

ITEM

Application Reference	DC/082050
Location:	Woodford Aerodrome Chester Road Woodford Stockport
PROPOSAL:	Reserved matters application for the "C2 extra care unit" approved by hybrid permission DC053832, for construction of a 3-storey building containing 87 no. 1 and 2-bedroom extra care apartments, communal facilities and staff facilities; construction of 17 no. 2-bedroom extra care bungalows; and associated landscaping, parking and external enclosures.
Type Of Application:	Reserved Matters
Registration Date:	04.08.2021
Expiry Date:	20211103
Case Officer:	Jane Chase
Applicant:	Anchor Hanover Group and Redrow Homes Limited
Agent:	Pegasus Planning Group Ltd

UPDATE SINCE AREA COMMITTEE

In response to the comments made by Cllr Bagnall in relation to the proposed boundary fence between the site and neighbouring properties on Chester Road, a meeting was held on site. Amended plans (site layout, roof plan and landscaping plan) have been submitted to show the gap in the boundary treatment enclosed such that access to the rear of properties on Chester Road from Verdon Roe Avenue will not be possible. This addresses the issue raised by residents, Cllr Bagnall and the comments of GMP. The amended plans are attached to this report along with the others submitted as part of this application.

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Planning and Highways – development in excess of 100 dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Full and outline planning permission (subject to conditions and a S106 agreement) was approved in 2015 under reference DC053832 for 145 dwellings with associated infrastructure (full permission) and up to 775 dwellings together with a C2 extra care unit, commercial and retail floorspace, a pub, school and D1 floorspace (outline permission with all matters reserved).

Since that date the 145 dwellings approved under the full planning permission have been constructed and are occupied. Reserved matters approval has also been granted in respect of 775 dwellings comprising phases 2ABCDEFGH & H along with phases 3ABCDE & F and the highway works to facilitate access to these phases; many of these dwellings are constructed and occupied. Reserved matters approval has also been granted for the school (DC075293) and full planning permission approved for the pub (DC070617).

This application seeks reserved matters approval in relation all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the extra care development approved as part of Phase 2 under the hybrid consent referred to above (DC053832). In this respect the application can be summarised as follows:

The proposal comprises a total of 104 no. extra care units and associated development, with the accommodation split between an apartment building in the southern part of the site containing 87 no. apartments and 17 no. detached and semi-detached bungalows located in the northern part of the site.

Vehicular access to the site is positioned fairly centrally along the site's eastern boundary off the western access road into the Garden Village which then splits to serve the apartments to the south of the site and the bungalows to the north.

The apartment building will form a crescent shape, positioned around communal landscaping and the car parking serving this element of the development. The building would extend 92.5m across the rear southern elevation, 63m along the length of the western wing and 56m along the length of the eastern wing. Rising 3 storeys and 11.8m to the ridge of a pitched roof, the building will have an eaves height of 9.2m. The roof is punctuated by projecting gables to the front and rear elevations in between which are projecting balconies with flat roofs over. Materials are indicated as mainly comprising contrasting shades of red brick punctuated by areas of feature vertical brickwork and feature cladding to the main building with a standing seam roof. The projecting balconies, which would comprise open patio areas at ground floor level and are enclosed by railings at first and second floor level, would be formed from horizontal feature brickwork and cladding.

Within this crescent of development are landscaped areas that separate the building from a total of 40 parking spaces (including 8 disabled parking spaces and 8 electric vehicle charging points (2 to the disabled spaces)). Communal landscaped areas are also proposed to the side and rear of the building to the west, south and east with a large pergola proposed to the south of the building outside of the communal lounge and bistro.

The apartments will comprise 44 no. 1-bed extra care units and 43 no. 2-bed extra care units. Communal facilities are also proposed within this building at ground floor level comprising:

- A bistro and lounge area, with associated kitchen facilities. The seating areas in the lounge and bistro open out onto the gardens to the south
- A domiciliary care room
- Treatment room
- Wellbeing room, hair and beauty salon
- Reception, staff office and training rooms
- A quiet room
- Storage areas and
- A large mobility scooter store sufficient to store 24 scooters.

The bungalows to the north of the site will take the form of 8 pairs of semi detached bungalows and 1 detached bungalow (17 bungalows in total). Three house types are proposed all comprising 2 double bedrooms with hipped roofs and projecting gables to the front and/or rear. Each pair of bungalows (depending on house type) typically measures 16.47m to 21.87m wide, 12.6m to 15.18m wide rising 2.4m to eaves and 4.7m to 5.7m to ridge. The bungalows are of a traditional design with porches

enclosed by the overhanging roof of the main dwelling and chimneys to the semi detached pairs. Materials are indicated as red brickwork with tiled roofs. Externally each bungalow would have a small landscaped front garden with 2 parking spaces together with an enclosed rear garden. The occupiers of these bungalows will have access to the shared extra care communal facilities within the apartment building under the same terms as the occupiers of the apartments.

All 104 units are proposed as affordable housing with 33 apartments being offered for affordable rent, 54 apartments and 17 bungalows for shared ownership. The accommodation is aimed primarily at those aged 55 and over and who are in need of extra care to support their independent living. All the residential units are self contained and in this respect the residents will live independently of each other however they will all have access to the communal facilities to use as suits their personal circumstances. To provide this care it is anticipated that 10 and 15 staff members will be on-site at peak times (between 0700-1000 and 1900-2200).

Reflecting the extra care provision, disabled parking is proposed immediately to the main entrance of the apartment building. Across the development will be level access to main entrances, front doors, the scooter store within the apartment building and lift access to all upper floor areas of the apartment building. All units are designed to comply with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations so as to provide accessible and adaptable dwellings especially that for wheelchair users. Windows will be top hung or centre pivot to allow for the controls to be located at the bottom of the window. All electrical outlets will be set out to the recommended mounting heights for accessibility.

The application is supported by the following:

Design and Access Statement
Planning Statement
Affordable Housing Statement
Extra Care Units Statement
Crime Impact Statement
Daylight/Sunlight Assessment Report
Biodiversity Statement and Assessment
Ground Conditions Report
Ground Gas Letter
Energy Statement
Sustainability Checklist
Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy
External Lighting Plan Ref: 021.E.102 Rev P3
External Building Fabric Report (Noise)
Transport Statement
Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site comprising the former Woodford aerodrome is positioned to the south of Chester Road in Woodford and accommodates some 205ha of land spanning the boundary of Stockport with Cheshire East. Now known as Woodford Garden Village this wider site is currently undergoing extensive redevelopment as outlined above in the description of development. On Chester Road itself outside of the site is a variety of development comprising residential properties, retail development and Woodford Garden Centre.

The development proposed by this reserved matters application is located to the north west of the Garden Village immediately to the west of the western access road off Chester Road (now known as Verdon Roe Avenue). The site is some 1.7 hectares in area and is bound to the north by the rear gardens of detached houses on the south side of Chester Road. The northern boundary of the site is formed by a high and dense row of leylandii trees with that to the west comprising a dense area of woodland. To the south of the site within the Garden Village is development comprising phase 2D (DC072195 refers) which, where adjacent to the boundary with this submission, comprises 4 garage blocks beyond which are 2no. 3 storey apartment buildings. To the east of the site is the vacant Bodycote site and to the south of that, vacant land within the Garden Village that has yet to be the subject of a reserved matters application. Further to the south and east are 2 storey detached houses forming part of previously consented phases of the wider development.

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 31st 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 17th March 2011.

Saved policies of the SUDP Review

LCR1.1 Landscape Character Areas

EP1.7 Development and Flood Risk

GBA1.2 Control of Development in Green Belt

GBA1.5 Residential Development in Green Belt

GBA1.7 Major Existing Developed Sites in the Green Belt

CDH1.3 Care and Nursing Homes

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

CS1 Overarching Principles: Sustainable Development – Addressing Inequalities and Climate Change

SD-1 Creating Sustainable Communities

SD-3 Delivering the Energy Opportunities Plans – 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-3 Affordable Housing

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

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.

