting, have been submitted to and

approved in writing by the local planning authority. All tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being brought into use.

Nature Development Officer

- *Site Context*

The site is located off Andrew Street (to the west) in Compstall and is north of the River Etherow. The application involves demolition (in part) of the former Compstall Printworks and construction of 18 no. dwelling houses and 14 no. apartments with associated car parking and landscaping. Habitats on site include buildings and hard standing with areas of woodland and scrub. Gigg Brook is also present and flows into the River Etherow.

- *Nature Conservation Designations*

The site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise. Etherow Country Park is approximately 70m to the east and this site is designated as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and a Site of Biological Importance (SBI). I do not envisage that the proposed works will have a direct impact on the designated sites but the proposed increase in housing in the area is likely to increase the footfall and other associated impacts within the Etherow Country Park.

- *Legally Protected Species*

A Phase 1 Habitat Survey has been carried out and submitted as part of the application (Egniol Environmental Ltd, 2019). The survey was carried out in July 2019 and mapped the habitats present on site and assessed the site for bats and breeding birds. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey ecology report states that the current survey updates survey work carried out in November 2013 and spring 2014 – which was carried out as part of a previous application for the site (DC055286). An updated ecology survey report (Protected Species Survey Report –Rev A dated August 2020) also confirmed that other protected species such as badger, otter and water vole were also included within the ecological assessment.

Many buildings and trees have the potential to support roosting bats. In addition, the application site is located near to suitable bat foraging habitat, and there are records for bat activity for several bat species in the local area (common and soprano pipistrelle, and *Myotis* spp.), which increases the likelihood of bats being impacted by any proposed works. All species of bats, and their roosts, are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The latter implements the Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora. Bats are included in Schedule 2 of the Regulations as ‘European Protected Species of animals’ (EPS). Under the Regulations it is an offence to:

- 1) Deliberately capture or kill a wild EPS
- 2) Deliberately disturb a wild EPS in such a way that significantly affects:
 - a) the ability of a significant group to survive, breed, rear or nurture young.
 - b) the local distribution of that species.
- 3) Damage or destroy a breeding place or resting site of such an animal.

An assessment for roosting bats has been carried out (Egniol Environmental Ltd, August 2020 Protected Species Report Rev A) and involved an internal and external inspection of buildings on site to search for signs of bats and assessment of bat roosting potential. The survey was carried out in June 2019. No evidence of bats was recorded during the survey but buildings 1 and 2 were assessed as offering low potential and building 5 was assessed as offering moderate bat roost potential. All other buildings on site (numbered 3,4,6,7 and 8) were assessed as having negligible potential to support roosting bats.

The previous surveys carried out in 2013/14 found that two buildings offered high potential but it is not clear which buildings these are. A dusk/dawn activity survey was carried out in May 2014 (this survey was carried out within the same 24 hour period so counts as one survey). No bats were recorded roosting within the buildings.

A culvert is also present on site (450mm diameter). No inspection survey was possible to assess whether the culvert offers any potential bat roosting features although it has been confirmed that no impacts to the culvert are anticipated as a result of the proposals.

Two dusk surveys were carried out in May 2020. No bats were confirmed to emerge from the buildings or the culvert although during the first survey a common pipistrelle bat was observed flying above (and could have potentially emerged from) the roof of Building 2. Due to access restrictions limiting visibility and the resulting ambiguity of the May survey, a further dawn survey was undertaken in August to provide additional confidence in the survey findings. No bats were recorded emerging from the buildings/culvert during the August survey. A remote bat detector was also placed in building 5 during the surveys but did not record any bat activity. Soprano and common pipistrelle, and whiskered/Brandt's/Alcathoe bat activity was recorded on site during the surveys. It is acknowledged in the ecology report that other potential survey options (such as endoscope inspection of buildings with the aid of a cherry-picker) are not possible in this instance.

Two sycamore trees were identified during the 2019 survey as offering bat roosting potential. These trees were subject to inspection surveys with the aid of an endoscope and no signs of bat presence were observed.

Habitats on site offer suitable nesting sites for breeding birds. All breeding birds and their nests are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

The application site offers potential habitat for badgers and there are records of badger activity in the local area. Badgers receive legal protection under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. No signs of badgers were recorded during the 2013, 2019 or 2020 surveys.

Similarly, no evidence of riparian mammals such as otter and water vole, was observed during the 2019 and 2020 surveys. Otters receive the same level of legal protection as bats (outlined above) and water voles are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

- *Invasive Species*

Himalayan balsam is located within the site and the phase 1 habitat report detected Japanese knotweed present within an island on the River Etherow, which is outside

of the development site. Both Japanese knotweed and Himalayan balsam are included on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended) making it an offence to plant or cause these species to grow in the wild.

- *Development Plan Policies*

Core Strategy DPD policy CS8 'Safeguarding and Improving the Environment' (Green Infrastructure : 3.286; Biodiversity and Nature Conservation : 3.296)

Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-3 'Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment' (Protecting the Natural Environment : 3.345, 3.347, 3.361, 3.362, 3.364, 3.366, 3.367 and 3.369)

Saved UDP policy NE1.1 'Sites of Nature Conservation Importance'.

Saved UDP policy NE1.2 'Sites of Nature Conservation Importance'.

- *Recommendations*

It is considered that there is sufficient ecological survey information to inform determination of the application. No evidence of roosting bats was confirmed on site and the protected species survey report concludes that it is considered unlikely that the common pipistrelle observed flying over above the roof of building 2 emerged from the building. Nonetheless, given the limited visibility of the buildings during the activity surveys it is advised that a precautionary approach is adopted during works and that the reasonable avoidance measures detailed in section 6.1 of the August 2020 Protected Species Report Rev A are implemented in full. This can be secured by condition. An informative should also be used with any planning consent granted to state that the granting of planning permission does not override the need to abide by the legislation in place to protect biodiversity and that in the event that evidence of bats (or any other protected species) is discovered on site during works, works must stop and a suitably experienced ecologist be contacted for advice.

Ecological conditions can change overtime and so should works have not commenced within 2 years of the 2020 surveys, update survey work will be required to ensure that the ecological impact assessment is based on sufficiently up to date baseline data. This can be conditioned if necessary.

A method statement (Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) or similar) will also need to be produced to ensure that Gigg brook is not adversely impacted during construction works (e.g. through inadvertent pollution/sediment run off) and retained woodland habitats are not disturbed. It is also recommended that the two sycamore tree identified as having potential bat roosting features are subject to soft-felling techniques (should they require removal) and this can also be included within the CEMP.

Compensation measures to mitigate for the loss of potential bat roost sites are outlined in section 6.2 of the Protected Species Report Rev A. This includes the provision of a minimum of six bat boxes. It is also proposed (in section 6.3) to provide three bat boxes on retained mature trees and a bat loft in building 5 as an enhancement. These measures are welcome within the application and should be

secured via condition. Details of the proposed type and location of the bat boxes along with detailed design of the bat loft should be submitted to the LPA for review.

In relation to breeding birds, no vegetation clearance/demolition works should take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation/buildings for active birds' nests immediately before vegetation clearance/roof works commence and confirmed that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site.

A method statement detailing the control, treatment and eradication of Himalayan balsam will be required to be submitted to the LPA for approval in advance of any works commencing on site. This can be conditioned and can be included within the CEMP if preferred.

Given the close proximity of the proposed development to the Country Park/Local Nature Reserve, and bearing in mind paragraphs 3.346 and 3.368 of the LDF core strategy, I would encourage a financial contribution from the developer to maintain and improve the access to the site and also to contribute to the management of the habitats within Etherow Country Park.

Any proposed lighting should be sensitively designed so as to minimise impacts on wildlife associated with light disturbance (following the principles outlined in Bat Conservation Trust guidance: http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_and_lighting.html).

Replacement planting will be required to mitigate for the loss of habitats (e.g. semi-natural broadleaved woodland) along with improved management of retained woodland areas. Developments are also expected to achieve net gains for biodiversity in line with local (paragraph 3.345 of the LDF) and national planning policy (NPPF). Landscape planting should include locally native species and comprise a mix of species known to be beneficial to biodiversity so as to maximise benefits. Details of subsequent management will also need to be provided.

Environment Team (Noise)

I have assessed the above development and I do not object. An Acoustic Report has been undertaken and it has identified the need for increased window specification and ventilation to the properties fronting the road of the development. Due to noise levels produced from the road. However, the houses to the rear will not need the increased window specification and will be able to have windows open without the need for a ventilation scheme.

Development to be constructed as per Acoustic report (DBX Acoustics 19063 Andrew Street Compstall 02/09/2019).

Environment Team (Land Contamination)

I have reviewed the Phase 1 report on the portal, due to the nature of the former use, the site has been identified as potentially contaminated and will require a site investigation for soil and gas.

As such could I please recommend the following conditions :-

- CTM1

No development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment into contamination at the site, in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing by the local planning authority, has been carried out. The investigation and risk assessment shall include recommendations for remedial action and the development shall not be occupied until these recommendations have been implemented.

Reason

The report submitted with the application has identified potentially unacceptable risks from contamination and further investigation is required to ensure that these risks to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy SIE-3 "Protecting Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment", of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

- CTM2

No development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the specified use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme to be submitted shall specify but not be limited to :-the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria (ii) all remedial works to be undertaken including the quantities of materials to be removed from and imported to the development site. (iii) the proposals for sourcing and testing all materials imported to the site including testing schedules, sampling frequencies and actual and allowable contaminant concentrations (as determined by appropriate risk assessment in accordance with the document "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination" (CLR11)).

Reason

To ensure that any unacceptable risks from contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy SIE-3 "Protecting Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment", of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

- CTM3

The development shall not be occupied until the approved remediation scheme required to be submitted by Condition ^IN; has been carried out. Within ^IN; months of completion of remediation measures, a validation report assessing the effectiveness of the remediation carried shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall specify any further remediation

measures necessary and indicate how and when these measures will be undertaken.

