

## **ITEM**

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/081106</b>
<b>Location:</b>	Former B A S F Earl Road Cheadle Hulme Stockport SK8 6PT
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Proposed demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site for B1/B2/B8 and associated access, yard and parking.
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Full Application
<b>Registration Date:</b>	20.07.2021
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	20211019
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Jane Chase
<b>Applicant:</b>	Cantt Pak
<b>Agent:</b>	PIN Property Consultancy

## **DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS**

Planning & Highways Committee - more than 5000m2 floorspace

## **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

The application seeks the demolition of the existing 3 storey office building (7600m2) and the erection of a 4 storey building comprising 13,564m2 of floorspace including approximately 930sqm ancillary office accommodation to the ground and first floor. The application proposes the retention of the existing gatehouse building and the erection of a new single storey building positioned forward of that existing to provide a drivers breakout area with toilets. The application proposes either a B1 (light industrial), B2 (general industrial) or B8 (storage and distribution) use of the site.

The proposed 4 storey building would be positioned to the north of the site and would measure 92m wide, 130m deep, 15m to eaves with a shallow pitched roof rising to 19m high above. The vast majority of the building would be given over to a single space area rising into the roof of the building. At ground floor, a small area of the floorspace would be given over to a reception, open plan office, toilets, a shower and stair/lift access to the first floor. At first floor level a further area, the same in footprint as that to the ground floor would also provide an open plan office, toilets and a shower. A small area of the building to the north east corner at ground floor level will provide an office and toilet. Externally the building would comprise glazing to the front south eastern corner and elsewhere be largely finished in curtain wall glazing to the first, second and third floors. An enclosed canopy is proposed to the drive-ins and a short cantilevered canopy to the dock levellers on the east elevation.

The existing access would be largely retained in its current position and width with the existing gates replaced with new sliding gates albeit with minor improvements. The site entrance radii will be reduced which will assist in managing the speeds of vehicle entering and exiting the site and also in reducing the crossing distance for pedestrians. A pedestrian refuge crossing will be provided within the effective width of the entrance to further assist the movement of pedestrians with a safer and reduced distance crossing arrangement. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be

provided along with a pedestrian link into the site. 263 general parking spaces, including 29 spaces which will have facilities for charging electric vehicles are proposed together with the provision of 15 disabled bays. Cycle parking is provided for 20 bikes in a store positioned adjacent to the entrance into the site and showers, lockers and changing facilities will be provided in the building.

A small single storey building providing a drivers break out area and welfare facilities is proposed adjacent to the entrance into the site. This building will measure 6.3m by 6.5m rising 4m to eaves and 5.6m to the ridge.

6 individual trees and 4 groups of trees are to be felled to accommodate the proposed development. Indicative details of replacement planting to the site frontage and boundaries are shown on the landscaping plan attached to this report along with the existing and proposed plans and elevations.

The application is supported by the following:  
Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Request  
Planning, Design and Access Statement  
Transport Assessment  
Flood Risk Assessment  
Drainage Strategy  
Ecological Appraisal  
Arboricultural Impact Assessment  
Energy Statement  
Geoenvironmental Site Assessment  
Air Quality Assessment  
Crime Impact Statement

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site is located on the north west side of Earl Road and comprises a 2.7ha site accommodating vacant offices previously occupied by BASF. On the site is a substantial building rising up to 3 storeys in height together with extensive areas of car parking positioned around the building. Access onto Earl Road connects with Stanley Road to the north.

The site is located within the Stanley Green Business Park and is surrounded by commercial and industrial development. To the north the site is bounded by the A555 where it passes on an embankment. To the west is a railway line and to the south and east are commercial occupiers.

The UDP Proposals Map identifies the site as being within an Employment Area.

## **POLICY BACKGROUND**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("PCPA 2004") requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **The Development Plan includes-**

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

- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

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

NE1.2 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance  
 EP1.7 Development and Flood Risk  
 E1.1 Location of New Industrial Development  
 E1.2 Location of New Business Premises and Offices  
 E3.1 Protection of Employment Areas  
 MW1.5 Control of Waste from Development

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

CS1 Overarching Principles: Sustainable Development, Addressing Inequalities and Climate Change  
 SD1 Creating Sustainable Communities  
 SD3 Delivering the Energy Opportunities Plans  
 SD6 Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change  
 CS7 Accommodating Economic Development  
 AED3 Employment Development in Employment Areas  
 AED5 Education, Skills and Training Provision  
 CS8 Safeguarding and Improving the Environment  
 SIE1 Quality Places  
 SIE3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment  
 CS9 Transport & Development  
 T1 Transport & Development  
 T2 Parking in Developments  
 T3 Safety & Capacity on the Highway Network

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Supplementary Planning Guidance does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless it does provide non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

Local Employment and Training - provides guidance and assistance to developers and end users of developments. It outlines how we intend to work with and support employers to maximise local employment and skills benefits from new developments.

Sustainable Transport - should be read by the developers of any development that would be expected to result in a change in traffic patterns.

Sustainable Design and Construction - is a comprehensive document laying out the drivers and benefits of sustainable design and construction.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2021 and replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & revised 2018 and 2019). The NPPF has not altered the fundamental legal requirement under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations (such as the NPPF) indicate otherwise.