Woodford Aerodrome Opportunity Site SPD
Design of Residential Development
Affordable Housing
Sustainable Design and Construction
Sustainable Transport
Transport and Highways in Residential Areas

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 20th 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.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 users⁴⁹; 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.137 *“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.”*

Para.138 *“Green Belt serves five purposes:*

a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;

d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”

Para. 147. *“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”*

Para. 148. *“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.”*

Para. 149. *“A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:*

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- 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.*

Para. 150. *“Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:*

- a) mineral extraction;*
- b) engineering operations;*
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;*
- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and*
- f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.*

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. 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.219 "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)”.

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

There is an extensive planning history for this and the wider site. The most relevant applications are listed below.

DC053833: Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings, remediation of land, and the regrading of land to create development platforms for a residential-led mixed-use development. Approved 2014.

DC053832: Hybrid planning application for:

Part A: Outline planning permission (excluding phase 1) for the erection of:

- Up to 775 dwellings;
- C2 Extra Care Unit;
- Commercial floorspace (comprising up to 8,361 m² [90,000 ft²] of Class B1c);
- A public house (comprising some 650 m² of Class A4 floorspace);
- Retail floorspace (comprising up to 5 shop units and some 1000 m² of Class A1, A3 & A5 floorspace);
- A one form entry primary school;
- Use Class D1 floorspace; and
- The provision of associated infrastructure (including roads, footpaths, cycle ways and open space)

All matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved for subsequent approval. Approved 2015 subject to conditions and a S106 agreement.

DC/065219 Reserved matters approval for the construction of the western access road (Infrastructure Phase H1 and now known as Verdon Roe Avenue). Approved 2017.

DC069144 Reserved matters approval for the western access road (Infrastructure Phase H1 and revision to DC065219). Approved 2018.

DC072195 Reserved matters approval for 62 dwellings on Phase 2D (which is immediately to the south of this current application site). Approved 2019. This approval was subject to a non-material amendment (ref. DC/073873) to substitute a house type. Approved 2019.

DC082051 Discharge of conditions 27 (threshold levels), 29 (lighting plan), 30 (refuse and recycling), 31 (travel plan), 32 (road infrastructure, private accesses, parking and turning areas), 33 (SUDS), 52 (invasive species), 53 (foul and surface water), 59 (cycle parking) and 60 (drainage and surfacing of driveways) of planning permission DC/053832 in relation to the extra care development proposed by this reserved matters application. This application remains under consideration at the time of writing this report as much of the information to discharge these conditions has been submitted as part of this reserved matters application. Once a

resolution has been reached on this reserved matters application then a decision will be made on the discharge of conditions application.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The receipt of the application has been advertised by way of a site and press notice. Letters to 57 neighbouring properties have also been sent. At the time of writing this report 2 letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:-

- The Crime Impact Statement report identifies a security risk which in particular affects my property more significantly than any other property on Chester Road. Between the development and the boundary of existing properties on Chester Road is a belt of landscaping. Without any fencing to prevent access to this, my property would be very accessible. Additionally, the plans identify a substation on Verdon Roe Avenue, if you incorporate that within the overall scheme and re-visit security, from a site visit you will easily identify a weak point where the fencing is already compromised and it is only a matter of time before someone on Chester Road faces negative consequences. As much as the developer has stated the vegetation is dense, it is dense trees, but the ground is not densely vegetated and provides for easy access to the rear gardens along Chester Road.

- Plots 1 through 4 will cause will cause visual disturbance to my property. Currently, with where the tree line ends, my property benefits from great views across the landscape through to the hills in the Peak District. I understand the new developments to be bungalows and there is very little I may be able to affect in terms of preventing the build from taking place. By way of compromise, I would like to see adjustments made to the designs themselves. The design incorporates a tall chimney like structure to the rear of the bedrooms. Given that a) this is a smoke-controlled zone and b) these are just design features as opposed to offering any functional benefit, I do not see any need for a structure to rise in excess of 5 meters as the current designs show. Leaving the design as is, will leave two significant pillars rising up in to the view line of the Peak District hills that I currently enjoy.

- There is a line of high leylandii trees along the northern boundary of the site (G3) which the application advises are 'off site within adjacent residential properties'. This is not correct as the trees are planted on the development side of the boundary. This has implications for the management of the trees in the future. There are approximately 5 properties affected by the trees and in some situations the trees have achieved heights of over 30 feet and are blocking light from the residential gardens. In the past BAE did allow us to trim them down a bit ourselves hence the varying heights. My wish would be to maintain them at a height of around 3 metres in order to provide a boundary screen without blocking light. At their current height they would probably come under the 'High Hedges Act legislation.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Planning Policy Housing/Strategic Housing Lead – The affordable housing statement (AHS), submitted as part of the above Reserved Matters Application, has been provided on behalf of Anchor, a non Stockport Housing Partnership registered provider that specialises in providing accommodation for older people. The statement relates to the proposed provision of extra care/older person affordable housing to meet the S106 requirements to deliver 33 rental and 33 shared ownership affordable housing units.

The AHS confirms that the 33 rental units will be provided in accordance with the S106 requirements but proposes an alternative provision on intermediate affordable home ownership units, making the case that they consider this provides an equivalence/more appropriate provision having regard to the proposed client group/purchasers than normal policy requirements. The focus, therefore, will be on the provision of the intermediate home ownership units.

The original S106 requirements were for the provision of 33 shared ownership units which, in accordance with SMBC policy and guidance would be sold at fixed prices, as a percentage of the total open market valuation, with the rental element calculated on an open book basis by capitalising the Registered Providers reasonable costs associated with the delivery of the units (including legal, surveying, finance and administration costs), and then calculating the weekly rent required to meet these costs. The basis for this policy provision relates to the purchasing power of first time buyer households in housing need, on average/below average household incomes.

The AHS notes that these proposed units would be for purchase by older residents to enable them to move to more suitable accommodation and is targeted at older owner occupiers with insufficient equity/capital to purchase a full market product. The proposal, therefore, would provide 71 units of shared ownership accommodation (38 more than required), but at higher costs to the purchaser, in recognition of the equity that these older residents would have to support their purchase.

The proposal would involve the same monetary value of discount (calculated at £5.94m) as policy requirements, although this discount would be provided across 71 units rather than the required 33 units. The calculation of this discount notes that extra care provision provides significantly more communal space than general needs and therefore utilises the Stockport prices provided for larger accommodation to reflect this additional space. The proposed rents are also higher, at approximately twice the Stockport open book 'cost' rents, but the AHS notes the additional costs associated with operating the significant additional space/facilities than would be envisaged with general needs accommodation.

The AHS also considers the need for such accommodation, including providing analysis from the Council's Housing Needs Assessment 2019 and noting how the provision promotes independent living, and helps to provide family accommodation (as older residents move) which helps to address the significant housing need more widely within the borough.

In response to this the Strategic Housing Lead comments that there is a significant need for suitable affordable housing options for older people to promote independent living (HNA 2019 and All Age Living Strategy), and this proposal helps to address that need. The proposal would also help to provide additional general needs family accommodation as older people move into this proposed accommodation.

The proposal would provide significantly more units than could be required by the Council, and the AHS demonstrates that the overall level of sales price discount would be the same as policy at £5.94m. The information provided on the size and cost of the additional communal space/facilities to support sales and rental prices do accord with other facilities in Stockport and can be supported.

Whilst the approach does represent a departure from the Council's policy provision in terms of purchase price, the ability to afford accommodation by older people with

their own homes is very different from the target group of first time buyer households on which the calculation of prices is based.