Reason

To ensure that any unacceptable risks from contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SIE-3 "Protecting Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment", of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

- LFG1

No development shall take place until (i) a method statement for the carrying out of an investigation and assessment of the potential for landfill gas being present on the land has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and (ii) the investigation and assessment has been carried out in accordance with the approved method statement and (iii) a written report of the investigation and a copy of the assessment has been submitted to the local planning authority. All precautionary and remedial measures (whether relating to excavation and other site works, building development and construction, gas control measures or otherwise) recommended or suggested by the report and assessment shall be taken or carried out in the course of the development unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason

The land may contain landfill gas and it may be necessary to undertake remedial measures in order to comply with Policy SIE-3 "Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment" of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD

- LFG3

No part of the development shall be occupied until all works necessary to prevent landfill gas migration into the development have been approved in writing by the local planning authority and carried out in full.

Reason

The adjoining land may contain landfill gas and it may be necessary to undertake remedial measures in order to comply with Policy SIE-3 "Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment" of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

Drainage Engineer/Lead Local Flood Authority

Comments of 10/01/20

The LLFA has reviewed the documents submitted in support of the above named application and comment as follows :-

- The conditions stated within section 3.1 should be removed. These are referenced to the development in 2014 and the conditions are no longer valid.
- Section 4.4 should also be removed. The sequential and exception test carried out in 2013 is considered to be outdated. This should be done again.
- All reference to planning application DC/055286 should be removed. This is an old application and based on different standards than the best working practice which we work to today.
- The restrictions given for infiltration are not deemed acceptable. Infiltration should be reviewed again.
- It is SMBCs policy that all areas of hardstanding should be permeable or drain to an alternative form of SUDS.
- There is also a requirement to reduce the pre development run-off rates by 50%. These should be established and detailed for review.
- The current climate change figure is 40% not 30%.
- Over sized pipes and underground storage is not considered to be the most sustainable approach. Above ground and natural SuDS features should be investigated in the first instance.
- The building should be set no lower than the maximum level currently displayed for the development within regards to the flood zones 2 and 3.
- The proposed 40l/s detailed within the FRA is subject to the pre-development run-off rates review.
- The culvert and UU combined sewer should be shown on a plan including the easements required.

We cannot recommend condition at this stage until the above has been addressed in full.

Further comments of 04/04/20, following submission of amended Flood Risk Assessment :-

Can the applicant please address the points below :-

- The culvert should be shown on the plans with a 5m easement.
- The road (proposed to be adopted) could be constructed of a permeable material as long as this is a free draining system and not tanked. Stockport Council would adopt this under these conditions. Investigations into the permeability of the ground under the road should be reviewed.
- Appendices G, I and K are missing.
- We would require calculation to demonstrate 1 in 1yr, 1 in 30yr and 1 in 100yr +40% climate change figure.
- The flooding extents shown in Appendices H and M show a different figure for the 100yr +CC. Is this correct?
- Appendix M appears to show the culvert running under the building footprint. Is this correct? A 5m easement should be included as per point 1 above.

Further comments of 17/08/20, following submission of amended Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Study

- The 5m easement of the culvert appears to run under the building footprint. This should be diverted should this be the case.
- Should infiltration be viable, the LLFA would not support an off site discharge.

- We would require calculation to demonstrate 1 in 1yr, 1 in 30yr and 1 in 100yr +40% climate change figure.
- The road (proposed to be adopted) could be constructed of a permeable material as long as this is a free draining system and not tanked. Stockport Council would adopted this under these conditions. Investigations into the permeability of the ground under the road should be reviewed. From the infiltration tests these appear to be favourable – therefore, the proposed adopted highway should be of a permeable construction.

Environment Agency

Comments of 09/01/20

Environment Agency position

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) we object to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Reasons

The submitted FRA does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development. In particular, the FRA fails to :-

- Consider how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards especially the car park beneath living accommodation in building A;
- Consider how a range of flooding events (including extreme events) will affect people and property;
- Take into account the new climate change allowances have been published on 19th February 2016, see <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances> for full details;
- Confirm acceptable finish floor levels after consideration of the revised climate change allowances to include an acceptable freeboard of at least 600mm;
- Consider the requirement for flood emergency planning including flood warning and evacuation of people for a range of flooding events up to and including the extreme event

Overcoming our objection

To overcome our objection, the applicant should submit a revised FRA which addresses the points highlighted above.

If this cannot be achieved, we are likely to maintain our objection.

If you are minded to approve the application contrary to our objection, please contact us to explain why material considerations outweigh our objection. This will allow us to make further representations.

Advice to LPA

This location is currently being reviewed in your SFRA (draft) which indicates that more detailed modelling is required to assess the flood risk in this area and to include the new climate change allowances as detailed above.

Advice to Applicant

In the FRA, ref EEL.7161.R05.001 dated October 2019, building B is quoted to have a finished floor level of 79.35mAOD as it is in flood zone 1. This is considerably lower than 81.42mAOD, the lowest FFL elsewhere and should be reconsidered once the new climate change allowances have been reviewed.

Further comments of 15/04/20 following submission of amended Flood Risk Assessment

Environment Agency position

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) we object to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Reasons

The revised FRA from Egniol (Ref EEL.7858.R05.001) does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development. In particular, the FRA fails to :-

- Provide an explanation on how the extrapolated flood levels have been derived and how the 35% climate change allowance on peak levels have been applied;
- Consider overland flood flow risk from the culverted watercourse Gigg brook should a blockage upstream occurs;
- Consider how a range of flooding events (including extreme events) will affect people and property

Overcoming our objection

To overcome our objection, the applicant should submit a revised FRA which addresses the points highlighted above.

If this cannot be achieved, we are likely to maintain our objection.

Advice to LPA

This location is currently being reviewed in your SFRA (draft) which indicates that more detailed modelling is required to assess the flood risk in this area and to include the new climate change allowances as detailed above.

Informative

This development may require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8m of the top of the bank of the River Etherow, designated a 'main river'. This was formerly called a Flood Defence Consent. Some activities are also now [excluded](#) or [exempt](#). A permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted. Further details and guidance are available on the GOV.UK website: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>.

The Environment Agency has discretionary powers to carry out maintenance works on the channels of "main river" watercourses to remove blockages and ensure the free flow of water. The responsibility for the repair and condition of the River Etherow, its channel, banks and adjacent structures, lies ultimately with the riparian owner.

Further comments of 06/11/20 following submission of further amended Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Study

Environment Agency Position

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and supporting model we maintain our objection to the proposed development.

The details submitted are a response to findings from the first review and comments by our Evidence and Risk team who reviewed the hydrology and modelling report.

There are still some amber and red issues that need addressing by the applicants. Further detailed comments are provided and the applicant should provide a more detailed response addressing the red and amber findings.

We would therefore suggest the applicant provides an updated model report with detailed justifications on hydrology methodology chosen as requested.

Further comments of 04/12/20 following submission of further amended Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Study

Environment Agency Position

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and supporting model we maintain our objection to the proposed development. Below are the summaries of the findings from our Evidence and Risk team who reviewed the hydrology and modelling reports. Further detailed comments are provided within two spreadsheets and the consultant should address all comments within the spreadsheets.

Evidence and Risk Team

The reports prepared by Hydrock do not offer sufficient explanation to enable us to sign off the Hydraulic Model. The documents received from Hydrock have not been updated fully in response to our previous comments. We note that some updates in the report have been undertaken, but the exact amendments /additions need to be detailed in combination with our comments.

We would kindly ask you to clarify and submit details to address the following:

1) The FEH calculation record suggests that an Enhanced Single Site (ESS) analysis has been carried out at Etherow@Compstall gauge. However the Winfap screen dumps do not show this gauge in the group, which would suggest that a standard pooling approach has been taken. In previous reviews the ESS has been suggested as potentially the best method to adopt.

2) It is not clear in the FEH calculation record exactly what the ReFH analysis has been used for. There is neither clear reporting of flows or its use in establishing the hydrograph shape. The hydrograph shape could be derived from observed events at Etherow.

FMP guidance notes that ReFH improves the way that design events are modelled and has a number of advantages over the FSR/FEH unit hydrograph and losses model. A comparison of FEH and ReFH2 should ideally be undertaken to support the choice of inflow boundary used.

The attached Model Reviews outline our comments, including a number of other review points that need clarification for completeness.

Further comments of 06/01/21 following submission of further amended Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Study

Environment Agency Position

Flood Risk

Following the review of the revised Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) from Egniol (Ref EEL.7858.R05.001 dated August 2020) submitted with the application, we are satisfied that it demonstrates that the proposed development will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. We therefore, remove our objection.

The proposed development must proceed in strict accordance with the FRA and the mitigation measures identified as it will form part of any subsequent planning approval. Therefore, we consider that planning permission for the proposed development should only be granted if the following mitigation measures as set out below are implemented and secured by way of planning conditions on any planning permission.

- Condition

The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) from Egniol (Ref EEL.7858.R05.001 dated August 2020) and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. Finished floor levels shall be set as set out in section 8 of the FRA.
2. Flood resilient measures are implemented within the ground floor as per section 8 of the FRA.
3. Identification and provision of safe routes into and out of the site to an appropriate safe haven.
4. The preparation of an emergency evacuation plan, including the registration

with Floodline on 0345 988 1188 to receive Flood Warnings for the River Etherow.

Reason

1. To reduce the impact of flooding on the proposed development and future occupants.
2. To reduce the impact of flooding on the proposed development and future occupants.
3. To ensure safe access and egress from and to the site.
4. To ensure safe access and egress from and to the site.

Advice to LPA/applicant

The Environment Agency recommends that in areas at risk of flooding consideration be given to the incorporation into the design and construction of the development of flood proofing measures. These include barriers on ground floor doors, windows and access points and bringing in electrical services into the building at a high level so that plugs are located above possible flood levels.

Reference should also be made to the Department for communities and local Government publication 'Preparing for Floods' please email: communities@twoten.com for a copy or alternatively go to: <http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/odpm/400000009282.pdf> as well as the communities and local Government publication 'Improving the flood performance of new buildings' which can be viewed at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/improvingflood>. Additional guidance can be found on our website at <https://www.gov.uk/prepare-for-a-flood> or by contacting Floodline on 0345 988 1188.