The NPPF representing the governments up-to-date planning policy which should be taken into account in dealing with applications focuses on achieving a lasting

housing reform, facilitating the delivery of a greater number of homes, 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. If decision takers choose not to follow the NPPF, then clear and convincing reasons for doing so are needed.

N.B. In respect of decision-taking the revised NPPF constitutes a “material consideration”.

Para.1 *“The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these should be applied”.*

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

Para.7 *“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”.*

Para.8 *“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 – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;*  
*b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and*

*c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.”*

Para.11 *“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”.*

*Para.12 “.....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”.*

*Para.38 “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”.*

*Para.47 “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”.*

*Para. 81 “Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential.”*

*Para. 83 “Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.”*

*Para. 92 “Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which:*

*a) promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – for example through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections within and between neighbourhoods, and active street frontages;*

*b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of attractive, well-designed, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas; and*

*c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.”*

Para. 104 *“Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:*

- a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;*
- b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;*
- c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;*
- d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and*
- e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.”*

Para. 105 *“The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.”*

Para. 110 *“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and*
- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.”*

Para. 111 *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”*

Para. 112 *“Within this context, applications for development should:*

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;*
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;*
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;*
- d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and*
- e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.”*

Para. 113 *“All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.”*

Para. 119 *“Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land.”*

Para.120 *“Planning policies and decisions should:*

- a) encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;*
- b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;*
- c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;”*

Para.126 *“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.”*

Para. 130 *“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users<sup>49</sup>; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”*

Para. 131 *“Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that*

*opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible.”*

*Para.134 “Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:*

*a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or*

*b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”*

*Para.152 “The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.”*

*Para.154 “New development should be planned for in ways that:*

*a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure; and*

*b) can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government’s policy for national technical standards.”*

*Para.157 states “In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:*

*a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and*

*b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption”.*

*Para.167 “When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:*

*a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*

*b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the*



event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;

- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.”

Para. 169 “Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should:

- a) take account of advice from the lead local flood authority;
- b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards;
- c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and
- d) where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.”

Para. 174. “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and
- f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.”

Para.183 “Planning policies and decisions should ensure that:

- a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation);
- b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and
- c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.”

Para.184 “Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.”

Para.185 “Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:

- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;*
- b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and*
- c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.”*

Para.188 *“The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities.”*

### **Planning Practice Guidance**

The Planning Practice Guidance (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**

DC/015936; Type: OUT; Address: Former Basf Premises, Stanley Green Business Park, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire; Proposal: Erection of 18 No. office units (90,000 sq.ft.) together with associated site works; Decision Date: 03-DEC-04; Decision: GTD

DC/018250; Type: RES; Address: Former Basf Premises, Stanley Green Business Park, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire; Proposal: Construction of new 2/3 storey office units comprising 87,250 sq ft with associated car parking (Reserved matters); Decision Date: 07-APR-05; Decision: GTD

J/66191; Type: XHS; Address: Basf Earl Road Cheadle Hulme; Proposal: Change of use of part of warehouse (B8) to research and development with associated offices and laboratories (B1) and car parking.; Decision Date: 23-DEC-96; Decision: GTD

### **NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

The receipt of the application was publicised by way of a press notice and site notice. The occupiers of 20 neighbouring properties were notified in writing. No comments have been received in response.

### **CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

Highway Engineer – The site currently comprises an office building which although vacant has a floor area of circa 7,600sqm, is accessed from a priority junction arrangement on to Earl Road and parking is provided across the site for over 300 vehicles. The site is within an established employment and commercial area.

Further to discussion with the applicant modest improvement is proposed to the site entrance. The site entrance radii will be reduced which will assist in managing the speeds of vehicle entering and exiting the site and also in reducing the crossing

distance for pedestrians. A pedestrian refuge crossing will be provided within the effective width of the entrance to further assist the movement of pedestrians with a safer and reduced distance crossing arrangement. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be provided. Gates across the entrance will be set back sufficiently to allow an articulated vehicle to stand clear of the highway and the entrance has been subjected to vehicle swept path analysis to demonstrate the free and safe movement of vehicles within the revised design. A pedestrian link is proposed into the site and visibility at the entrance will be provided and protected to an acceptable standard with the footway to be widened to 3m across the full site frontage up to the A555 bridge to facilitate a shared footway cycleway. Replacement tree planting and landscaping to the rear of this widening would be acceptable.

The accompanying Transport Assessment, which has been recently updated to reflect a minor change in development floorspace, includes a review of the traffic generation and modal trip date for the extant office use on the site and an appraisal of the proposed flexible use as either industrial or storage/distribution. I am comfortable with the appraisal which demonstrates that with the increased floor area and use for either of the purposes intended, that the development generates a volume of traffic during both the peak periods and daily that is no greater than the extant office use. It is clear and evident that industrial and/or storage uses are less intensive in terms of trip generation when compared to an office use and I am satisfied that it has been demonstrated that the predicted development traffic can be accommodated on the surrounding highway network links and junctions without material or unacceptable impact in terms of capacity or consequent risk to safety. Whilst I have to acknowledge that the Earl Road junction with Stanley Road does suffer from some congestion and driver delay to journeys, the assessment is robust and it would be difficult and indeed unreasonable to seek to argue and evidence that the proposed development in whichever use is progressed would unacceptably worsen the situation.