Although the AHS does provide some analysis to support the affordability for those older households living in properties of below average market value, this has been cross referenced separately against both the HNA 2019, and data published by the Office for National Statistics (updated based on property price increases). The general approach with the Council policy is to target households on below average household income and ensure that the product is affordable to them. To provide an equivalence for older owner occupiers, analysis has looked at free equity that could be utilised to support purchase, with both the HNA 2019 and latest ONS data from March 2020 suggesting an average level of affordability being at approximately £250k. It should also be noted that the average property price in Stockport in November 2021 was £276k.

Although the AHS provides detail of an average discount of £83k, with a purchase price of £216k, and notes that there will be variation according to individual circumstances, it is clear that the properties will be affordable to older households with below average free equity.

Although the remaining rental element would be higher than the Council model, with the household having purchased the unit utilising the available free equity, and not having to make mortgage payments, this rent would be affordable to the majority of older person households having regard to retirement incomes.

Highway Engineer – The site is suitably located in terms of accessibility and I note that infrastructure works and sustainable transport interventions secured as part of the overall garden village development have been and continue to be progressed and built out. Furthermore, some commercial development is expected to be delivered within the overall site development which would enhance the provision of services and amenities for residents and generally reduce the need for car borne trips by new residents.

This development plot has outline permission for extra care units that was predicated on 100 beds for the purposes of the traffic generation and highway impact assessment that accompanied the outline submission. This application seeks a total of 164 beds which although clearly an increase in numbers, has to be considered on its own merits with a review of the likely traffic generation and impact relative to the intended use. The development also proposes the restraining of parking provision to a level that is considered acceptable for extra care development, rather than simply maximising or over providing parking spaces for occupants. This helps restrain traffic generation and inform a realistic traffic generation exercise for the development and shows it to be to a level that is not materially different to that considered at outline stage.

Having reviewed the traffic appraisal that accompanies the application and following discussion with the applicant I can conclude that when having regard to the outline permission for the site and the principle road infrastructure and junctions that have been constructed, I can see no reason or justification to express concern about traffic generation and any consequent highway impact that is associated with this proposal.

The development proposes parking at a ratio of one space for each of the 17 bungalows and 43% general provision for the apartment block, increasing to 52% when factoring in the disabled spaces to be provided. There is a strong and

accepted case for parking to serve extra care development to be at a lesser ratio and this has been generally proven to be in the region of 50%. Provision at the ratios identified respects and supports the general principles of residents moving into specialist accommodation and the realistic expectation that the level of car ownership will reduce once people have settled in. I am comfortable that this form of development with restrained parking provision does seem to manage the realistic demand for parking space to a level that respects supply. Should there be any additional parking demand and need for overspill the layout of the site has extensive kerb lines against which parking can occur without giving rise to site operational and safety issues.

The submission includes, for the apartment building, 8 disabled parking bays which satisfies the Council's standards and 16 bays overall will be provided with a facility for the charging of an electric vehicle, which again satisfies standards. The bungalows which are all standalone with dedicated parking must each have a charge facility, a matter for conditional control. A minibus/drop off area will also be provided, suitably located to meet possible user demands. In summary I see no reason or justification to express concern about parking provision within the site or the consequence of any overspill that may arise.

The internal site layout has been subjected to numerous revisions and I am now comfortable with the proposal and detail. The site entrance ties in to road infrastructure provided as part of the overall development, with suitable carriageway width, pedestrian facilities and scope for delivery and service vehicles accommodated. I understand the applicant does not intend to offer the internal road infrastructure for adoption. This I cannot oppose as highway adoption is beyond the reasonable control of the Local Planning Authority it has been assured that the road infrastructure is designed and will be constructed to a suitable and safe standard with potential for adoption should circumstances change. Suitable provision will be made for vehicular and pedestrian access to both the bungalows and the apartment block, with dedicated pedestrian space for the apartments and shared space used for the bungalow road. Vehicle parking bays are suitably located and laid out and delivery and service sized vehicles can access safely both elements of the development.

Finally, the bungalows each require a covered and secure cycle storage facility and a communal cycle parking area is required for the apartments. This is a matter for conditional control, as the mobility scooter area identified and required for the apartments.

In conclusion I have no concerns or issues with the proposal.

Tree Officer - The proposed development is not within a Conservation Area. A full tree survey has been supplied as part of the planning application to show the condition and amenity levels of the existing trees and where applicable which trees could be retained to increase the amenity levels of the site with retained mature trees.

The proposed landscaping scheme delivers a greater number of trees than that lost and as such will improve the amenity and aesthetics of the site, as well as increased native hedgerows at every opportunity. All remaining trees will need to have full protection status during the all stages of the development as these trees cannot be lost or accidentally damaged.

No objections subject to conditions to ensure:-

- There is no tree loss beyond that proposed in the application;
- The replacement of any that are removed without consent, die, become damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years of the development commencing;
- The protection of retained trees for the duration of construction works; and
- That 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.

Nature Development Officer – The site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been submitted with the application (Applied Ecology Ltd, 2021). An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out to map the habitats on site and identify the potential for protected species to be present and impacted by the proposals. The survey was carried out in June 2021 by a suitably experienced ecologist and followed best practice survey guidelines.

Habitats on site are dominated by ephemeral /short perennial vegetation and bare ground with a shallow ephemeral pool present and also broadleaved plantation woodland present in the northwest corner. Temporary site compound buildings are also located within the site.

Many buildings and trees have the potential to support roosting bats however no potential roosting features were identified during the survey and so the site is considered to offer negligible potential to support a bat roost. Foraging habitat is provided by the woodland and ephemeral pool on site. All species of bats and their roosts are protected under UK (Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)) and European legislation (The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019).

The ephemeral pool is recently established but the marginal plants indicate that it is at least semi-permanent. Waterbodies and their surrounding terrestrial habitat can support amphibians such as great crested newt (GCN). GCN receive the same level of legal protection as bats (outlined above). A Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) survey to assess the suitability of the waterbody to support great crested newts (GCN) was carried out and scored as 'poor suitability'. Terrestrial habitats on site are considered to be sub-optimal (with the exception of the woodland which will be retained). Seven ponds are present within 250m of the application site but on-going surveys as part of the Woodford Aerodrome redevelopment scheme (most recently surveyed in 2021) have not recorded GCN to be present. The nearest pond known to support GCN is approx. 480m to the southwest of the current application area. As such it is considered that there is a low likelihood of GCN being present on site and impacted by the proposals.

All breeding birds and their nests are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The site has the potential to support a range of largely common garden and woodland nesting species, predominantly within the boundary woodland habitat, but it is considered too small to support a large or particularly significant assemblage of species.

No signs of badgers or significant potential for any other protected species (such as reptiles) was identified during the survey.

No invasive species listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) were recorded during the survey.

Recommendations:

A sufficient level of ecological survey effort has been carried out to inform determination of the application. No evidence of/significant potential for roosting bats was observed and so the proposed works are considered to be of low risk to bats. Bats can regularly switch roost sites and can sometimes be found to roost in seemingly unlikely places however. As a precautionary measure it is therefore advised that an informative should be attached to any planning consent granted to ensure that the applicant is aware of the legal protection that bat roosts receive. If at any time during works, evidence of roosting bats (or any other protected species) is discovered on site, works must stop and a suitably experienced ecologist be contacted for advice.

No any vegetation clearance/waterbody clearance should take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately (no more than 48 hours) before works commence and provided confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. This can be secured by condition.

Works are considered to be of low risk to GCN. To further minimise the potential of amphibians (e.g. toad) being adversely impacted by the proposals, Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) should be implemented during works (including the draining down of the ephemeral pool). A Method Statement detailing sensitive working measures should be submitted to the LPA for review prior to works commencing.

All retained trees should be adequately protected from potential impacts in accordance with British Standards and following advice from the Council's Arboriculture Officer.