- Informative

This development will require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8m of the top of the bank of the River Etherow, designated a 'main river'. This was formerly called a Flood Defence Consent. Some activities are also now [excluded](#) or [exempt](#). A permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted. Further details and guidance are available on the GOV.UK website: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>.

The Environment Agency has discretionary powers to carry out maintenance works on the channels of "main river" watercourses to remove blockages and ensure the free flow of water. The responsibility for the repair and condition of the River Etherow, its channel, banks and adjacent structures, lies ultimately with the riparian owner.

Contaminated Land

We have reviewed the report in terms of the risk to controlled waters from land contamination and would like to make the following comments.

Contaminated Land Preliminary Risk Assessment (Phase 1 Assessment) Ref: EEL.7161.R03.001 Draft, dated the 20 of June 2019 provided for phase 1 of the proposed residential development of the Former Compstall Printworks, Andrew

The report provided identifies potential land contamination sources related to the previous land uses both on and off-site. The historical uses of the proposed development site and the wider area present a risk of contamination that could be mobilised during construction to pollute controlled waters.

At this location, controlled waters are particularly sensitive as the site is located upon a secondary A aquifer associated with mudstone, siltstone and sandstone belonging to the Pennine Lower Coal Measures Formation. The overlying superficial deposits include River Terrace Deposits and Alluvium to the south and small pockets of Glaciofluvial sand and gravel to the north, all of which are classified as Secondary A aquifers. Devensian glacial till designated a secondary undifferentiated aquifer covers the wider area. This designation is assigned where it has not been possible to attribute either a Secondary A or B aquifer classification. The inferred groundwater flow direction is towards the River Etherow south of the site.

Given the desk study identifies further works are required to assess the risks to controlled waters, we consider that the proposed development will be acceptable if planning conditions are included requiring the submission of further ground investigation work and a groundwater remediation strategy. These should be carried out by a competent person in line with paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Without these conditions, we would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

- Condition

Prior to each phase of development approved by this planning permission no development shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy will include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which identifies:
 - all previous land uses
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
2. A site investigation scheme, based on the prior information collected providing information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.
3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (1) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning

authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reasons

To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from/adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to protect the underlying Secondary A aquifer, Secondary undifferentiated aquifer and surface watercourses.

- Condition

If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason

- To protect the underlying Secondary A aquifer, Secondary undifferentiated aquifer and surface watercourses.
- To ensure that the development does not contribute to, is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Condition

Prior to any part of the permitted development being brought into use, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reasons

To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to protect the Secondary A aquifer, Secondary undifferentiated aquifer and surface watercourses.

- Condition

Piling or any deep foundation solution using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason

To ensure that any proposed Piling or alternative deep foundation solution does not

harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution/turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater.

Request for consultation of discharge of conditions

We ask to be consulted on the details submitted for approval to your Authority to discharge these conditions and on any subsequent amendments/alterations.

Informatives

The redevelopment of the site may give rise to waste management and groundwater issues, and we would advise the applicant as follows:

- Re-use of material on site

The CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (version 2) provides operators with a framework for determining whether or not excavated material arising from the site during remediation and/or land development works are waste or have ceased to be waste. Under the Code of Practice:

- excavated materials that are recovered via a treatment operation can be re-used on site providing they are treated to a standard such that they fit for purpose and unlikely to cause pollution
- treated materials can be transferred between sites as part of a hub and cluster project
- some naturally occurring clean material can be transferred directly between sites

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically and that the permitting status of any proposed on-site operations is clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays.

We recommend that developers should refer to : the [position statement](#) on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice; The [waste management](#) page on GOV.UK

- Waste to be taken off-site

Contaminated soil that is (or must be) disposed of is waste. Therefore, its handling, transport, treatment and disposal are subject to waste management legislation, which includes:

- Duty of Care Regulations 1991
- Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005
- Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016
- The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically in line with British Standard BS EN 14899:2005 ' Characterisation of Waste - Sampling of Waste Materials - Framework for the Preparation and Application of a Sampling Plan' and that the permitting status

of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays. If the total quantity of hazardous waste material produced or taken off-site is 500kg or greater in any 12 month period, the developer will need to register with us as a hazardous waste producer. Refer to the [hazardous waste](#) pages on GOV.UK for more information.

- SuDS – Further information

Further information on SuDS can be found in:

- the CIRIA C697 document SuDS manual
 - HR Wallingford SR 666 Use of SuDS in high density developments
 - CIRIA C635 Designing for exceedance in urban drainage – good practice
- the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems – the Interim Code of Practice provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SuDS.

Dewatering

Any dewatering activities on-site could have an impact upon local wells, water supplies and/or nearby watercourses and environmental interests. This activity was previously exempt from requiring an abstraction licence. Since 1 January 2018, most cases of new planned dewatering operations above 20 cubic metres a day will require a water abstraction licence from us prior to the commencement of dewatering activities at the site. More information is available on gov.uk:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/water-management-apply-for-a-water-abstraction-or-impoundment-licence#apply-for-a-licence-for-a-previously-exempt-abstraction>.

Regulatory position statements

If dewatering and discharging into surface water is required during development, the following Regulatory Position Statement will apply: 'Temporary dewatering from excavations to surface water.'

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/temporary-dewatering-from-excavations-to-surface-water>

Advice to applicant

Section 4.0 of the Phase 1 Desk Based Assessment states that this report has been prepared in line with CLR 11 Model Procedures. CLR 11 Model Procedures have now been superseded by our 'Land Contamination Risk Management' guidance on gov.uk. Please ensure that any future reports are completed in line with this updated guidance.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/land-contamination-how-to-manage-the-risks>

In respect of the development, the applicant will need to assess local ground conditions on completion of site investigation works to determine whether the overlying superficial deposit comprised of glacial till material should be designated a Secondary A or B aquifer.

With regard to the mobilisation of contaminants to controlled water, all potential sources of land contamination need to be considered by the conceptual model and future works. The Groundsure report has identified several possible sources of on and off-site land contamination that have not been addressed by the conceptual

model (Section 4.0). For example, the on-site historical tanks (8 possible) and those within 500 m of the site boundary (49 possible); the on-site area of potentially infilled land and similar areas within 500 m of the site boundary (124 possible); and the 43 potentially contaminative land uses reported between 0 - 50 m of the site boundary, 18 of which are on-site. In section 5.0, the risk to groundwater has been classified as moderate, and the risk to surface waters has been classified as high. As a consequence, a complete record of historical and current land use and manufacturing activity is necessary to identify all potential sources of land contamination, and when considering sampling strategies and the suite of analysis needed to identify, and rule out all likely contaminants.

We are keen to work with all parties concerned in resolving any problems or issues that may occur so that any further possible delays are minimised or avoided. Our chargeable scheme allows detailed technical advice and guidance to be sought from a dedicated technical officer in the groundwater and contaminated land team for the duration of the project. Should you wish us to undertake a detailed review of your reports or want further advice to address the land contamination issues, we can do this as part of our charged service. As part of our service charge, we will provide a dedicated project manager to act as a single point of contact to help resolve any problems. We currently charge £100 per hour. We will provide you with an estimated cost for any further discussions or review of documents. The terms and conditions of our charged for service are available upon request.

United Utilities

With regard to the above development proposal, United Utilities Water Limited (United Utilities) wishes to provide the following comments.

- *Drainage*

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way.

We request the following drainage conditions are attached to any subsequent approval to reflect the above approach detailed above:

Condition 1 – Surface water

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. In the event of surface water draining to the combined public sewer, the pass forward flow rate to the public sewer must be restricted to 6 l/s. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved drainage scheme.

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.

Condition 2 – Foul water

Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.

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

The applicant can discuss any of the above with Developer Engineer, Neil O'Brien, by email at wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk.

Please note, United Utilities are not responsible for advising on rates of discharge to the local watercourse system. This is a matter for discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority and / or the Environment Agency (if the watercourse is classified as main river).

If the applicant intends to offer wastewater assets forward for adoption by United Utilities, the proposed detailed design will be subject to a technical appraisal by an Adoptions Engineer as we need to be sure that the proposal meets the requirements of Sewers for Adoption and United Utilities' Asset Standards. The detailed layout should be prepared with consideration of what is necessary to secure a development to an adoptable standard. This is important as drainage design can be a key determining factor of site levels and layout. The proposed design should give consideration to long term operability and give United Utilities a cost effective proposal for the life of the assets. Therefore, should this application be approved and the applicant wishes to progress a Section 104 agreement, we strongly recommend that no construction commences until the detailed drainage design, submitted as part of the Section 104 agreement, has been assessed and accepted in writing by United Utilities. Any works carried out prior to the technical assessment being approved is done entirely at the developers own risk and could be subject to change.

- *Management and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems*

Without effective management and maintenance, sustainable drainage systems can fail or become ineffective. As a provider of wastewater services, we believe we have a duty to advise the Local Planning Authority of this potential risk to ensure the longevity of the surface water drainage system and the service it provides to people. We also wish to minimise the risk of a sustainable drainage system having a detrimental impact on the public sewer network should the two systems interact. We therefore recommend the Local Planning Authority include a condition in their Decision Notice regarding a management and maintenance regime for any sustainable drainage system that is included as part of the proposed development. For schemes of 10 or more units and other major development, we recommend the Local Planning Authority consults with the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the exact wording of any condition. You may find the below a useful example:

Prior to occupation of the development a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development shall be submitted to the local planning authority and agreed in writing. The sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan shall include as a minimum:

- a. Arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, or, management and maintenance by a resident's management company; and*
- b. Arrangements for inspection and ongoing maintenance of all elements of the sustainable drainage system to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.*

The development shall subsequently be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that management arrangements are in place for the sustainable drainage system in order to manage the risk of flooding and pollution during the lifetime of the development.

Please note United Utilities cannot provide comment on the management and maintenance of an asset that is owned by a third party management and maintenance company. We would not be involved in the discharge of the management and maintenance condition in these circumstances.

- *Water Supply*

The applicant must undertake a complete soil survey, as and when land proposals have progressed to a scheme design i.e. development, and results submitted along with an application for water. This will aid in our design of future pipework and materials to eliminate the risk of contamination to the local water supply.