Within the site, car parking provision will comprise of 263 general spaces, including 29 spaces which will have facilities for charging electric vehicles and furthermore the provision of 15 disabled bays. The Council's adopted parking standards permit a maximum of 301 spaces for the quantum of development and the uses that are proposed thus my initial consideration is that the provision of 263 general spaces is within the allowance of the standards. This level of provision does however need to be considered relative to the accessibility of the site and whether there is sufficient likelihood that trips by alternative modes of travel will be chosen, not only to avoid short term overspill concern but also to ensure the development delivers a positive shift toward sustainable travel choices.

It is my view that the site is far from ideally located in terms of the relative accessibility and at this time it being considered unlikely that staff will make travel choices that do not involve a private motor car when travelling to and from work. Whilst the site is clearly accessible as non-car owners can actually access the site on foot, cycle or public transport, the quality and frequency of these alternative means and that being the pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and the convenience and intensity of bus services are not such that existing motor car drivers would ever realistically make a sustainable travel choice and move away from reliance on car travel. Whilst accessible I find it difficult to consider that the site is sustainable in terms of travel modes.

Paragraph 105 of the NPPF confirms that significant development should be focussed on locations which are or can be made sustainable through offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 110 states that development should

ensure that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have been taken up given the type of development and its location. These requirements are reflected in Core Strategy Policy T1 which confirms that new development notably that generating significant numbers of trips will be required to be sustainably accessible by public transport, cycling and walking and where additional transport infrastructure is required to make the site accessible, developers will be expected to provide such or make a financial contribution towards the cost of new infrastructure secured by way of a S106.

The Stanley Green area lacks connectivity and access by high frequency bus services, although I must reasonably acknowledge and accept that a development of this scale and in isolation cannot be reasonably expected to deliver bus service improvement. There are however a number of infrastructure deficiencies to walking and cycling routes that are apparent, to such an extent that they would not encourage and would actually probably discourage employees in the locality making such sustainable travel choices. Deficiencies in particular are the absence of controlled crossing facilities on all arms of the Earl Road junction with Stanley Road and the lack of dedicated cycle routes that connect the site to the major road network and to nearby residential areas. I strongly feel that development should make endeavours to address some of these deficiencies.

In having already acknowledged accessibility concerns around the Stanley Green area the Council is considering and seeking funding streams towards a comprehensive package of improvements around the Stanley Green area. Works have been identified that could improve the Earl junction with Stanley Road to provide pedestrian and cycle facilities alongside vehicle capacity benefits. Further works may also include improved facilities for cyclists along Earl Road and Stanley Road by provision of shared footways and cycleways and a shared footway cycleway link to the A555 cycle route.

Following a constructive discussion with the applicant's representatives it has been agreed that the development proposal will deliver a scheme of footway widening to 3m across the frontage of the site to enable provision of and potential extension/continuity of a shared footway cycleway along Earl Road. Furthermore the applicant has agreed to a financial contribution of £100,000 which can be utilised for providing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure works in the area with the primary focus being on delivering an improved connection to the A555 shared footway cycleway from Earl Road.

This leads me to conclude that the development is making acceptable endeavours to assist with and deliver substantive cycle and pedestrian infrastructure that should contribute towards addressing barriers in modal travel choices. This will assist in the delivery of a sustainable form of development in terms of travel choices and satisfy Local and National Planning Policy and tests.

In terms of the internal site layout I welcome the extension of footway provision into and throughout the site and have no issues with the area identified for servicing and manoeuvring. Disabled parking is proposed with 15 spaces, this satisfies the Council's minimum standards and also the provision of electric vehicle charge facilities to 29 parking bays satisfies Council standards. The detail of electric vehicle charge facilities is a matter for conditional control and I will seek charge points to a proportion of the disabled bays. I also note the provision of a covered and secure storage area for 20 cycles, again a matter for conditional control. The only additional comment with respect to the layout is the need for parking for a minimum of 4

motorcycles and I would appreciate this clarifying on a future drawing, although again a matter capable of conditional control.

Finally I note an Interim Travel Plan accompanies the application. This is still need to review but am accepting in principle and am satisfied that travel planning is a matter capable of conditional control.

In conclusion I raise no objections to the application and note that a financial contribution would be secured under the terms of a S106 Agreement and conditional control can be used to cover other aspects and construction requirements within the development.

LLFA – No objections. The drainage proposals are policy compliant. A condition should be imposed to ensure compliance with the drainage proposals submitted with the application.

United Utilities - 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. Following our review of the submitted Drainage Strategy Report we can confirm the proposals are acceptable in principle to United Utilities. However, we do not have sufficient information on the detail of the drainage design and therefore a condition should be imposed in the event that planning permission is approved to secure these details.