Ecological conditions can change over time. In the event that works have not commenced within two years of the 2021 survey (i.e. by June 2023) then update survey work will be required to ensure the ecological impact assessment remains valid. This can be secured via condition

Developments are expected to achieve net gains for biodiversity in accordance with national and local planning policy. Some suitable measures are indicated on the submitted Landscape Masterplan and outlined below and can be secured via condition:

Provision of bat and bird boxes (12 sparrow terraces integrated within the new buildings, 11 bat boxes integrated into the new buildings, 5 bird boxes to be provided on retained trees and 5 bat boxes to be provided on retained trees). This is welcomed but it is requested that the specification of bat and bird boxes to be provided is submitted to the LPA for review. This should be secured via a pre-construction condition since integrated bat/bird boxes are difficult to retrofit. Provision of a wildlife hibernacula – further details on design should be provided to the LPA.

The landscaping scheme shows planting of understorey woodland planting, native trees across the site, creation of wildflower areas and also native hedgerows at site boundaries. This is welcomed. Details of the proposed species should be submitted to the LPA for review – a mix of locally native species should be provided.

Details of the long-term sympathetic management of the woodland and other habitat areas should be submitted to the LPA (including targets for condition, monitoring and roles and responsibilities). It is stated that dead wood will be cleared from the woodland. This can be used to create habitat piles. It is also recommended that some is retained as standing deadwood due to its high biodiversity value. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) or similar document can be conditioned.

Planting of native hedgerows to demark plot boundaries is advised to maximise biodiversity gains, as opposed to using wooden fencing which is currently proposed.

Where close-board fencing is to be used, occasional gaps (13cm x 13cm) should be provided at the base of any close-board fencing (at least one gap per elevation) to maintain habitat connectivity through the site for wildlife (such as hedgehog which are a UKBAP species).

Any proposed lighting should be sensitively designed so as to minimise impacts on wildlife associated with light disturbance and ensure that light spill does not occur on the retained broadleaved plantation woodland.

Planning Policy (Energy) – The energy statement for this application is in full compliance with the Core Strategy Policy SD3 showing evidence of full consideration of low / zero carbon technologies for their technical feasibility and financial viability. The statement also commits the development to exceeding the policy carbon reduction target through delivery of a 20% reduction in carbon emissions over current Part L – exceeding the target by some 7%.

It will achieve this through specification of higher levels of insulation and efficiency in equipment, and through the use of a Mechanical Ventilation & Heat Recovery system [ensuring efficient circulation of warm and cool air as required] alongside an Air Source Heat Pump for heating / cooling. Furthermore there is a proposed use of solar photovoltaics to provide renewable electricity.

This commitment ensures that this development contributes to the GM Zero Carbon target for 2038 and reduces the need for costly and disruptive retrofit in the next decade to ensure compliance with net zero requirements.

The requirement for low carbon buildings is reflected in Stockport Council's declaration of a climate emergency and adoption of the Climate Action Now Strategy.

In addition, I note that the Sustainability Checklist for the development scores Silver [26 main score + 14 gold] reflecting the following proposed elements of design: sustainable drainage, cycle parking, natural ventilation, site waste management plans [construction + operation], increased insulation and specification of equipment alongside the renewable energy systems outlined above, efficient use of water as well as native planting on the site, together with heating / lighting controls that will benefit the health of the residents.

Director of Public Health – The submission of Stockport's Sustainability Checklist is welcome and the Silver Score reflects a reasonable level of intention to ensure a sustainable development that delivers social, environmental and economic benefits to the area.

Social Infrastructure: At the moment there are no known issues with GP practice levels in the area being impacted by this proposed development, however Public Health or the Stockport Clinical Commissioning Group will contact the Planning Officer if there are any issues identified prior to the decision date. The provision of extra care is welcomed addressing the need for quality care units in the Borough delivering the specialist care where needed by residents. Discussions have taken place with the Council's Health Protection Lead Nurse regarding design of the care facilities with regard to the need for a hand wash basin in the ground floor treatment room and the dirty laundry storage and management capacity. These were addressed through proposed appropriate changes to the design and this effort is very welcome, not least at this time of continuing higher risk of infection transmission.

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, reducing emissions from vehicles and enabling social interaction. Accessible paths through the site are welcomed as this can help to ensure pedestrians can navigate the site fully encouraging natural surveillance from pedestrian and cycling through traffic. The proposed cycle parking of 20 spaces is welcomed as this will enable staff and visitors to make healthier travel choices. Showers and clothes drying and storage for staff working at the site are not mentioned and inclusion of such could facilitate a greater choice of travel options for staff and visitors in all weathers. All of these measures are 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. Reducing risks of such diseases also reduces pressures on current and future public sector health budgets (Stockport's JSNA). The proposed electric vehicle charging is vital to ensure vehicle emissions are reduced where car use is considered essential by future residents, staff and visitors. Indeed it would be helpful if the site is designed flexibly to incorporate further charging capacity as the UK moves to an electrified vehicle approach by 2030. There is evidence of the impact of traffic emissions on human health. Electric vehicle charging is welcome in air quality terms, but 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, reducing congestion and considerably reducing carbon emissions. A shift in travel choice will free up road space for essential vehicle users including emergency services. The reduced need for roads will protect the natural environment and human health

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. On a site such as this appropriate volume and styles of seating [with backs and arm rests to aid sitting, resting and rising] should be considered to enable older and other vulnerable pedestrians to take rest stops when walking through the site and accessing the wider area for their needs, including leisure.

Green Infrastructure (GI): the scheme is in an urbanised location and it should be noted that the proposed 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 is welcome in public health terms and could help to manage urban temperatures and extreme rainfall events in the area, reducing stress and thereby

maintaining immunity. Achieving biodiversity net gain so that overall levels of biodiversity are enhanced helps to protect human health through a healthy natural environment. Native planting also contributes to managing air quality and enabling new natural capital to provide improved ecological corridors to nearby green chain and open space areas, further enhancing access for and to nature in and around 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 and increasing recovery times, including on people with long term physical and/or mental health conditions. The summertime comfort and well-being of the urban population has become increasingly compromised. The urban environment stores and traps heat even in suburban locations. 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).

Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land) – I can confirm I have read the Betts Geo Phase 2 report dated November 2018 and the Perega Gas Letter dated June 2021.

There is no remediation required in the extra care area of the site for soil however there is remediation required for gas. As such I would recommend the LFG3 condition, revised to specifically request the submission of a validation report.

Environmental Health Officer (Noise) – There are a number of noise sensitive residential receptors in the vicinity of the site, which may be sensitive to construction noise, so an informative relating to acceptable construction hours is recommended.

An acoustic report has been submitted in support of the application. This report is an 'External Fabric Assessment' but external amenity areas have not been assessed. The noise measurement results are not however cause for concern for garden/communal areas and no further assessment is required for external areas.

The reports methodology, conclusion and 'internal noise mitigation' recommendations are accepted. Conditions will be required requiring the implementation of mitigation measures as set out in the acoustic report prior to the occupation of any dwelling; to control noise from fixed plant and to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (to include details of noise and dust management). Should piling be required during construction works then this shall not be carried out other than in accordance with a method statement which has first been submitted to and approved by the LPA.

GMP Security by Design – We would recommend that a condition to reflect the physical security specifications set out in section four of the Crime Impact Statement should be added, if the application is to be approved.

LLFA – No objections. This application incorporates a drainage strategy (Perega) which references compliance with the overall drainage strategy for the wider site by WSP which has already been accepted in the consideration of previous applications.

United Utilities – Following discussions with the LPA and the applicant since our original response, United Utilities now holds no objection to the drainage details submitted as part of this application. We originally requested further information with regards to the drainage solution, in particular the proposed levels. This resulted in the applicant providing evidence that resolved our concerns.

We acknowledge the provision of the Drainage Strategy referenced C13259-PER-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0001, dated June 2021. We are anticipating a more detailed strategy to be submitted prior to commencement of any development. This detailed strategy will contain levels details and should be considered as and when approved documents are being finalised. We would appreciate an update from the LPA when approved documents are being finalised should this application be recommended for approval as we wish to ensure the most up to date Drainage Strategy is referenced as part of any decision. We anticipate no objections to the updated strategy as we anticipate it to reflect the positive discussions to date. The principles of C13259-PER-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0001 are however deemed acceptable in the context of this submission so we hold no objection to the drainage submission as proposed.