Although water supply in the area is compliant with current regulatory standards, we recommend the applicant provides water storage of 24 hours capacity to guarantee an adequate and constant supply.

Our water mains may need extending to serve any development on this site and the applicant may be required to pay a contribution.

Any necessary disconnection or diversion of the private main(s) must have the approval of the pipeline owner and be carried out to our standards at the applicant's expense.

The applicant may have to privately negotiate an easement for the new service supply to the property.

If planning permission is granted, the applicant should check the location and conditions of our easement with United Utilities Property Services, Grasmere House, Lingley Mere Business Park, Lingley Green Avenue, Warrington, WA5 3LP.

If the applicant intends to obtain a water supply from United Utilities for the proposed development, we strongly recommend they engage with us at the earliest opportunity. If reinforcement of the water network is required to meet the demand, this could be a significant project and the design and construction period should be accounted for.

To discuss a potential water supply or any of the water comments detailed above, the applicant can contact the team at DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk. Please note, all internal pipework must comply with current Water Supply (water fittings) Regulations 1999.

- *United Utilities' Property, Assets and Infrastructure*

A public sewer crosses this site and we may not permit building over it. We will require an access strip width of six metres, three metres either side of the centre line of the sewer.

The applicant should be aware of water mains in the vicinity of the proposed development site. Whilst this infrastructure is located outside the applicant's proposed red line boundary, the applicant must comply with our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines'. We provide this information to support the applicant in identifying the potential impacts from all construction activities on United Utilities infrastructure and to identify mitigation measures to protect and prevent any damage to this infrastructure.

Where United Utilities' assets exist, the level of cover to the water mains and public sewers must not be compromised either during or after construction.

For advice regarding protection of United Utilities assets, the applicant should contact the teams as follows:

Water assets – DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk

Wastewater assets – WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk

It is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the possibility of any United Utilities' assets potentially impacted by their proposals and to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development.

A number of providers offer a paid for mapping service including United Utilities. To find out how to purchase a sewer and water plan from United Utilities, please visit the Property Searches website; <https://www.unitedutilities.com/property-searches/>

You can also view the plans for free. To make an appointment to view our sewer records at your local authority please contact them direct, alternatively if you wish to view the water and the sewer records at our Lingley Mere offices based in Warrington please ring [0370 751 0101](tel:03707510101) to book an appointment.

Due to the public sewer transfer in 2011, not all sewers are currently shown on the statutory sewer records and we do not always show private pipes on our plans. If a sewer is discovered during construction; please contact a Building Control Body to discuss the matter further.

Should this planning application be approved the applicant should contact United Utilities regarding a potential water supply or connection to public sewers. Additional information is available on our website <http://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers.aspx>

Public Rights of Way Officer

Whilst the proposed development does not appear to impact on the Public Footpath (15 Bredbury and Romiley) please note the comments below. The development also abuts land under the control of Greenspace so you may wish to consult them also.

No change to the surface of the right of way should be made without consultation with the council. The developer should be made aware of their obligations not to interfere with the public right of way either whilst development is in progress or once it has been completed. The developer must ensure :-

- There is no diminution in the width of the public right of way available for use by members of the public.
- No building materials to be stored on the right of way.

- No damage or substantial alteration, either temporary or permanent, is cause to the right of way.
- Vehicle movements are arranged so as not to interfere with the public use of the way.
- No additional barriers (i.e. gates) are placed across the right of way, either temporary or permanent nature.
- The safety of member of the public at all times.

The public right of way must be kept open and available for public use at all times. If a temporary closure is required the appropriate order must be applied for and agreed before work commences.

Coal Authority

The application site does not fall with the defined Development High Risk Area and is located instead within the defined Development Low Risk Area. This means that there is no requirement under the risk-based approach that has been agreed with the LPA for a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be submitted or for The Coal Authority to be consulted.

In accordance with the agreed approach to assessing coal mining risks as part of the development management process, if this proposal is granted planning permission, it will be necessary to include The Coal Authority's Standing Advice within the Decision Notice as an informative note to the applicant in the interests of public health and safety.

Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security)

We would recommend that a condition to reflect the physical security specifications set out in the Crime Impact Statement should be added, if the application is to be approved.

Director of Public Health

Active Travel : The promotion of active travel and public transport is key to maintaining physical and mental health through fostering activity, social interaction and engagement. The development addresses the need to maintain access to walking and cycling routes to bus and rail services for access to employment, schools, leisure and other service needs some of which lie in local centres such as Romiley and Marple. Rail Stations are under 10 minutes away by bike and therefore cycle access is critical to support in terms of being both a healthy and affordable travel option for residents. Cycle parking, particularly for the apartments, will be critical to enabling sustainable transport choices that enable activity as part of daily commutes and other reasons for travelling. The promotion of active travel and public transport is key to maintaining physical and mental health through fostering activity, managing healthy weight, reducing emissions from vehicles and enabling social interaction. On this affordable housing development it is also critical to tackling health inequalities through enabling affordable access to employment, learning and services.

Ageing Well : Stockport Council has adopted an Ageing Well Strategy which takes account of the World Health Organisation guidance on appropriate place making for older people. The design considerations are critical to ensuring that the needs of the growing ageing population of Stockport are addressed where practicable through

new development,:

www.who.int/ageing/publications/Global_age_friendly_cities_Guide_English.pdf

Green Infrastructure (GI) : GI offers opportunities for new and existing residents to increase their physical activity. Child obesity levels in the Borough remain higher than the previous decade. Achieving healthy weight reduces risks of other lifestyle diseases such as hypertension, coronary heart disease and stroke. Reducing risks of such diseases also reduces pressures on current and future public sector health budgets (Stockport's JSNA). GI also offers multifaceted health benefits whether it be shading in hot or wet weather, active travel routes, tackling social isolation through outdoor amenity spaces, providing recreational and interactive spaces and possible community food growing areas to encourage activity and healthy eating (ranging from planters to raised beds). Consideration of trees and biodiversity are key to enabling public health benefits from green infrastructure enhancement not just around addressing flood risk but also in terms of tackling stress and its exacerbating effect on health, through provision of pleasant relaxing environments and views. In terms of public health benefit the proposed enhancement of Green Infrastructure on this site is welcome, including opportunities contributing to tackling urban heat island impacts, managing air quality and enabling links between existing natural capital assets such as the adjacent countryside, especially alongside the River Etherow. The summertime comfort and well-being of the urban population has become increasingly compromised. The urban environment stores and traps heat even in more rural locations such as this. The majority of heat-related fatalities during the summer of 2003 were in urban areas and were predominantly older more vulnerable members of society (Designing urban spaces and buildings to improve sustainability and quality of life in a warmer world).

Affordable Housing : This proposed affordable housing development at Compstall is welcomed in public health terms. It is important to note that a lack of affordable housing can be argued to contribute to widening health inequalities, with additional pressure on the Council's public health and related budgets. Evidence is available to show that affordable housing benefits health in a variety of ways including reducing the stress of unaffordable homes, enabling better food budgets for more nutritious food, access to better quality homes that do not impact negatively on health (including management of chronic illnesses), support for domestic violence survivors to establish a safe home and mental health benefits of a less stressful expensive home (The Impacts of Affordable Housing on Health).

Electricity North West

We have considered the above planning application and find it could have an impact on our infrastructure.

The development is shown to be adjacent to or affect Electricity North West's operational land or electricity distribution assets. Where the development is adjacent to operational land the applicant must ensure that the development does not encroach over either the land or any ancillary rights of access or cable easements. If planning permission is granted the applicant should verify such details by contacting Electricity North West, Land Rights & Consents, Frederick Road, Salford, Manchester M6 6QH.

The applicant should be advised that great care should be taken at all times to protect both the electrical apparatus and any personnel working in its vicinity.

The applicant should also be referred to two relevant documents produced by the Health and Safety Executive, which are available from The Stationery Office Publications Centre and The Stationery Office Bookshops, and advised to follow the guidance given.

The documents are as follows:-

HS(G)47 – Avoiding danger from underground services.
GS6 – Avoidance of danger from overhead electric lines.

The applicant should also be advised that, should there be a requirement to divert the apparatus because of the proposed works; the cost of such a diversion would usually be borne by the applicant. The applicant should be aware of our requirements for access to inspect, maintain, adjust, repair, or alter any of our distribution equipment. This includes carrying out works incidental to any of these purposes and this could require works at any time of day or night. Our Electricity Services Desk (Tel No. 0800 195 4141) will advise on any issues regarding diversions or modifications.

Electricity North West offers a fully supported mapping service, at a modest cost, for our electricity assets. This is a service which is constantly updated by our Data Management Team who can be contacted by telephone on 0800 195 4141 or access the website <http://www.enwl.co.uk/our-services/know-before-you-dig>

It is recommended that the applicant gives early consideration in project design as it is better value than traditional methods of data gathering. It is, however, the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship on site between any assets that may cross the site and any proposed development.

ANALYSIS

Compliance with Planning Brief

The application site is the subject of a Planning Brief titled 'Compstall Mills Planning Brief', adopted in May 2008, which defines a package of proposals for the overall Compstall Mills Estate and sets the parameters for the scale, form and content of development within the site. Although the Planning Brief is somewhat dated, being over 12 years old, and much of its content is in relation to the Compstall Mills site on the opposite side of Andrew Street to the East, it is a material consideration in assessment of the planning application.

It is important to highlight that the current planning application before Members only covers the Western portion of the MEDS, with the remainder of the Eastern portion of the MEDS being on the opposite side of Andrew Street, forming the 'Compstall Mills' site. Planning permission for the redevelopment of the 'Compstall Mills' site on the Eastern side of Andrew Street, comprising the partial demolition, refurbishment and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development of 121 residential units, commercial units, a replacement boat house and a hydro-electric power generator, together with associated vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and landscaping works, was granted in April 2013 (DC042235). It is however acknowledged that this planning permission has now expired.

The Planning Brief seeks to ensure that proposals for redevelopment will assist in securing environmental improvements and maintaining the sites significant

employment value. It is recommended that development should achieve a number of objectives, each of which will be assessed in turn :-

No net harm, and if possible a net improvement, to the openness of the Green Belt throughout the MEDS.