Tree Officer – There are no legally protected trees within this site or affected by this development. A full tree survey has been submitted as part of the application to show the condition and amenity levels of the existing trees and where applicable which trees could be retained. The retained trees on site will require root protection and protective fencing should be erected prior to any works commencing on site, this will need to be conditioned to allay those concerns for the retained trees. The proposed landscaping which includes for replacement tree planting is acceptable.

Nature Development Officer – The site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been submitted as part of the application. The survey work has been carried out by a suitably experienced ecologist and follows best practice survey guidelines (Collington Winter Environmental, 2021). Habitats on site were mapped and the potential for protected species to be present and impacted by the proposals was assessed. The surveys were undertaken in February and March 2021. It is recognised that this is a sub-optimal time of year to undertake botanical surveys but given the habitats present on site (predominantly hard standing) this is not considered to be a limitation of the survey findings. Habitats on site are dominated by buildings, hard standing and bare ground, with scattered trees, ornamental planting and an area of amenity grassland.

Many buildings and trees have the potential to support roosting bats. 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 (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. 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.

The buildings and trees on site were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats. An internal and external inspection survey of the three buildings on site was undertaken. No signs of bats were observed and the buildings were found to be well-sealed with no potential bat roosting opportunities observed. As such the buildings have been assessed as offering negligible potential. It was confirmed via email submitted to the LPA that none of the trees on site were found to have bat roosting potential, being small in size and lacking suitable roosting features. The tree line adjacent to the railway line is likely however to provide a foraging resource for the local bat population and it would be reasonable to assume that the railway line forms a key wildlife corridor, providing connectivity to the wider area.

Buildings, trees and vegetation offer suitable nesting habitat for breeding birds. All breeding birds and their nests are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

One pond has been identified within 250m of the application area. This pond is approx. 110m to the west. Ponds and their surrounding habitats have the potential to support amphibians such as great crested newt (GCN) and toad. GCN receive the same level of legal protection as bats (outlined above) whilst toad are listed as a Species of Principal Importance under the NERC Act 2006. No records for GCN exist at the pond but this is not necessarily confirmation of GCN absence and may just be a reflection of a gap in the baseline data. Although GCN can travel up to 500m from a pond, research shows that they are typically found within 100m of a pond (within 50m is termed 'core habitat').

Paragraph 016 of the Natural Environment Planning Practice Guidance (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/natural-environment#biodiversity-and-ecosystems>) states that the local authority should only request a survey if they consider there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by development. Given the distance of the pond to the application site and the nature of the habitats present on site (suitable terrestrial habitat for amphibians is limited to along the railway line only), there is considered to be a low likelihood that GCN would be present within the application area and I would not consider it reasonable to request further GCN survey work as part of the current application.

No evidence of, or significant potential for any other protected species (such as badger) was recorded during the ecology surveys.

Wall cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*) was recorded within the application site. This species is listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), which makes it an offence to grow or otherwise cause to spread this invasive species in the wild.

#### Recommendations:

There is considered to be sufficient ecological information available to inform determination of the application. No evidence of bats was recorded and the proposed works are considered to be negligible risk to roosting bats. Bats can sometimes roost in seemingly unlikely places however and so it is recommended

that an informative is attached to any planning consent granted so that the applicant is aware of the potential for roosting bats to be present. It should also state that the granting of planning permission does not negate the need to abide by the legislation in place to protect biodiversity. If at any time during works, evidence of roosting bats (or any other protected species such as GCN or badger) is discovered on site, works must stop and a suitably experienced ecologist be contacted for advice.

In relation to nesting birds, the following condition should be used: No demolition or vegetation clearance works should take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of buildings/vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before (no more than 48 hours before) demolition/vegetation clearance works commence and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. This is outlined in section 4.3.1 of the submitted ecology report and should be secured via condition.

Cotoneaster horizontalis was recorded on site. A pre-commencement condition should be attached to any planning consent granted to ensure an invasive species management plan is prepared and implemented. This plan shall detail appropriate measures to prevent the spread (and ideally dispose) of the cotoneaster. This should be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to any ground works commencing.

So as to minimise disturbance to local wildlife it is advised that a sensitive lighting scheme is developed following the recommendations outlined in section 4.3.3-4.3.5 of the submitted ecology report and in accordance with relevant guidance: <https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2018/09/new-guidance-on-bats-and-lighting>. It is particularly important that there is minimal light spill on to the adjacent railway line and associated habitats to help maintain this wildlife corridor. I would therefore request that the lighting plans that have been submitted are reviewed to try and achieve no more than 3 lux along the west site boundary (studies have shown that light levels greater than 3 lux can significantly affect bat foraging activity) and/or ensure any lighting is screened (e.g. through additional landscape planting) and/or reduced (e.g. by having some unlit time during the night to provide dark periods for example). This can be secured by condition.

Tree loss will be required to accommodate the proposals. The submitted landscape plan shows provision of new tree and shrub planting around the site to mitigate for this proposed loss. The proposed species are welcomed as they comprise a mix of locally native species such as rowan, silver birch, hawthorn, hazel, dog rose and blackthorn and these will benefit local wildlife. Tree planting should however be maximised within the site where possible.