ANALYSIS

This reserved matters application has been informed by the parameters established by the hybrid (part full, part outline) permission (DC053832) which sets out the principles of development and provides a framework for the density, land use, routes through the site, the maximum height of buildings and the landscape principles. The parameters plans approved as part of the hybrid consent establish the general principles for the masterplan and design of future phases of the development. In this respect it should be noted that the approved illustrative masterplan, density parameters plan and building heights plan identified this part of the wider site as accommodating the extra care development at a density of 15dph to 30dph+ and a height of 10m with landmark buildings 12m high to define gateways, corners and frontages. The compliance of the proposed development with these approved plans is set out below.

Impact on the Green Belt

In assessing the parent permission (DC053832), the impact of the proposed development upon the openness of the Green Belt was carefully considered. In terms of the outline element of that application, of which this reserved matters application is pursuant to, no details of the size, siting and design of the proposed development were submitted for formal consideration. Notwithstanding that application DC053832 was supported by indicative layouts, a Design and Access Statement, Design Codes, Housing Density Plan and Parameter Plans which set the framework upon which the detailed proposals for the site would be based. Compliance with these documents will therefore result in a development that would enhance the openness of the Green Belt and not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. This assessment is set out in the report below.

Layout, Appearance and Scale

Policy SIE-1 states that development that is designed and landscaped 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. In addition policy SIE-1 sets out that the provision, maintenance and enhancement (where suitable) of satisfactory levels of access, privacy and amenity for future, existing and neighbouring users and residents should be taken into account. Policy H-1 requires that the design and build standards of new residential development should be high quality, inclusive, sustainable and contribute to the creation of successful communities. Proposals should respond to the townscape and landscape character of the local area, reinforcing or creating local identity and distinctiveness in terms of layout, scale and appearance, and should consider the need to deliver low carbon housing. In addition policy H-1 requires that good standards of amenity, privacy, safety/security and open space should

be provided for the occupants of new housing and good standards of amenity and privacy should be maintained for the occupants of existing housing.

The extra care development is located in the Woodford Extended Character Area (C1) as identified in the Design Codes approved under DC053832. The Codes advise that within this neighbourhood, the urban form and architectural style will be strongly linked to the existing Woodford village centre & influenced by the villages that surround it. Focused around the entrance Village Green Space and enhanced Chester Road frontage, this area contains the first sections of the Green Streets that continue throughout the rest of the development. Large villa type houses surround the green, together with well defined and fronted secondary roads, incorporating large front garden spaces that reflect the character of the local area, and ensure an attractive and green environment is created.

The approved illustrative masterplan for the development shows the extra care element comprising 2 large C shaped buildings facing each other across a central courtyard/parking area. In accordance with the approved Density Parameters Plan development here shall comprise 15 to 30+ dwellings per hectare with the higher density being in appropriate locations to define street frontages, create gateways or reinforce corners. In terms of height development shall be 10m high with landmark buildings 12m high to define gateways, corners and frontages.

In response to the position established by the grant of DC053832 the following is noted:

The density of the development as a whole proposed by this reserved matters application equates to 61dph. This high density is driven in part by the inclusion of apartments however noting that the approved Density Plan allows for a density on this part of the site in excess of 30dph, this considered acceptable subject to a satisfactory assessment in relation to matters such as size, siting, parking provision and amenity space provision. All these matters are explored in the report below.

To the north of the site it is proposed to erect 17no. extra care bungalows in the form of 8 pairs of semi detached bungalows and 1 detached bungalow. Being single storey and screened from the adjacent houses to the north of the site by a dense leylandii hedge, these will have little impact on the visual amenities afforded from these existing neighbouring occupiers. Their height at 5.7m to ridge sits comfortably within the maximum height of 10m for residential development within the approved Building Heights plan.

It is noted that one objector references the interruption of views of the Peak District from their property on account of the siting of plots 1 to 4 and in particular their chimneys. Members are advised that existing neighbouring occupiers do not have the right to a view across adjacent land as to exercise such rights could stifle development. The issue for consideration here is whether that proposed is in keeping with the character of the locality in terms of its size, siting and design and is not so high or so close to existing neighbouring occupiers that it results in a visually obtrusive form of development.

The Council's SPD 'Design for Residential Development' provides guidance on the interface distance between dwellings so as to ensure a satisfactory level of residential amenity. For 1 to 2 storey development such as the single storey

bungalows proposed there should be 21m between habitable room windows on the public or street side of dwellings, 25m on the private or rear side of dwellings and 12m between habitable room windows and a blank elevation, elevation with non-habitable rooms or with high level windows. The proposed layout is such that the side and rear elevations of bungalows closest to the northern boundary will be positioned at least 26m from the nearest rear elevation of the houses on Chester Road extending to 65m at the furthest. The erection of bungalows in this position will not only ensure that the siting of the development significantly exceeds the privacy distances set out in the Council's SPD (12m between side and rear elevations and 25m between rear and rear elevations) but also that there will be no adverse impact on the amenities of these existing neighbouring occupiers.

An objector has questioned the need for chimneys given the location of the site within a smoke free zone and indeed the applicant advises that they are not functional but rather have been included as a means of adding interest to the appearance of the development. Given the siting of these chimneys from the adjacent houses on Chester Road, their relatively small projection above the proposed ridge height of 0.7m and their small width of 0.7m, it is not considered that they will appear visually obtrusive.

The siting of the bungalows in this location will also provide a buffer and degree of separation to these neighbouring occupiers from the higher development proposed to the south of the application site. The orientation of those to the east of the site with front elevations facing towards Verdon Roe Avenue will ensure that there is an appropriate response to the street scene thus providing visual interest and activity to this main route into the development.

There are instances across the proposed road within the development and between rear elevations where the siting of the proposed bungalows relative to each other is closer than that suggested in the Council's SPD 'Design of Residential Development' (9.5m across the street between front and side elevations facing each other vs 12m as required by the SPD and 15.5m between rear elevations vs 25m required by the SPD). As such this element of the development in terms of its layout will have a tighter, more close knit feel than that suggested as appropriate by the SPD. That aside, in terms of the amenity afforded to the future occupiers of the bungalows, noting that they are all single storey, of a low height and separated by solid fencing, it is not considered that the layout of the development will feel unduly cramped nor give rise to a loss of privacy or amenity. Noting also that to an extent future occupiers will buy in to the development or not and that the layout causes no harm to existing neighbouring occupiers, it is not considered that this element of the proposal will result in an unacceptable form of development.

The traditional design of these bungalows with projecting gables, hipped roofs and overhanging elements to porches is considered to be in keeping with the character of the Garden Village and wider Woodford area. Subject to the imposition of a condition to secure details of the materials of external construction, this element of the proposal accords with the parameters set out in the hybrid consent.

Each of the bungalows would be afforded a private rear garden. As these will be self contained dwellings it is appropriate to consider their amenity space provision in light of that for residential development. The Council's SPD 'Design of Residential Development' requires the provision of 75m² of amenity space for

small (2 to 3 bedroom) dwellings. The gardens of all the bungalows in the development accord with the requirement of the SPD and as such it is considered that the occupiers of the bungalows will be afforded an acceptable level of amenity.

To the south of the site it is proposed to erect a single building with 2 wings projecting northwards to accommodate 87 no. 1 and 2-bedroom extra care apartments. This will be a substantial 3 storey building rising 11.8m to the ridgeline. Being over 65m from the closest boundary with the existing houses on Chester Road with the proposed bungalows being positioned in between, it is not considered that the scale and layout of this building will cause harm to the amenities of these existing neighbouring occupiers.