The impact of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt and the applicants case for 'Very Special Circumstances' are assessed within the 'Policy Principle – Green Belt' section of the report, below.

No net harm, and if possible enhancement of, the character of the Compstall Conservation Area, the landscape character of the Etherow Parklands Landscape Character Area, the setting of the River Etherow, the amenity of the Etherow Country Park or the quality of the Etherow Park and Roach Wood and Ernocroft Wood Sites of Biological Importance.

The impact of the proposed development on the character of the Compstall Conservation Area and the Etherow Parklands Landscape Character Area are assessed within the 'Design, Siting and Impact on Heritage Assets' section of the report, below. It is however noted that the scheme would retain the most significant heritage assets on the site and proposes their re-use in a sympathetic manner. The scale, massing and design of the proposed development is considered to be an appropriate response to the setting of the site and, as such, it is considered that the proposal would safeguard the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and Landscape Character Area within which the site is located.

To provide a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a variety of households.

It is noted that the scheme would deliver an appropriate mix of one bedroomed and two bedroomed apartments and three bedroomed and four bedroomed houses, to support a variety of households.

Achievement of 35% affordable housing across the MEDS as a whole.

The development would be delivered by Stockport Homes as a 100% affordable housing scheme on a shared ownership and social rented tenure, over and above the 35% affordable housing requirement.

Maintain the MEDS role in providing employment opportunities, particularly for small-scale, start-up and grow-on businesses.

Whilst it is acknowledged that no employment uses are proposed on this portion of the site, it is noted that a range of employment uses were secured as part of the, albeit expired, planning permission (DC042235) for the significantly larger 'Compstall Mills' site on the Eastern portion of the MEDS.

Achievement of an exemplar sustainable development in which attainment of a high level under the Code for Sustainable Homes residential development and a high standard under BREAM scheme for non-residential development is considered the norm.

As acknowledged by the Council Planning Policy Officer in the 'Energy Efficiency' section of the report, below, the requirement for appropriate carbon reduction,

energy efficiency and sustainability measures within the development would be secured by way of a suitably worded planning condition.

The provision, if viable, of a shop to meet the local and/or convenience needs of a potentially growing residential population.

Whilst it is acknowledged that no shop uses are proposed on this portion of the site, it is noted that the provision of a small convenience shop was secured as part of the, albeit expired, planning permission (DC042235) for the significantly larger 'Compstall Mills' site on the Eastern portion of the MEDS.

Improvement to the access to the Western part of the MEDS from Andrew Street, including improving access to the Andrew Street car park.

The scheme proposes improvements to the access onto Andrew Street and to the existing car park, by the widening of the car park, reconfiguration of the car park and retaining the level of provision

Improvement to the public realm along Andrew Street, especially around the Compstall Athenaeum (including maintenance of the Andrew Street car parks 'Park Mark' standard).

The scheme would secure improvements to the public realm along Andrew Street and to the setting of the Compstall Athenaeum, by way of enhanced landscaping and planting and the refurbishment of existing heritage assets. The proposal would also comprise improvements to the Andrew Street car park

Creation of a new/improved pedestrian and cycle route linking through the MEDS to Brabyns Park and Etherow Country Park, possibly including the construction of a new bridge across the river adjacent to the existing (listed) Compstall Bridge.

In view of the size of the site and the scale of the proposed development, the cost of providing a new bridge across the river would be unviable and unduly onerous on the applicant. However, it is noted that the scheme would provide improved pedestrian and cycling facilities, in the form of improvements to the Riverside Walk to the South of the site and the provision of a cycle link from the site access road to the Riverside Walk.

Policy Principle – Green Belt

The application site is allocated within a Major Existing Developed Site (MEDS) within the Green Belt. Saved UDP policy GBA1.7 states that complete or partial redevelopment of sites within MEDS will be permitted provided that it would :-

- (i) Result in environmental improvements;*
- (ii) Have no greater impact on the existing development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it, and where possible have less;*
- (iii) Contribute to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belt;*
and
- (iv) Not result in the loss of Listed Buildings or other buildings or features of visual, amenity, ecological, environmental or archaeological importance.*

Any proposals involving redevelopment should not occupy a larger area of the site, nor exceed the heights of existing buildings. However, good design and layout

principles should be employed to remove any harmful impacts on openness or visual amenity. This may result in small increases in site coverage to compensate for reductions in the height of development depending on individual site circumstances.

The NPPF addresses the national approach to Green Belt policy under the heading entitled 'Protecting Green Belt Land' and takes as its fundamental starting point the importance of maintaining 'openness' on a 'permanent basis'. Paragraph 133 of the NPPF confirms that 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development, is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states that when considering any planning application, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very Special Circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, except in a number of limited circumstances. Such forms of development include, within Paragraph 145 (g) :-

Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would :-

- *Not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- *Not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the Local Planning Authority.*

In assessment of the proposal, given the fact that the proposed development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, by virtue of it exceeding the height of existing buildings on the site, it would not comply with all of the requirements of saved UDP policy GBA1.7 (ii) and the proposal would effectively comprise inappropriate development within the Green Belt. In such circumstances, the applicant would need to make a case that 'Very Special Circumstances' exist to demonstrate that the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, in order to justify the granting of the application as a departure from the Development Plan.

In view of the above requirements, the Planning Statement submitted in support of the application asserts the following case for 'Very Special Circumstances' :-

- The proposal will result in positive environmental and visual improvements to the appearance of the site. The site has been vacant for many years and has significantly degraded over this period to the detriment of the street scene. The proposal will reinvigorate the site with a sympathetically designed development having regard to its location, heritage and ecological considerations. The proposal offers the opportunity to regenerate the vacant

site and to provide a future viable use, securing remaining heritage assets. The development will secure a conservation led regeneration of this part of the Compstall Conservation Area and would address previous phases of unsympathetic reconstruction;

- In considering the previous planning application (DC055286) in 2014, it was determined that the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be greater. However and notably, amendments to Paragraph 145 (g) of the NPPF in 2019 since consideration of the previous application (DC055286), change the test in respect of schemes for the redevelopment of previously developed land where they provide affordable housing. This deems the redevelopment of sites to be an exception to Green Belt policy and acceptable where it would 'not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt', whereas the previous test was where it would 'not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt';
- Whilst it is acknowledged that some of the proposed buildings would have an increased height compared to existing buildings (existing – up to 9.59 metres; proposed - up to 11.2 metres), the floorspace and footprint of buildings across the site would be reduced by 50% (existing floorspace – 3164 square metres; proposed floorspace – 2823 square metres; existing footprint GEA – 2764 square metres; proposed footprint GEA - 1382 square metres). As such, this is not considered to result in a 'substantial' impact on the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the tests contained within Paragraph 145 (g) of the revised NPPF;
- The overall reduction in the building floorspace and footprint will create open areas within the site. Views into the site from the South will be enhanced from the riverside walkway with a new pedestrian link provided from the development. The extensive areas of trees to the West will be retained. Views into the site from the North West would be framed by trees. Whilst the proposed new buildings to the East of the site would be higher than those existing, they would be of a much reduced footprint than the existing building;
- The proposed development would meet an identified affordable housing need for the local community, an exception under Paragraph 145 (g) of the NPPF. The scheme would provide a development of 100% affordable housing, where there is an identified need within the Borough. This affordable housing offer goes above and beyond the requirements of the Development Plan and the Development Brief for the site;
- The site has a longstanding identification within the Development Plan as a MEDS in the Green Belt and there is a Development Brief in place to secure its redevelopment;
- There is a strong support for the redevelopment of previously developed land in all tiers of planning policy at both the local and national level;
- The proposal will not result in the loss of a Listed Building. The scheme incorporates the retention of existing buildings which are of heritage interest and has due regard to ecological considerations;
- Collectively, the beneficial heritage impacts and regeneration of a currently vacant and previously developed site, outweigh any harm to the openness of

the Green Belt and therefore 'Very Special Circumstances' have been demonstrated.

In addition, Members are advised that the principle of the quantum of residential development as proposed has previously been considered acceptable as part of planning application DC055286 in 2014. As previously explained, Members of the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee resolved to grant planning permission for this development, however the application was subsequently withdrawn due to the fact that the required Section 106 Agreement was not completed. In addition to the fact that the current scheme would now secure a 100% affordable housing development and in view of the 'substantial harm' test as defined by Paragraph 145 (g) of the revised NPPF, introduced since the consideration of the previous planning application (DC055286) in 2014, these factors add weight to the justification for approval of the development within the Green Belt MEDS.

In summary, it is considered that the applicant has provided a sound case for 'Very Special Circumstances' in relation to the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt. On this basis, it is considered that 'Very Special Circumstances' have been clearly demonstrated to justify any potential harm to the Green Belt arising from the proposed development. Nevertheless, given the conflict with saved UDP policy GBA1.7 (ii), the proposal remains a Departure from the Development Plan. Accordingly, should Members of Marple Area Committee be minded to grant planning permission, the application will be required to be referred to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee for determination as a Departure from the Development Plan.

Policy Principle – Residential

At the outset, Members are advised that the principle of residential development at the site has previously been considered acceptable as part of planning application DC055286 in 2014. As previously explained, Members of the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee resolved to grant planning permission for this development, however the application was subsequently withdrawn due to the fact that the required Section 106 Agreement was not completed.

Core Strategy DPD policy CS4 directs new housing towards three spatial priority areas (The Town Centre, District and Large Local Centres and, finally, other accessible locations), with Green Belt sites being last sequentially in terms of acceptable Urban Greenfield and Green Belt sites. Core Strategy DPD policy H-2 states that the delivery and supply of new housing will be monitored and managed to ensure that provision is in line with the local trajectory, the local previously developed land target is being applied and a continuous 5 year deliverable supply of housing is maintained and notes that the local previously developed land target is 90%.

The NPPF puts additional emphasis upon the government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing, rather than simply having land allocated for housing development. Stockport is currently in a position of housing under-supply, with 2.8 years of supply against the minimum requirement of 5 years + 20%, as set out in paragraphs 47 of the NPPF. In situations of housing under-supply, Core Strategy DPD policy CS4 allows Core Strategy DPD policy H-2 to come into effect, bringing housing developments on sites which meet the Councils reduced accessibility criteria. Having regard to the continued position of housing under-supply within the Borough, the current minimum accessibility score is set at 'zero'.