Biodiversity enhancements are expected as part of developments in line with local (paragraph 3.345 of the LDF) and national planning policy (NPPF). Section 4.3.6 of the submitted ecology report recommends that 6 bat boxes should be provided on site as an enhancement. Section 4.3.2 also recommends provision of bird boxes. I would suggest that 6 bird boxes would also be an appropriate number. The proposed type and location of the 6 bat and 6 bird boxes to be provided should be submitted to the LPA for review and this can be secured via condition. Woodcrete/woodstone boxes should be provided as these have greater longevity than timber boxes. Where possible integrated boxes should be used since these are less likely to be interfered with. I would advise that a pre-commencement of construction condition is used as part of any planning consent, as it is difficult to retro-fit integrated roosting/nesting features.

Environmental Health Officer (Contamination) - I have no objection to the proposed development however the reports have highlighted that further investigation is required in the inaccessible areas and below a retaining wall, as such conditions are required in the event that planning permission is approved to secure the submission and approval of further details. The Gas report concluded that no gas remediation is required, as such no gas conditions are required.

Environmental Health Officer (Air Quality) - The report states that the potential construction phase air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions were assessed as a result of demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout activities. It is considered that the use of good practice control measures would provide suitable mitigation for a development of this size and nature and reduce potential impacts to an acceptable level. I would suggest that the developer provides more detail as to what these measures might be in the form of a construction management plan for dust mitigation. This can be secured by condition in the event that planning permission is approved.

Planning Policy Officer (Energy) – The Energy Statement is compliant with policy SD3.

Director of Public Health - Stockport Sustainability Checklist: the submission of the Sustainability Checklist is welcome and the Silver Score reflects basic efforts to ensure a sustainable development. The main score of 36 points and the gold score of 12 reflects that some key areas of sustainability are being addressed through this proposed development, including cycle parking for 20 spaces [7% of the overall parking provision] plus showers, lockers and changing space, as well as 29 spaces for electric vehicles [10% of the overall parking provision]. These aspects are critical for a site that is not adjacent to rail stations.

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, managing healthy weight and reducing emissions from vehicles. The site is a 20 minute walk and 5 minute cycle from the nearest rail station [Handforth] and a 12 minute cycle from two other rail stations [Bramhall and Styal]. Regular bus services also serve the site which lies directly on the southern Stockport border with Cheshire East. It is therefore vital that cycle parking is provided to facilitate access to the site via multi modal choices to enable active travel and reduce traffic emissions and congestion. The commitment in the design to cycle parking and further ancillary requirements such as showers and clothes drying / storage is welcomed, as it is critical in enabling active travel choices and increasing physical activity. Achieving healthy weight reduces risks of other lifestyle diseases such as hypertension, coronary heart disease and stroke; it also increases productivity in employees as a result of good health. Reducing risks of such diseases also reduces pressures on current and future public sector health budgets (Stockport's JSNA). The proposed car parking provides 29 electric vehicle charging car parking spaces. It is useful to have this need addressed in light of the GM Zero Carbon target for 2038 and as the UK moves to an electrified vehicle approach by 2030. Indeed a commitment to ensuring that further parking can be adapted for additional EV charging in the near future as demand rises would also be welcome and be a positive marketing aspect for the site. Whilst there is evidence of the impact of traffic emissions on human health and electric vehicle charging is welcomed in air quality terms, it is one level in a hierarchy of sustainable transport choices where prioritising sustainable transport options of walking, cycling and public transport are vital to increasing activity and considerably reducing carbon emissions and pollutants from all vehicles.



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 WHO design considerations are critical to ensuring that the needs of the growing ageing population of Stockport are addressed where practicable through new development. In particular accessibility for older workers could be considered within design to ensure that employees aged 55 and over can continue accessing work readily.

Green Infrastructure (GI): whilst the site does not contain or lie adjacent to any environmental designations, it should be noted that opportunities for biodiversity net gain can benefit human health in many ways. Robust GI offers multifaceted health benefits ranging from addressing flood risk to tackling stress and its exacerbating effect on health through provision of views of greenery and wildlife. Appropriate delivery of green infrastructure would be very welcome in public health terms and could help to manage extreme rainfall events in the area, reducing stress and thereby maintaining immunity. The consideration of some native planting around the site will contribute to reducing flood risk and managing air quality; delivery of this will be critical to good health. Alongside bird and bat boxes, native planting can also enable biodiversity net gain on a site that currently has low ecological benefit, further enhancing access for and to nature on the development. Enabling people to get next to nature is important in terms of lifting the human spirit, which also assists with reducing the health impacts of stress, including on people with long term physical and/or mental health conditions, and further increasing productivity. The summertime comfort and well-being of the urban population has become increasingly compromised. The urban environment [even on suburban sites like this] stores and traps heat. The majority of heat-related fatalities during the summer of 2003 were in urban areas and were predominantly more vulnerable members of society (Designing urban spaces and buildings to improve sustainability and quality of life in a warmer world). Shading from GI is a critical tool on development for adapting to the climate crisis where extreme summer temperature events are likely to occur more frequently.