The location of the apartment building to the south of the site reflects the scale of development previously approved as part of Phase D (DC072195 refers). Here, adjacent to the boundary with this current application site, are 4 single storey garage blocks beyond which are 2 no. 3 storey apartment buildings also rising to a height of 11.8m. The architectural approach proposed for the apartment building comprising projecting gables and balconies together with the use of chimneys and detailing all assist in breaking up the mass of what will be a large building to an acceptable degree. The ridge height at 11.8m high accords with the approved Design Codes and Building Heights plan noting that this makes allowance for landmark buildings to this part of the wider site up to a height of 12m in order to create define gateways, corners and frontages.

The orientation of this building with the 2 wings projecting northwards results in the east, side elevation facing Verdon Roe Avenue. This is an appropriate and acceptable response to the street scene noting the varied treatment of this elevation with projecting gables, balconies, chimneys and detailing afforded from a variety of materials.

The siting of this building is such that it will be positioned 3m to 11m from the southern boundary of the site with the adjacent phase 2D development. Phase 2D comprises a series of single storey garage courts adjacent to the boundary with the site accommodating the extra care development. The height of the extra care apartment building reflects the scale of the slightly higher apartments within Phase 2D immediately to the south (11.8m high) and in this respect is considered an acceptable response to this neighbouring development. The apartments on this adjacent site are positioned some 30m to 55m from that proposed in excess of the 28m separation suggested as appropriate by the SPD. On this basis it is not considered that the siting of the extra care development will give rise to a loss of amenity to these neighbouring occupiers.

To the west, the extra care apartment building will be positioned 1m to 29m from the boundary of the site. Beyond this boundary is an area of woodland that extends virtually the full length of this western boundary. The siting of the development in this respect causes no concerns.

The siting of the apartment building in relation to the proposed bungalows is generally acceptable noting that to a large extent the access to the apartments and car park will be positioned between the building and adjacent bungalows. The siting of the eastern wing 13m to 17.5m from the side elevation of the bungalow at plot 1 is in places closer than the 15m required by the Council's SPD. Noting however the staggered finish of this end elevation and position of the closer element, off set from the side elevation of plot 1, it is not considered

that this will result in an unacceptable impact of the future occupiers of this bungalow. Equally, the siting of the western wing 12m from the closest rear elevation of the proposed bungalow at plot 13 is 3m closer than that suggested by the SPD. Noting however that the end elevation of the apartment building would only extend across a small proportion of the rear garden to plot 13, it is not considered that the siting of the apartment building will be unduly overbearing, unneighbourly or visually obtrusive.

It is noted within the supporting information submitted with this application that the M profile of the roof to this apartment building with a central flat roof section in between the 2 parallel pitched roof elements will allow for the installation of solar panels to the south and east facing roof slopes and plant to the flat roofed section. No details of these works are currently included in the application however this can be secured by condition to ensure that they and any other plant proposed are of an appropriate size, siting and design and that any noise generated by the operation of that plant does not give rise to a loss of amenity.

In terms of amenity space provision, whilst proposing C2 extra care development, the apartments are self contained. As such, like the bungalows it is considered appropriate to assess amenity space provision having regard to that required for C3 residential accommodation. In this respect the Council's SPD for Design of Residential Development suggests that for each 1 bed apartment there should be 5sqm and/ or adequately screened communal amenity space with minimum provision of 18sqm per unit. For each 2 bed apartment there should be 35m² of communal amenity space.

Each 1 bed apartment will benefit from a private patio or balcony of at least 5m² thus complying with the SPD. With regard to the 2 bed apartments the main communal amenity space is proposed to the south, rear of the building. Here around 924m² of communal gardens will be accessed from private patios off the ground floor apartments and multiple doors in the ground floor bistro, lounge and multi purpose area. To the west, side elevation of the building a further, smaller area of amenity space is proposed, providing around 150m² and which would be accessed from a footpath to the north of the building and the private patios of the ground floor apartments to this wing. Noting that 43no. 2 bed apartments are proposed, to comply with the SPD 1505m² of amenity space is required. That totalling 1074m² falls short of that provision however noting that all of the 2 bed apartments will also benefit from a private patio or balcony, it is considered that this shortfall can be justified and that the occupiers of the apartments benefit from an acceptable level of amenity.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that subject to the imposition of conditions to secure details relating to materials of external construction together with that relating to the proposed solar panels and other plant, the development in terms of layout, appearance and scale accords with the parameters established through the grant of the hybrid consent, DC053832.

The consideration of accessibility within the development in terms of level access, lift access, internal layouts and the provision/position of accessible parking etc are welcome and will ensure that the development is inclusive and provides for the needs of residents and visitors alike. In this respect the proposal is compliant with Core Strategy policies CS3, H1, CS8 and SIE1.

Landscaping and Ecology

Core Strategy policy CS8 confirms that development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard will be given positive consideration. The Council will work with developers to protect, develop and enhance a network of high quality and multi functional green infrastructure to improve health and wellbeing, protect and connect existing and potential sites of nature conservation value, to protect and provide appropriate natural space to connect landscapes and allow wildlife movement and to mitigate the negative effects of climate change and support biodiversity. Development will be expected to make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of the Borough's natural environment and biodiversity. Sites and areas of identified ecological importance will be safeguarded. This is reiterated in CS policy SIE1 which requires specific regard to be had to appropriate landscaping and nature conservation features. Policy SIE3 confirms that the Borough's varying urban and rural landscapes and biodiversity combine to create a unique and distinctive local character of considerable value to residents. This locally distinctive sense of place and character will be maintained and enhanced. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancements will be identified and pursued. Planning applications should identify mitigation measures that keep disturbance to a minimum and provide alternative habitats to sustain at least the current level of population. Development proposals affecting trees, woodland and other vegetation which makes a positive contribution to amenity should make provision for the retention unless there is justification for its removal.

Submitted with the application are an ecological appraisal of the site, a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment together with a landscape masterplan. The latter has been amended since the first submission of the application to include the leylandii hedge to the northern boundary site into the proposals. In this respect this hedge will be retained and topped at 4m high with the branches to the application site side of the hedge trimmed back to allow for the erection of a 1.8m high weld mesh fence along this northern boundary. This should address the concerns of the neighbouring occupiers regarding the height and maintenance of this hedge.

Beyond this hedge and positioned between it and the rear garden boundaries of the proposed bungalows, additional trees and shrubs will be planted in the gaps between the existing trees to increase biodiversity and visual interest as seen from the newly created rear gardens. Tree species will include closely planted white stemmed birch amongst groups of dogwood, hazel and Guelder rose shrubs. The woodland along the western boundary of the site will be retained and deadwood and ivy will be removed from trees. Lower branches will be crown lifted to 2m in the immediate area adjacent to the wildlife hibernacula that it is proposed to create at the western extent of the cul de sac of bungalows.

Elsewhere the application proposes retention of tree planting where possible and the creation of new habitats and soft landscaped areas around and within the development including understorey woodland planting, native trees across the site, creation of wildflower areas and also native hedgerows at site boundaries. The application also proposes the provision of bat and bird boxes (12 sparrow terraces integrated within the new buildings, 11 bat boxes integrated into the new buildings, 5 bird boxes to be provided on retained trees and 5 bat boxes to be provided on retained trees). Within and adjacent to the site are 2 individual trees, 5 groups, and a single woodland area. These are generally positioned around the perimeter of the site. Sections of 3 small groups together with 1 group are proposed for removal to construct the bungalows and create the gardens to the proposed bungalows along with the trimming back and height management of

the leylandii hedge to the north boundary. None of these trees are legally protected nor considered worthy of such protection.

The landscape masterplan shows a high level of commitment to the landscaping of the site and replacement of that lost. In this respect and noting that the Tree Officer raises no objections it is considered that there will be significant gains to landscaping. Conditions can be imposed to ensure that no trees other than those identified for removal are felled, that protective fencing is installed during construction works and that detailed landscaping proposals (including size, species and density of locally native planting) are submitted for approval. Given also the scale of the proposed development and inclusion of a large amount of landscaping outside of private gardens, it is considered appropriate that a condition be imposed to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a landscape management plan. This will ensure that the landscaping of the site is maintained and managed in an appropriate manner going forward.