In view of the above factors, the principle of residential development at the site, in an accessible and sustainable location and comprising previously developed 'brownfield' land is considered acceptable at the current time of housing under-supply within the Borough. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with Core Strategy DPD policies CS2, CS4 and H-2.

Policy Principle – Loss of Employment Land

The application site comprises an existing lawful, albeit vacant, employment use. Core Strategy DPD policies CS7 and AED-6 effectively seek to retain such employment uses outside designated employment areas unless the loss of the employment use can be clearly justified.

In assessment of the proposal, it is clear that the site has been vacant for a period of time and therefore is no longer considered to be viable for employment use. Furthermore, the principle of the loss of the lawful employment use has previously been considered acceptable as part of planning application DC055286 in 2014. As previously explained, Members of the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee resolved to grant planning permission for this development, however the application was subsequently withdrawn due to the fact that the required Section 106 Agreement was not completed.

In view of the above, the loss of the existing lawful employment use at the site is considered to be justified in this particular case, in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy DPD policies CS7 and AED-6.

Affordable Housing

With regard to the issue of affordable housing provision, Core Strategy DPD policy H-3 and the Affordable Housing SPD state that, subject to viability, there is a requirement for 30% affordable housing provision within the area to which the application site relates, with a tenure split of 50% intermediate housing for Stockport residents on average and below average incomes and 50% social rented housing.

Information submitted in support of the application confirms that the development would be delivered by Stockport Homes on the basis of a 100% affordable housing scheme, with 29 of the proposed units to be offered for shared ownership and 3 of the proposed units to be offered for social rent. It is acknowledged that the proposed tenure split does not strictly reflect the 50% split recommended in the area by Core Strategy DPD policy H-3. Nevertheless, the Council's 2019 Housing Needs Survey identifies a greater need for shared ownership properties in the area to which the site is located. On this basis, the proposed tenure split of 29 shared ownership properties (90%) and social rented units (10%) is considered acceptable in this particular case.

The application is accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement submitted by Stockport Homes, which outlines that the proposed development of 32 units would be subsidised with grant from Homes England with all of the units developed on the site being affordable, as per the definition provided by Homes England. Affordable housing includes social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing (shared ownership) provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market.

As outlined above, the policy compliant position for the site would be for a 30% affordable housing provision, which equates to a maximum of 10 affordable units for the development. As such, if the scheme were to be delivered by way of a standard

Section 106 agreement, a maximum of 10 of the 32 units proposed would need to be affordable, with the developer subsidy being £349,730.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the Stockport Homes model moves away from the standard Section 106 route, consideration should be taken of the fact that the scheme would provide a greater number of affordable units (32) and a much higher level of subsidy by introducing Homes England grant. On the basis of the scheme for 29 sales units and 3 social rented units, the overall developer subsidy would be £980,232.

In view of the above, by moving away from the standard Section 106 Agreement policy route and instead leveraging in Homes England grant, the scheme is considered to provide the following benefits :-

- 22 more affordable homes than would usually be required by policy.
- £606,935 more subsidy into the Borough.
- Provision of larger family housing at social rent levels.
- More people housed in rental units.
- Long term interest in the management of the scheme by Stockport Homes.

The 3 units for social rent would be let to applicants registered on the Homechoice housing register. The applicants with the greatest need will be allocated a property. Future lettings will also be to those on the Homechoice housing register. The 29 units for sale/shared ownership will initially be sold on a leasehold basis to those eligible for shared ownership, with purchasers having the ability to 'staircase' and buy additional equity in the property. The freehold will be retained by Stockport Homes, with the day-to-day management of the leases being managed by Stockport Homes. Prospective purchasers will need to meet the national eligibility criteria as set out by Homes England to qualify to purchase a property and checks will be undertaken to ensure the identity of the applicants and to ensure that the applicants can afford and are eligible for a property.

An affordability assessment contained within the Affordable Housing Statement, based on a 50% purchase, concludes the following :-

- All of the proposed properties would be considerably more affordable than the full market monthly costs.
- 15 of the proposed properties would be more affordable than the usual policy requirement.
- 15 of the proposed properties would be more affordable to those on low quartile household incomes.
- 24 of the proposed properties would be affordable to a couple working full time on below median income levels.

In summary, the proposed affordable housing offer, comprising 100% provision, 70% above the usual affordable housing policy requirement with a significant increased subsidy, would clearly be of great benefit to the Borough and should be afforded appropriate weight in determination of the application, in the context of the current position of significant undersupply of new housing in the Borough, particularly in relation to affordable housing. The 100% affordable housing provision, including tenure, prices/rents, affordability and occupancy criteria would be secured by way of a suitably worded planning condition.

Open Space/Developer Contributions

In terms of open space provision, saved UDP policy L1.2, Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-2 and the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD identify the importance of open space and children's play facilities to meet the needs of the community and a requirement to include provision for recreation and amenity open space either on-site or off-site, dependent on the population of the proposed development. On the basis of the submitted scheme, the population of the proposed development would be 111. Based on off-site provision, this would generate a commuted sum payment requirement of £166,056.00p for the proposed development.

Notwithstanding the above policy requirement, the application is supported by an Economic Viability Assessment, which seeks to demonstrate that the development would not be viable if the policy requirement for open space provision was met. In summary, the Economic Viability Assessment asserts :-

- *In line with the adopted NPPF and NPPG on viability and RICS Guidance Note, developments must deliver a return which does not undermine the deliverability of a scheme. For schemes of this nature and structure, a developer will require a typical profit on cost of between 8-10%.*
- *This scheme, based on assumed costs, will deliver a negative development profit margin. This justifies a zero Section 106 Agreement – both financial contributions and an on-site affordable provision.*
- *Ordinarily, the negative development profit margin would question the deliverability of the scheme. However, the scheme would be developed and retained by Stockport Homes over a long-term period. This enables them to take a long-term view on their profit returns, which will derive from their income.*

In consideration of the submitted Economic Viability Assessment, the Council has appointed a specialist Consultant to undertake an independent assessment of the information. This assessment concludes :-

- *The assertions made are a true reflection of the situation in terms of the issue of development viability. The scheme, based on 100% affordable housing, does not support a further request for open space contributions and such requirements should therefore be waived. The appraisal indicates a loss-making scenario before further possible contributions. However, Stockport Homes are prepared to take a long-term view on the site that would undoubtedly benefit from inward investment and, in this scenario, would ultimately benefit the community by the provision of affordable and social housing, producing regeneration locally. Based on the submitted figures, it is concluded that the Councils open space contribution requirements should be waived.*

In view of the above, on the basis of the submitted Economic Viability Appraisal and given the significant viability gap highlighted above, it is concluded that the applicant has clearly demonstrated that in this particular case it would not be viable for the scheme to provide the usually required open space contributions. As such, it is considered that open space contributions should be waived in this particular case. Whilst this policy shortfall and conflict does weigh against the proposal in the overall planning balance, consideration should be taken of the affordable housing offer over and above the usual policy requirement and the delivery of the wider regeneration benefits of the proposed development. A clause is recommended to be imposed

within a Section 106 Agreement, to require a review mechanism for potential clawback in relation to open space contributions.

Design, Siting and Impact on Heritage Assets

The application site is located within the Compstall Conservation Area and Etherow Parklands Landscape Character Area. The detailed comments received to the application from the Council Conservation Officer are contained within the Consultee Responses section above.

Members are advised that the principle of residential development at the site has previously been considered acceptable as part of planning application DC055286 in 2014. As previously explained, Members of the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee resolved to grant planning permission for this development, however the application was subsequently withdrawn due to the fact that the required Section 106 Agreement was not completed. The current proposal is almost identical to the previous scheme supported by Members in 2014, in terms of the quantum of development, siting and design.

As with the previous application (DC055286), the current proposal would retain the most significant heritage assets on the site and proposes their re-use in a sympathetic manner and, in its amended form, is considered acceptable by the Council Conservation Officer. The scale, massing and design of the proposed development is considered to be an appropriate response to the setting of the site and, as such, it is considered that the proposal would safeguard the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and Landscape Character Area within which the site is located.

Appropriate matters of detail, in relation to materials of external construction, external door and window frames, methodology for dismantling/re-erecting the historic gable within Character Area A, rainwater goods, boundary treatment and hard and soft landscaping would be secured by way of the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions.

The application is accompanied by an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, describing the historical development of the site and significance of various components of the site and the detailed comments received to the application form Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS) are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. In raising no objections to the proposal, a condition is recommended by GMAAS to require the submission, approval and implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation. In the absence of objections from GMAAS and subject to compliance with such a condition, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the archaeological interest of the site.

In terms of general design matters, the proposed density of development of 42 dwellings per hectare is considered acceptable, as is the proposed mix of housing comprising one bedroomed flats, two bedroomed flats, three bedroomed houses and four bedroomed houses, in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy DPD policy CS3. Appropriate levels of private amenity space would be provided to serve the proposed development, comprising private gardens to serve the proposed houses within Character Areas A, C, D and E and communal space to serve the

proposed apartments within Character Areas A and D, in accordance with the requirements of the Design of Residential Development SPD.

In view of the above, in the absence of objections from relevant consultees and subject to conditional control, it is considered that the quantum, scale, siting and design of the proposed development could be successfully accommodated on the site without causing undue harm to the character and appearance of the Compstall Conservation Area and Etherow Parklands Landscape Character Area within which the site is located, or the archaeological interest of the site. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with saved UDP policies LCR1.1, LCR1.1A, HC1.1, HC1.3 and HC1.4 and Core Strategy DPD policies H-1, CS8, SIE-1 and SIE-3.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Due to the location of the site and separation to the nearest residential properties to the North and South, it is considered that the proposed residential development would not cause harm to the residential amenity of surrounding properties, by reason of overshadowing, over-dominance, visual intrusion, loss of outlook, overlooking or loss of privacy, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies H-1 and SIE-1 and the Design of Residential Development SPD.