Mental Health: developments of certain types (such as higher buildings) trigger public health concerns around designing for suicide prevention purposes. Stockport Council's Public Health Team can discuss appropriate assessment and government guidance is available that outlines potential options for minimising any risk of self-harm. Alongside the ethical imperatives to prevent suicide, it is of note that for each life lost to suicide, the estimated total cost to society is around £1.67 million. In terms of this specific application, the proposed building seem to have addressed opportunities for self-harm where access to the roof is limited and windows appear to be unopenable. The proposed layout ensures the site is reasonably well overlooked which can deter such actions during busy periods. It is critical that areas of concern be accessible to emergency services attempting to access a vulnerable individual including recovering them safely where required.

Greater Manchester Police – We recommend that a condition to reflect the physical security specifications set out in section four of the Crime Impact Statement should be imposed if the application is to be approved.

Cheshire East – no comments received.

## **ANALYSIS**

The UDP Proposals Map identifies the application site as being within a designated Employment Area. The main issues for consideration are therefore

the provision of employment floorspace in this location, the impact of the development upon the character of the area and amenities of neighbouring occupiers, parking provision, traffic generation and highway safety, pollution, ecology, trees, drainage and crime prevention. These issues are explored below.

### Principles of Development

Saved policies E1.1 & E1.2 confirm that new industrial developments, business premises and offices will be permitted within designated employment areas. All sites must be appropriate in size and scale to their surrounding area and must not conflict with other UDP Review policies for housing, retail and the protection of the environment as well as having good access to the highway network and public transport. This position is reflected in saved policy E3.1 and CS policy CS7. CS policy AED3 confirms that the Council will protect employment areas for employment generating uses.

Para 81 of the NPPF confirms that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

The provision of employment floorspace whether B1, B2 or B8 on this site, which has a lawful use for employment purposes and is within a designated employment area, complies with the policy position set out above. The impact of the development upon the surrounding area in terms of its scale and size is considered below as are access issues. Subject to an acceptable assessment in this respect the proposal accords with saved policies E1.1, E1.2 and E3.1 together with policies CS7 and AED3 of the Core Strategy and the government's policy position within the NPPF.

### Impact on the Character of the Area and Amenity

Core Strategy policy CS8 welcomes development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to a sustainable, attractive, safe and accessible built and natural environment. This is reiterated in policy SIE-1 of the Core Strategy which confirms that development which is designed to the highest contemporary standard, paying high regard to the built/and or natural environment within which it is sited, will be given positive consideration. Specific regard should be paid to the use of materials appropriate to the location and the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings (particularly with regard to height, density and massing of buildings). Policy SIE3 seeks to ensure that the landscaping of development will aid biodiversity and to secure a sense of place and character.

The NPPF at Chapter 12 sets out the Government's most up to date position on planning policy and confirms that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment.

The character of the locality is derived from the variety of industrial, retail and employment generating uses adjacent to the site and within the wider Stanley Green industrial estate and retail park. In terms of built form, there is a variety of development ranging in size and scale as well as architectural form. On Earl Road itself, the application site is viewed in the backdrop of the A555 to the north which is raised on an embankment of substantial height above the level of the site. Immediately to the east is a substantial double height self storage facility whilst to the south on both sides of Earl Road is substantial 2 storey office development.

Noting that the application site already accommodates a 3 storey building of significant size, that proposed is considered of an appropriate size, siting and design having regard to the established character of the area. The closest occupiers to the site are those associated with the adjacent commercial, industrial and office developments; there are no residential occupiers within close proximity. Having regard to the character of the area, it is not considered the amenities of the neighbouring users will be harmed by the proposed development.

Subject to the imposition of conditions to secure and approve details relating to materials of external construction, hard and soft landscaping, the proposal is considered compliant with Core Strategy policies CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 in terms of its impact on the character of the area.

#### Parking and Highway Safety

Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy DPD requires development to be sited in locations accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. The Council will support development that reduces the need to travel by car. This position is followed through in policy T1. Policy T2 requires parking in accordance with the maximum standards and policy T3 confirms that development which will have an adverse impact on highway safety and/or the capacity of the highway network will only be permitted if mitigation measures are proposed to address such impacts. Developments shall be of a safe and practical design.

The NPPF at Chapter 9 seeks to ensure that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be or have been taken up, given the type of development and its location. Safe and suitable access to the site should be achieved for all users and the design of parking areas, other transport elements reflects current national guidance. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

The NPPF confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The detailed comments of the Highway Engineer are set out above in this report. In this respect he advises that the minor revisions to the access onto Earl Road acceptable, will be safe and practical to use and will improvement conditions of highway safety. In terms of traffic generation Members are advised that this arising from the proposed development will be no greater than the lawful use of the site for offices (noting that industrial and/or storage uses are less intensive in terms of trip generation when compared to an office use). As such the proposed development in terms of traffic generation will not have an unacceptable impact in terms of capacity or consequent risk to safety nor can it be demonstrated that it would worsen the operation of the Earl Road junction with Stanley Road (which suffers from some congestion and driver delay to journeys).