In terms of ecology it is noted that the surveys of the site that have been carried out are to the required level. No significance evidence of bat roosting potential has been identified and as such there is low risk of harm to bats. Conditions and informatives in relation to bats can be imposed as requested by the Council's ecologist as can that in relation to vegetation and waterbody clearance.

Subject to the imposition of a condition to secure Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) and a Method Statement detailing sensitive working measures, it is considered that there will be no harm to Great Crested Newts. A condition can also be imposed to secure a repeat ecological impact assessment of the site if development is not commenced by June 2023.

The provision of bat and bird boxes throughout the development is welcomed and the specification of them can be secured by condition as can that relating to the design of the proposed wildlife hibernacula and the management of the woodland (through a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) or similar). Whilst the planting of native hedgerows to demark plot boundaries is encouraged Members are advised that having regard to the acceptability of the proposals in all other respects to ecology and biodiversity, such provision could not be insisted upon. Notwithstanding this and as secured through other reserved matters approvals across the wider site occasional gaps at the base of any close-board fencing to maintain habitat connectivity through the site for wildlife can be secured by condition.

On the basis of the above the proposal is considered acceptable and policy compliant in relation to landscaping and ecology.

Access

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 and development will be required to consider the needs of the most vulnerable road users first (those being pedestrians). 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 notes 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.

Issues relating to the accessibility of the development and traffic generation have already been considered in the granting of the hybrid parent permission. The implementation of the planning permission with the improvements to accessibility secured by the S106 (such as highway improvements, bus services, cycle routes and improvements to rights of way) will ensure that the development in terms of its location is sufficiently sustainable. Elements of the hybrid approval that have yet to be delivered in terms of the commercial/retail floorspace will improve the accessibility of the development further still once constructed.

The Highway Engineer notes that extra care development was assessed at outline stage on the basis of 100 beds vs the 164 now proposed. Parking provision is also set at a level that reflects the extra care use such that in terms of traffic generation, the proposed development despite the increase in beds is not materially different to that considered at outline stage. On this basis it is considered that the level of traffic likely to be generated will not give rise to any adverse highway impact.

Each bungalow would have a single parking space with the apartments benefitting from a 52% provision overall. Noting the specialised nature of the accommodation proposed, the likely reduction in car ownership amongst occupants and having regard to experience from other similar developments, it is accepted that a parking ratio of around 50% is appropriate. Within the provision for the apartments is accessible parking and electric vehicle parking both of which accord with the Council's standards. The bungalows will also have charging for electric vehicles the details of which, like that for the apartments, will be secured by condition. A pick up/drop off area is proposed along with pedestrian crossing points. On this basis it is considered that the proposal incorporates an acceptable level of parking provision reflecting the nature of the development proposed and such that there will be no adverse impacts in relation to highway safety.

In terms of the highway layout, that proposed connects to Verdon Roe Avenue and in terms of its width and layout will be safe and practical to use. Acceptable vehicular and pedestrian access is secured with dedicated pedestrian routes for the apartments and a shared surface for the bungalows. This is considered appropriate having regard to the different scales of both elements of the proposals. Details of cycle storage for both the bungalows and the apartments can be secured by condition.

On the basis of the above the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of accessibility, parking and highway impacts and thus compliant with policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 of the Core Strategy DPD.

Other Matters

Core Strategy policy CS3 seeks to secure a mix of housing throughout the Borough in terms of tenure, price, type and size in order to meet the needs of new forming households, first time buyers, families with children, disabled people and older people. The provision of affordable housing to meet demand will be sought with the assistance of Stockport Homes and developments by other affordable housing providers. Policy H3 sets out the proportion of affordable housing that will be secured through planning applications.

The grant of the hybrid consent for this site (DC053832) secured a significant contribution to affordable housing through on site delivery and developer contributions. In this respect 15.5% of residential dwellings across all phases will be delivered as affordable units (143 dwellings out of a maximum of 920). In addition to this a minimum of 66 self contained affordable units were approved within the extra care development as part of Phase 2 (with a 50/50 mix between affordable rent and shared ownership). A contribution of £4.065m has also been made towards the provision of off site affordable housing.

In relation to Phase 2, the S106 requires the owner to submit to the Council on or before the commencement of Phase 2:

- An affordable housing scheme setting out the location, type and mix of affordable housing in a relevant phase provided always that the size of units, type of tenure and phasing will be based upon an up to date housing needs survey taking account of current market conditions. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented.
- An extra care units scheme setting out how the extra care units shall be delivered. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented.

In addition to this the S106 requires that on submission of any reserved matters application for any sub phase within phase 2 containing an affordable housing parcel, the owners will submit an affordable housing parcel plan as part of that reserved matters application. That parcel plan shall show where the affordable housing will be located.

In response to this Members are advised that an affordable housing scheme was submitted and approved prior to the commencement of Phase 2 in accordance with the S106. This scheme dated April 2017 provided detail on the location, type and mix of affordable housing units which would be delivered as part of Phase 2 but excluded those forming the extra care development as at that time, no operator for this housing had been identified. The absence of this element in the affordable housing scheme has however been rectified by this current reserved matters application which includes an affordable housing statement clarifying the location, type and mix of affordable housing model proposed through the extra care development.

In this respect, Members should note that the S106 attached to the hybrid consent requires of the extra care development, that there should be a minimum of 66 self contained units which are only to be available for use and occupied as affordable housing. The tenure mix will be 50% affordable rent and 50% shared ownership. The S106 defines affordable rent as being no more than 80% of local market rent. Shared ownership is defined as affordable housing where the occupier owns a share of the property and the remainder is owned by a registered provider; the occupier pays a rent and can purchase further shares up to 100%.

The affordable housing scheme submitted as part of this reserved matters application proposes 104 extra care units all of which will be delivered as affordable housing. In this respect the proposal accords with and significantly increases the amount of affordable housing secured in the S106 agreement. The provision of this much needed specialist affordable housing is welcomed and will make a significant contribution towards addressing need within the Borough. This

need is identified within the Stockport's Housing Needs Assessment 2019 and nationally is recognised in Planning Practice Guidance.

Of the 104 units proposed, 33 will be offered for affordable rent with the remaining 71 being shared ownership. Noting that the S106 requires a 50/50 split between affordable rented and shared ownership properties, the provision of 33 affordable rented units out of a total of 104 units equates to a 32% provision and the 71 shared ownership units a 68% provision. Notwithstanding this Members are advised that the S106 does allow the Planning Authority to agree a different tenure split.

In favour of the proposal it should be noted that the hybrid consent does not set a cap on the level of extra care provision. It does state however through the S106 that of that provision there will be a minimum of 66 affordable units with a 50/50 split between affordable rent and shared ownership. As part of this reserved matters application the applicant could therefore deliver 66 of the extra care units as affordable housing and the remaining 38 extra care units on the open market. Notwithstanding this ability, the applicant proposes to offer all 104 units as extra care affordable housing; whilst still delivering the 33 affordable rented dwellings, which being let at a charge below 80% of the market rate accords with the S106, this significantly exceeds the requirement for shared ownership and in turn the overall affordable housing provision set out in the S106 agreement.

In considering an alternative tenure split it is also important to understand how the affordable housing model in relation to shared ownership proposed by this application differs from the traditional model. Members will know that shared ownership allows buyers to purchase a share of a home, usually between 25% and 75%. Traditionally these purchasers will be first time buyers in housing need and on average/below average household incomes. They will pay a mortgage on the share that they own, and a below-market-value rent on the remainder to a housing association, along with any service charge and ground rent. As the purchaser only needs a mortgage for the share they own, the amount of money required for a deposit is often much lower compared to purchasing a property outright on the open market. Because of the limited buying power of these purchasers, the registered provider also has to discount the overall value of the properties to ensure that they are truly affordable. This level of discount is set by the Council having regard to household incomes and property prices.