Within the proposed development itself, recommended separation/privacy distances, as defined by the Design of Residential Development SPD would be complied with. Appropriately sized and sited private gardens would be provided to serve the proposed dwellings and communal amenity space would be provided to serve the proposed apartments. On this basis, it is considered that the siting and layout of the proposed development would be such that future occupants of the proposed development would be provided within satisfactory levels of amenity, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies H-1 and SIE-1 and the Design of Residential Development SPD.

Due to the existence of a car repair workshop/car breakers yard to the West of the site and Andrew Street to the East of the site, a Noise Assessment has been submitted in support of the application which has been assessed by the Council Environment Team. In raising no objections to the proposal, the Environment Team notes that there is a requirement for increased window specification and ventilation to the properties fronting Andrew Street, due to noise levels produced from the road, however no increased window specification or ventilation will be required to the properties to the rear of the site. As such, subject to the imposition of a condition to ensure that the development is constructed in accordance with the required mitigation measures, as specified within the submitted Noise Assessment, it is considered that future occupants of the proposed development would not experience unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance from the operation of nearby existing commercial/industrial use, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3.

Highway Considerations

The detailed comments received to the application from the Council Highway Engineer are contained within the Consultation Responses section above.

The Highway Engineer notes the planning history of the site and the previous application (DC055286) for the redevelopment of the site to provide 18 no. dwellinghouses and 14 no. apartments, which was resolved to be granted by the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee in 2014, pending the completion of a

Section 106 Agreement to secure open space provision and traffic regulation orders, which was not completed and was subsequently withdrawn. The current proposal is no different to this previous scheme from a highways perspective.

As with the previous scheme, the proposed development would be accessed via a new access road which would take access from Andrew Street in approximately the same location as an existing access. Car parking would be provided for the proposed houses and apartments in a number of parking areas. A Transport Statement and, at the request of the Highway Engineer, a Road Safety Audit and associated Designers Response have been submitted in support of the application.

- *Accessibility and Sustainability*

With respect to accessibility and sustainability, the submitted Transport Statement outlines that the site is within reasonable walking distance of Compstall Post Office, a number of Public Houses and Ludworth Primary School and is within reasonable cycling distance of locations including Romiley, Woodley and Bredbury. The Transport Statement also outlines that there are various cycle routes in the local area and the site is located close to bus stops served by a fairly frequent bus service. The Transport Statement does not, however, outline whether the sites location and local transport infrastructure and services would ensure that the site is adequately accessible by sustainable modes of transport or whether occupiers of the development and their visitors would reasonably be able to travel by sustainable modes of transport.

Consideration of the sites accessibility using the Councils accessibility model, which considers a site accessibility in relation to employment, retail, schools, health centres, hospitals and evening economy uses, concludes that the site scores 37, which indicates a fairly low level of accessibility. Marple Station is beyond the distance which most people would walk; the Schools are beyond the distance younger children are likely to walk; the nearest High School is a fair distance away; the local bus services only provide public transport links to some nearby towns/villages; and a number of walking and cycling routes in the area are sub-standard.

As outlined as part of the previous application (DC055286), it is considered that routes and infrastructure in the area are such that occupiers of the development could be prevented or discouraged from travelling by sustainable modes of transport, unless improvements are carried out to address the deficiencies and improve the sites accessibility. The usual policy requirement in such circumstances would be for the applicant to fund/carry out off-site transport improvements so as to improve the sites accessibility.

Notwithstanding the above, the Highway Engineer notes that an Economic Viability Assessment has been subsequently submitted in support of the application and independently verified which has confirmed that the development would not be economically viable if the financial contribution to fund accessibility improvements was required. In view of the conclusions of the Financial Viability Assessment, it is clearly not possible for the applicant to make such a contribution to fund off-site transport improvements, which is consistent with the previous application (DC055286), which Members resolved to grant. It is also noted that the current proposal would comprise a 100% affordable housing scheme, which would further impact on the viability of the development. As such, the provision of a financial contribution to secure accessibility improvements will not be sought as part of the development, with accessibility measures limited to the provision of cycle parking,

improvements to the Riverside Walk to the South of the development, the provision of a cycle link from the site access road to the Riverside Walk, the provision of signage on routes to and from the site and implementation of Travel Plan Measures, as recommended by the Highway Engineer and which would be secured by condition.

- *Access*

In terms of access and impact on the local highway network, the proposed development would be accessed via an access road with a 6.0 metre carriageway and 2.0 metre footways on both sides, which will take access from Andrew Street in approximately the same location as an existing access. The access road will also serve a number of existing users, including a vehicle repair garage to the West and a children's nursery and car park to the North. To enable its construction, part of the existing car park will be required, however this would be reconfigured and improved, including the provision of an improved access, with a similar number of parking spaces (34) provided.

The Highway Engineer considers that the proposal should not have a material impact upon the local highway network. The proposed new junction should operate satisfactorily in capacity terms, with minimal queueing and the Highway Engineer notes that information submitted in support of the previous application (DC055286) outlined that an adequate levels of visibility would be able to be provided at the site access, subject to the removal of a slightly longer section of the existing wall, which could be dealt with by condition at the detailed design stage.

At the request of the Highway Engineer, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designers Response has been submitted in support of the application. This confirms that the scheme has been amended to ensure that the required visibility splays will be able to be provided and that the applicant has agreed that dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be installed at the junction, thus addressing the issues raised by the Highway Engineer to the original submission.

- *Site Layout*

The Highway Engineer considers that the proposed site layout is generally acceptable. Details matters, in relation to access to the underground car park and Units 30-32, access to the access drive serving Units 25-29, the provision of a direct pedestrian link from the access road to the public car park and the widening of the footway to the North of the access stage would be dealt with at the detailed design stage and secured by way of the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition.

- *Parking*

54 parking spaces are proposed to be provided to serve the proposed development, comprising a 30 space underground car park with 4 disabled spaces under Units 1-10 to serve 18 Units (1-22); 16 surface level spaces including 1 disabled space by Units 23-29 to serve those units and 2 visitors; 8 surface level spaces including 1 disabled space by Units 30-32 to serve those units and a visitor.

The above equates to a level of parking of 169%, which accords with adopted standards and the applicant indicates that 2 spaces will be allocated to each house and 1 space to each apartment, with 3 spaces for visitors. In addition, whilst the existing public car park is proposed to be amended, a similar number of spaces would be retained. Parking for motorcycles and cycles is proposed for occupiers of

the apartments within the underground car park.

Although the Highway Engineer notes that the proposed level of parking accords with adopted parking standards, it is likely that drivers may try and parking on the proposed access road, which could have safety implications and affect access to the users to the West of the site. As such, a condition is recommended to require the applicant to arrange the provision of parking restrictions on the site access road. The provision of such restrictions would require a Traffic Regulation Order at the applicants expense, which the applicant has agreed to.

Whilst the submitted plan show parking being provided for disabled badge holders, some spaces are sub-standard in design and may need to be relocated. Nevertheless, this issue could be addressed at the detailed design stage and secured by conditional control. The provision of charging points for electric vehicles and the provision of cycle parking facilities would also be secured by condition.

- *Summary*

In conclusion, no objections are raised to the proposal from the Highway Engineer from a highway perspective, noting that it is effectively a re-submission of a scheme which was considered in 2014 (DC055286). Vehicle movements generated by the development should not have a material impact on the local highway network and an adequate level of parking would be provided. The submitted Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has not raised any safety issues with the scheme and the submitted Financial Viability Assessment demonstrates, as was the case with the previous scheme (DC055286), that the development cannot sustain the payment of monies to fund off-site transport improvements. Subject to the imposition of conditions as recommended by the Highway Engineer and the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to fund the provision of parking restrictions, the proposal is considered acceptable from a traffic generation, access, parking and highway safety perspective. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with Core Strategy DPD policies SD-6, SIE-1, CS9, T-1, T-2 and T-3, the Sustainable Transport SPD and the Transport and Highways in Residential Areas SPD.

Impact on Trees

Existing trees on the site are afforded protection by way of a Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Status and, as such, a Tree Survey has been submitted in support of the application. The detailed comments received to the application from the Council Arboricultural Officer are contained within the Consultee Responses section above.

In raising no objections to the proposal, the Arboricultural Officer notes that the existing trees proposed for removal are categorised as low amenity trees and therefore are not worthy of protection. Nevertheless, the trees do offer a screening and biodiversity benefit, therefore a condition is recommended to require the submission, approval and implementation of a landscaping/tree planting scheme to offset the proposed tree loss. Further conditions are recommended to ensure that no existing tree to be retained is worked to and to require the provision of protective fencing to existing trees to be retained during construction.

In view of the above, in the absence of objections from the Arboricultural Officer and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to its impact on trees, in accordance with saved UDP policy HC1.1 and Core Strategy DPD policies SIE-1 and SIE-3.

Impact on Protected Species and Ecology

The detailed comments received to the application from the Council Nature Development Officer are contained within the Consultee Responses section above.

It is noted that the site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise. Etherow Country Park, a designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and a Site of Biological Importance (SBI) is located approximately 70.0 metres to the East of the site. Whilst it is not envisaged that the proposed development would have a direct impact on these designated sites, the increased housing in the area is likely to increase footfall and other associated impacts within Etherow Country Park.

A suite of ecological surveys have been submitted in support of the application, to assess the site for bats and breeding birds, along with other protected species such as badger, otter and water vole. The Nature Development Officer has confirmed that sufficient ecological information has been submitted in order to inform determination of the application.

In terms of impact on bats, a protected species, buildings and trees have the potential to support roosting bats, the application site is located near to suitable bat foraging habitat and there are records of activity for several bat species in the local area, which increases the likelihood of bats being impacted by any proposed works. The submitted surveys include an inspection for bats within the existing buildings on the site, within the culvert present on the site and within the trees on site. In summary, no evidence of roosting bats was confirmed on site and the protected species survey report concludes that it is considered unlikely that the common pipistrelle observed flying above the roof of Building 2 emerged from the building. Nonetheless, given the limited visibility of the buildings during surveys, the Nature Development Officer recommends that a precautionary approach is adopted during works and that the Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) detailed within the submitted Protected Species Report are implemented in full and secured by condition. A condition is also recommended to ensure the submission, approval and provision of suitable compensation measures to mitigate for the potential loss of bat roost sites, as outlined within with submitted Protected Species Report. The applicant will also be advised of legislation in place to protect biodiversity and procedures should protected species be discovered during works by way of informative.