The proposed provision of 263 general parking spaces, including 29 spaces for the charging of electric vehicles and provision of 15 disabled bays accords with the Council's adopted parking standards. Conditions can be imposed to secure details of the electric charging points, cycle and motorcycle parking together with a completed travel plan. As confirmed by the Highway Engineer this level of provision does however need to be considered relative to the accessibility of the site and whether there is sufficient likelihood that trips by alternative modes of

travel will be chosen, not only to avoid short term overspill concern but also to ensure the development delivers a positive shift toward sustainable travel choices.

In this respect the Highway Engineer notes that at this time it is unlikely that staff will make travel choices that do not involve a private motor car when travelling to and from work (on account of the poor accessibility of the site by other more sustainable modes of travel).

Paragraph 105 of the NPPF confirms that significant development such as that proposed should be focussed on locations which are or can be made sustainable through offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 110 states that development should ensure that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have been taken up given the type of development and its location. These requirements are reflected in Core Strategy Policy T1 which confirms that new development notably that generating significant numbers of trips will be required to be sustainably accessible by public transport, cycling and walking and where additional transport infrastructure is required to make the site accessible, developers will be expected to provide such or make a financial contribution towards the cost of new infrastructure secured by way of a S106.

It is noted that the Stanley Green area lacks connectivity and access by high frequency bus services, although a development of this scale and in isolation cannot be reasonably expected to deliver bus service improvement. The infrastructure associated with walking and cycling routes are, as existing deficient, and most likely discourage employees in the locality making such sustainable travel choices. These include the absence of controlled crossing facilities on all arms of the Earl Road junction with Stanley Road and the lack of dedicated cycle routes that connect the site to the major road network and to nearby residential areas. It is therefore considered that the proposed development should include measures to address some of these deficiencies and improve the accessibility of the site (in accordance with the abovementioned policy position).

In this respect the applicant has agreed to the 3m widening of the footway across the site frontage to the A555 bridge to facilitate a shared footway cycleway and to making a contribution of £100,000 towards the improvement of sustainable transport measures. These measures could include improvements to the Earl Road junction with Stanley Road in the form of pedestrian and cycle facilities alongside vehicle capacity benefits. In addition to this facilities could be improved for cyclists along Earl Road and Stanley Road by provision of shared footways and cycleways and a shared footway cycleway link to the A555 cycle route.

Having regard to these measures it is concluded that the proposed development will deliver improvements to the accessibility of the site by sustainable modes of travel which in turn will improve not just the accessibility of this application site but the wider locality as well. The proposal is therefore policy compliant in this respect subject to the imposition of conditions and the signing of a S106 agreement to secure these measures.

Members are therefore advised that the proposed development accords with Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 together with advice contained within Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

### Other Matters

Policy CS1 seeks to ensure that all development meets a recognised sustainable design and construction standard where viable to do so. All development will be expected to demonstrate how it will contribute towards reducing the Borough's carbon footprint by achieving carbon management standards.

Policy SD1 confirms that the Council will look favourably upon development that seeks to achieve a high rating under schemes such as BREEAM.

Policy SD3 requires development to demonstrate how it will assist in reducing carbon emissions through its construction and occupation through the submission and approval of an energy statement.

The NPPF at para 152 confirms that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. It should help shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, encourage the reuse of renewable resources and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.

The energy statement submitted with the application advises that:

- 10% of the roof area will comprise roof lights, maximising natural daylight and reducing lighting energy demands;
- 100% LED lighting for is proposed for warehouse lighting and office lighting & emergency lighting;
- External lighting will be controlled by time clock/photocell units;
- Space heating will be via high efficiency panel heaters with integrated programmer / time clock;
- Water heating will be via high efficiency point of use heater;
- The building façade will have a performance (U values, air tightness etc) above the Part L 2013 compliance backstop values; and
- There will be natural ventilation to office areas.

The statement also advised that the proposed all-electric energy strategy will ensure the building is not locked in to high carbon energy supplies such as gas or other fossil fuels. As a result operational CO2 emissions performance will significantly improve year on year in line with the ongoing decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid. Given the proposal all-electric energy strategy, the reduction of CO2 emissions will be increased from the 57% improvement on Part L 2006 currently estimated, towards or potentially beyond Stockport's 75% maximum CO2 target. Renewable technologies including Solar PV, Air Source Heat Pumps, and Ground Source Heat Pump have been considered. While a Solar PV is technically feasible the high capital cost and potential differential between modelled hot water demand and actual use mean this type of technology will not be considered further. While additional low carbon renewable energy systems could further reduce the carbon emissions of the development, at this time no additional system are proposed given the development already achieves a significant reduction in carbon emissions in accordance with Stockport's carbon reduction requirements.

This statement has been considered by the Planning Policy Officer (Energy) who advises that the proposed development, without the inclusion of any renewable technologies, is compliant with Core Strategy policies SD1, SD3 and CS1 together with advice in the NPPF.

Saved UDP Review policy EP1.7 confirms that development will not be permitted where it would be at risk of flooding or increase flooding elsewhere. CS policy SD6 requires all development to be designed in such a way as to avoid, mitigate or reduce the impacts of climate change. In this respect development is required to incorporate sustainable drainage systems so as to manage run off water from the site.

Para 167 of the NPPF confirms that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Major developments should incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems (para 169).

The application site is not identified on the UDP Proposals Map as being in an area liable to flood and the Environment Agency identifies the site as being within Flood Zone 1. Having regard to the size of the site and scale of the proposed development there is a requirement for the application to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment; this along with a drainage strategy has been submitted and considered by the LLFA.

Members are advised that as the site is within Flood Zone 1, it is considered to be at 'low risk' from all sources of flooding; tidal, fluvial, pluvial, sewer, groundwater and artificial sources. Surface water is currently drained without restriction into the existing culverted watercourse that flows under the verge lines of Earl Road. Due to ground conditions which prevent infiltration and the lack of open watercourses, ditches or land drainage within or in close proximity to the site, it is proposed that surface water will be drained to the existing culverted watercourse in a manner controlled by the introduction of new attenuation facilities. The rate of runoff will be limited to 50% of the pre-development rate which equates to approx. 55 litres per second. Foul water will be drained to the nearest public sewer chamber for foul water located within the site entrance which United Utilities have advised would be the preferred point of connection for the proposed development.

The drainage strategy has been considered by both the LLFA and United Utilities both of whom confirm that the strategy is acceptable. Subject to the imposition of conditions to ensure compliance with the strategy, the proposal complies with saved UDP Review policy EP1.7, Core Strategy policy SD6 and para's 167 and 169 of the NPPF.

Policies NE1.2 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance of the UDP Review and SIE-3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment of the Core Strategy along with para's 174 and 180 of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposed development does not adversely affect protected species and secures enhancements for biodiversity.

Submitted with the application is a protected species survey; no evidence of, or significant potential for any other protected species (such as badger) was recorded during the ecology surveys. On this basis and subject to the conditions recommended by the Nature Development Officer, the proposed development will have no adverse impact on ecology and is compliant with policies NE1.2, SIE3 and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Policy SIE3 along with advice contained within the NPPF at Chapter 15 seek to protect against pollution whether that be from contamination in the ground, dust or noise. Submitted with the application are various reports addressing these

issues which have been considered by Officers in Environmental Health. Members are advised that subject to the imposition of conditions as requested by the EHO's, the proposed development will cause no harm in terms of pollution. On this basis the proposal is compliant with Core Strategy policy SIE3 and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Policies H1 and SIE1 of the Core Strategy together with para's 119 and 130 of the NPPF seek to ensure that developments create safe living conditions. To address this policy position the application includes a Crime Impact Statement. GMP advise that subject to a condition to secure the physical security specifications set out in the Statement, the proposed development is acceptable in terms of crime prevention measures. On this basis and subject to the imposition of such a condition Members are advised that the proposal is compliant with policies H1 and SIE1 of the Core Strategy together with para's 119 and 130 of the NPPF.

### Conclusions

The provision employment floorspace within this designated Employment Area accords with saved UDP Review policies E1.1, E1.2 and E3.1 together with policies CS7 and AED3 of the Core Strategy and the government's policy position within Chapter 6 the NPPF.

The proposed development is considered to be of an acceptable size, siting and design having regard to the character of the surrounding locality. There will be no adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore compliant with Core Strategy policies CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 together with advice contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

The proposed development subject to the imposition of conditions and signing of a S106 agreement will be accessible, secures sufficient parking (including that for the disabled, electric vehicles and cycles), is of a layout that is safe and practical to use and will not give rise to unacceptable congestion on the highway network. On this basis the proposal is compliant with CS policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3.

The application includes details to demonstrate that the proposed development will contribute towards a reduction in carbon emissions and is therefore compliant with policies CS1, SD1 and SD3 of the CS DPD together with Chapter 14 of the NPPF.

The application includes sufficient detail to demonstrate that the proposal will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and that the drainage of the site can be carried out in an acceptable manner. The proposal is therefore compliant with policies EP1.7 and SD6 together with advice contained within Chapter 14 of the NPPF.

Noting the absence of any protected species on the site, it has been demonstrated that there will be no adverse impact on ecology. Improvements to biodiversity can be secured by way of conditions imposed on the grant of planning permission. On this basis the proposal is compliant with policies NE1.2, SIE3 and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposed development will not have an unacceptable impact in terms of pollution. The proposal is therefore compliant with Core Strategy policy SIE3 and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

The proposed development will create an environment that is safe to use and deters crime in compliance with policies H1 and SIE1 of the Core Strategy together with para's 119 and 130 of the NPPF.

Having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in Chapter 2 of the NPPF it is considered that the proposed development as assessed above is acceptable and should be approved without further delay.

**RECOMMENDATION** Grant subject to conditions and S106 agreement

**BRAMHALL AND CHEADLE HULME SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE 27<sup>TH</sup>  
JANUARY 2022**

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Members asked no questions however Cllr Wyatt commented on the lack of associated traffic control, Highway Engineer identifies lack of controlled crossing facilities. This is the second application in the area where this is an issue and we have been trying to find funding for a crossing in the area. It is important that we don't ignore what the Highway Engineer is advising and we should register this.

The Planning Officer advised that the S106 money secured by this application would contribute to the improvement of sustainable travel measures however Cllr Wyatt responded that this does not include a controlled pedestrian crossing.

Members agreed the recommendation to grant.