Habitats on site offer suitable nesting sites for breeding birds, a protected species. As such, a condition is recommended to ensure that no vegetation clearance or demolition works are undertaken during the bird breeding season, unless an Ecologist has confirmed that no birds will be harmed and/or there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting birds.

In terms of impacts on other protected species, no signs of badgers, nor evidence of riparian mammals such as otter and water vole were recorded during the surveys.

Invasive species, in the form of Himalayan Balsam is located within the site and Japanese Knotweed has been detected as present within an island on the River Etherow, outside the development site. A condition requiring the submission and approval of a Method Statement, detailing the control, treatment and eradication of invasive species is recommended by the Nature Development Officer.

Further conditions are recommended by the Nature Development Officer to ensure that update surveys are submitted should the development have not commenced within two years; to require the submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure that Gigg Brook is not adversely affected during construction works; to require appropriate replacement landscape planting to mitigate for the loss of habitat; to require subsequent management of retained woodland areas; and to ensure that any external lighting is sensitively designed so as to minimise impacts on wildlife.

In view of the above, on the basis of the submitted ecological information, in the absence of objections from the Nature Development Officer and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on protected species, biodiversity and the ecological interest of the site. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with saved UDP policies NE1.1 and NE1.2 and Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The detailed comments received to the application from the Environment Agency, the Council Drainage Engineer and United Utilities are contained within the Consultee Responses section above.

In terms of flood risk, it is noted that the majority of the application site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is defined as having a low risk of flooding, with less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of flooding. However, due to the fact that the site is adjoined to the South by the River Etherow and Gigg Brook runs through the site, the South Eastern portion of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3, which is defined as having a medium/high probability of flooding. On this basis, a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted in support of the application.

The Consultee Responses section, above, highlights that the scheme has been the subject of extensive negotiations between the applicant and the Environment Agency over a 12 month period with regard to potential flood risk and an amended Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling information have been submitted in order to address concerns raised by the Environment Agency.

On the basis of the submitted amended Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling information, the original objection raised by the Environment Agency has been removed, subject to the imposition of a condition to require that the development is implemented in complete accordance with the amended Flood Risk Assessment and the proposed mitigation measures contained within it. Conditions are recommended by the Environment Agency to require the submission and approval of a Risk Assessment, Investigation Scheme, Remediation Strategy and Verification Report, in order to prevent possible contamination and pollution of controlled waters from the development. A further condition is recommended by the Environment Agency to ensure that details of any piling or deep foundation works are submitted and approved.

In view of the above, on the basis of the submitted amended scheme, in the absence of objections from the Environment Agency and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to the issues of flood risk and water contamination, in accordance with saved UDP policy EP1.7 and Core Strategy DPD policies SD-6, CS8 and SIE-3.

With regard to the issue of surface water drainage, Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-3 states that all development will be expected to comply with the approach set out in national policy, with areas of hard-standing or other surfaces, should be of a permeable construction or drain to an alternative form of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Core Strategy DPD policy SD-6 requires a 50% reduction in existing surface water runoff and incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage the run-off water from the site through the incorporation of permeable surfaces and SuDS.

Information submitted in support of the application confirms that the scheme seeks to incorporate SuDS, in the form of permeable paving and an infiltration system, with a restricted discharge of surface water to adjacent watercourses where SuDS are constrained. On this basis, the betterment over pre-development run-off would be 50%.

The drainage strategy for the proposed development, contained within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, has been considered by the Council Drainage Engineer. Whilst the Drainage Engineer is not in a position to agree the submitted drainage strategy on the basis of the submitted information, as acknowledged by United Utilities, an appropriate drainage scheme for the proposed development could be secured by the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions. Such conditions would require the submission, approval and subsequent implementation of a sustainable surface water drainage system, including management and maintenance of such at all times thereafter. Subject to compliance with such conditions, it is considered that the proposed development could be drained in a sustainable manner, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies SD-6, CS8 and SIE-3.

Land Contamination

A Phase 1 Preliminary Land Contamination Risk Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The detailed comments received to the application from the Council Environment Team are contained within the Consultee Responses Section above.

In view of the nature of the former use of the site, the site has been identified as being potentially contaminated and will therefore require a site investigation for soil and gas. As such, it is recommended that conditions are imposed, which should be applied as a phase approach, to require the submission, approval and implementation of an investigation, risk assessment, remediation scheme and remedial action into contamination at the site and the provision of measures to prevent landfill gas migration into the development. Subject to compliance with such conditions, it is considered that the proposed development would not be at risk from land contamination or landfill gas migration, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3.

Energy Efficiency

In respect of energy efficiency, an Energy Statement has been submitted in support of the application and the detailed comments received to the application from the Council Planning Policy Officer are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. It is noted that the detailed design has not been addressed and there is no specific assessment of how target of a minimum 40% improvement over 2006 Part L Building Regulations Target Emissions Rate would be achieved. On this basis and to ensure compliance with Core Strategy DPD policy SD-3, a condition is

recommended to require the submission and approval of details of the potential percentage carbon savings to be achieved within the development.

Other Considerations

The detailed comments received to the application from The Coal Authority are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. It is noted that the application site does not fall within the defined Development High Risk Area and is instead located within the defined Development Low Risk Area. As such, there is no requirement for the submission of a Coal Mining Assessment as part of the application. The applicant will however be advised of The Coal Authorities Standing Advice, to assess potential coal mining risks, by way of informative.

The detailed comments received to the application from the Director of Public Health are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. In summary of and in response to these comments, it is noted that the site is located in an accessible location in relation to public transport and employment, schools, leisure and other services in relation to active travel; appropriate cycle parking facilities will be secured within the development; green infrastructure provision will be secured within the development in the form of additional tree planting, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements; and the development would comprise a 100% affordable housing scheme.

A Crime Impact Statement has been submitted in support of the application and the detailed comments received to the application from Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security) are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. No objections are raised to the proposal from Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security), subject to the imposition of a condition to require the physical security specifications set out within the submitted Crime Impact Statement being incorporated within the development. Subject to compliance with such a condition, no safety and security concerns are raised to the proposal, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-1.

The application site is sited adjacent to a Public Footpath and the detailed comments received to the proposal from the Council Public Rights of Way Officer are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. In raising no direct objections to the proposal, the Public Rights of way Officer has recommended that applicant is advised of their obligations not to interfere with the Public Right of Way during the development or following completion by way of informative.

SUMMARY

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF establishes three dimensions to sustainable development – economic, social and environmental and Paragraph 8 of the NPPF indicates that these should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a number of existing buildings on the site and a comprehensive redevelopment of the site to comprise the erection of 18 no. dwellinghouses and 14 no. apartments with associated works. Members will be aware that the principle of an almost identical residential development has previously been considered acceptable at the site as part of planning application DC055286 in 2014, however this application was subsequently withdrawn as the required Section 106 Agreement was not completed.

The current scheme is considered to comprise a sympathetic, heritage-led regeneration of an existing redundant site which has been vacant since 2007 and is currently in a poor state of repair. The principle of residential development at the site, within an accessible and sustainable location and comprising previously developed 'brownfield' land, is welcomed, particularly during the current period of housing under-supply within the Borough. The 100% affordable housing scheme, over and above the usual policy requirement for the area and of an appropriate mix and tenure, would ensure that an identified affordable housing need would be met.

In its amended form, in the absence of objections from relevant consultees and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to the issues of impact on the character of the Compstall Conservation Area; impact on the character of the Etherow Parklands Landscape Character Area; impact on residential amenity; access, traffic generation, parking and highway safety; impact on trees; impact on protected species and ecology; flood risk and drainage; land contamination; energy efficiency; impact on the adjacent Public Right of Way; safety and security; public health; and coal mining legacy risk.

It is acknowledged that the scheme fails to provide the required financial contribution to secure the provision off-site play facilities and open space, contrary to the requirements of saved UDP policy L1.2 and Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-2. However, the Economic Viability Assessment submitted in support of the application has demonstrated that the development would not be viable or deliverable should the requirement for open space provision be met. As such, it is recommended that the required open space contributions should be waived in this particular case, in order to ensure the viability and delivery of the wider regeneration benefits of this 100% affordable housing development.

The application site is allocated within the Green Belt MEDS and the conflict with saved UDP policy GBA1.7 (ii) is acknowledged. However, Members are advised that the principle of the quantum of residential as proposed has previously been considered acceptable as part of the, albeit subsequently withdrawn, application in 2014 (DC055286). It is considered that the applicant has provided a sound case for 'Very Special Circumstances' to justify any potential harm to the Green Belt. Coupled with the 'substantial harm' test as defined by Paragraph 145 (g) of the revised NPPF introduced since the consideration of the previous application (DC055286) in 2014 and the fact that the current scheme would now secure a 100% affordable housing development, these factors are considered to justify approval of the development within the Green Belt as a Departure from the Development Plan.

In view of the above, in considering the planning merits of the proposal against the requirements of the NPPF, the proposal is considered to represent sustainable development. On this basis, notwithstanding the objections raised, the application is recommended for approval.

Given the conflict with saved UDP policy L1.2 and Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-2 in relation to open space provision/contributions and the conflict with criteria (ii) of saved UDP policy GBA1.7 in relation to Green Belt, the proposal remains a Departure from the Development Plan. Accordingly, should Members of Marple Area Committee be minded to grant planning permission, the application will be required to be referred to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee for determination as a Departure from the Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant.

Should Marple Area Committee be minded to agree the recommendation to grant planning permission, the application should be referred to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee as a Departure from the Development Plan.

Should the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee agree the Officer recommendation and resolve to grant planning permission, the decision should be deferred and delegated to the Head of Planning, pending the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the required financial contribution (£7500) to fund the provision of parking restrictions/a Traffic Regulation Order on the access road and to secure a review mechanism/clawback clause in relation to open space contributions.