Being extra care affordable housing, the shared ownership element proposed by this application is not aimed at first time buyers (as traditional shared ownership housing is) but rather the target market is older owner occupiers who are in need of residential accommodation with extra care. In Stockport between 75-80% of over 65s are owner occupiers, the vast majority of which want to remain as owner occupiers. As such there is a greater percentage of older owner occupiers in lower value properties than renters who will be in need of this type of affordable housing. The tenure split proposed by this application with approximately 70% of the units being provided as shared ownership rather 50% as set out in the S106 reflects that demographic.

Whilst these older owner occupiers will have equity tied up in the property that they own, this together with their income will not be sufficient to purchase a full open market product and the ongoing care they require (as extra care residential accommodation is more expensive than its mainstream equivalent due to the need for more extensive communal areas, accessibility features and larger room sizes etc). As such the only way owner occupiers of lower value properties can

access this accommodation with extra care is through affordable housing provision. Given the higher costs associated with such housing and target market, it is therefore not appropriate to apply the traditional approach to the delivery of shared ownership provision.

The model therefore proposed by the applicant is that these residents will be able to use the equity released by the sale of their existing property to fund the purchase of a percentage of a shared ownership property and the ongoing costs relating to care and then pay rent on the remaining element. The key benefits of this proposal are:

- Older residents with below average free equity will be able to purchase and live in accommodation more suited to their needs as they age.
- These residents are likely to be able to live independently longer than would be the case in traditional family accommodation.
- Living independently is significantly less costly to both the resident and the Council than living in a care home.
- The existing lower value open market, property would be released back to the market for purchase and occupation. As the existing property would be lower value and likely to be suitable for family occupation, this property would then be helping to address other significant identified housing needs within the Borough, that is for lower value family accommodation.

The applicant proposes to spread the discount required for 33 shared ownership dwellings by the Council's traditional model (£5.94m) over the 71 shared ownership properties proposed. Evidence obtained by the Council shows that notwithstanding this pro rata reduced discount, the properties will still be truly affordable to those older households with below average free equity who are unable to afford an open market product given their lack of mortgage to service and regular income afforded from pensions.

For the above reasons Officers are supportive of the affordable housing offer proposed by this application. Notwithstanding this it is acknowledged that the model proposed by the applicant is a departure for this Council and one on which additional information has needed to be submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that the shared ownership properties would still fall within the definition of affordable housing.

Having regard to this new approach together with the lack of reference to the extra care affordable housing within the affordable housing scheme previously submitted and approved prior to the commencement of phase 2, it is not considered unreasonable for the Council to now impose a condition requiring the implementation of the development in accordance with the affordable housing scheme submitted with this application. This follows the same approach in relation to the approval of the affordable housing schemes previously submitted in relation to phase 2 and reflects the obligation under the S106 of the applicant to implement the approved affordable housing scheme.

In addition to this, whilst the applicant has submitted evidence (which has been corroborated by the Council) to support their alternative approach to the delivery of shared ownership affordable housing and to demonstrate that the accommodation will remain affordable to those in need, noting that this alternative model has never been agreed by the Council before and as such is unprecedented, it is not considered unreasonable for a condition to also be imposed requiring the applicant to demonstrate at specified stages of the implementation of the development, that the level of discount they propose to

offer over the shared ownership element is actually being delivered. Such a condition would not require the applicant to deliver anything beyond that which they have confirmed in this application that they will deliver and as such does not impose any burden upon them. All that it would require of them is that they share with the Council, the total level of discount applied at various stages of the development so that the Council can be assured that the model is robust and appropriate for use in relation to other similar schemes going forward, and that the level of discount the developer has committed to provide is delivered in practice.

On this basis and for the above reasons it is considered that the affordable housing scheme submitted with this application is acceptable and compliant with the parent permission and CS policies CS3 and H3.

Submitted also with this reserved matters application is an extra care units scheme. Notwithstanding the requirement of the S106 that such a scheme be submitted on or before the commencement of phase 2, no such scheme was received by the Council. It is however noted that at the time phase 2 was commenced, an operator for the extra care scheme had not been identified. As such, it is accepted that at that point in time the details of the extra care units scheme would not have been known. Now that the operator has been appointed, this application seeking reserved matters approval for the extra care development includes the extra care units scheme required as part of the S106.

Noting that all of the extra care units will be affordable housing, this scheme reiterates much of the information set out above in relation to the delivery of affordable housing which it is not intended to repeat. Noting the acceptance of the affordable housing scheme, Members are advised that the extra care units scheme is also considered acceptable and compliant with the hybrid parent permission and Core Strategy policies CS2 and H3.

To fulfil their final obligation under the S106 agreement this application includes an affordable housing parcel plan showing where the affordable housing will be located. Noting that the entire development will comprise affordable housing it is considered also that this plan fulfils the applicant's obligation in respect of the S106 agreement.

In relation to the drainage of the site Members are advised that UDP Review policy EP1.7 will not permit development where it would be at risk of flooding; increase the risk of flooding; hinder access to watercourse; cause the loss of natural floodplains; result in extensive culverting; affect the integrity of flood defences or significantly increase surface water run-off. Core Strategy policy SD-6 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage the run off of water from the site through the incorporation of permeable surfaces and SuDS.

There is an established hierarchy to drainage which in order of priority is as follows:

- 1) discharge into the ground (infiltration); or where not reasonably practicable,
- 2) discharge to a surface water body; or where not reasonably practicable,
- 3) discharge to a surface water sewer, highway drain or other drainage system; or where not reasonably practicable,
- 4) discharge to a combined sewer.

Submitted with this reserved matters application is a Drainage Strategy which sets out the drainage proposals for this site and thus the discharge of the drainage conditions imposed on the hybrid parent permission (DC052832) through the corresponding discharge of conditions application (DC082051). This strategy confirms that:-

- An intrusive site investigation has shown that the site is overlain with varying thicknesses of made ground, under which the natural stratigraphy consists of stiff silty clay at shallow depths. The water table was recorded at relatively shallow depths (2m+). The topographic survey recorded standing water at ground level in the centre section of the site. Soakage testing was not carried out on the basis of poor anticipated results within the clay layers. On this basis, it is evident that discharge into the ground (Option 1) is not feasible.

- There is a watercourse (swale) adjacent to the site however this lies outside the site boundary and forms part of the strategic highway drainage for the adjacent public highway. There are no other watercourses within the site. It is therefore not possible to discharge to a surface water body (Option 2) hence this option is not feasible.

- There is however a surface water sewer in the adjacent public highway which has been designed to take the unrestricted flows from the Anchor Hanover development via two surface water spurs which extend into the site. The preferred solution is thus to connect to this surface water sewer (Option 3). Indeed, this is the confirmed solution as identified in the approved WSP Phase 2 and 3 Drainage Strategy as part of the overall site-wide development.

Surface water drainage for the site will be split into two networks, serving the northern and southern parts of the site. The bungalows in the north of the site will be drained by means of a private gravity network, discharging into a new demarcation chamber located on the site boundary. The apartment block to the south will also be drained by means of a private gravity network, discharging into a new demarcation chamber located on the site boundary. Both networks have been designed with free discharge at the outfalls. That for the apartment block does however require some on-site attenuation storage due to the limited capacity of the provided drainage spur from which the discharge flow rate will be controlled. Preliminary calculations indicate approx 70m³ of storage are required to cater for the critical 100yr +40% climate change storm without any flooding occurring on the site. Water quality issues and sustainable drainage will be addressed by the provision of permeable paving to the central parking areas, and petrol interceptors for the remainder of the road network.

This strategy has been considered by both the LLFA and United Utilities both of whom confirm their acceptance of it. It is noted that UU have requested further details in relation to levels within the site (manhole covers etc) and wish the planning authority to secure such details. In this respect they would wish to be consulted once the details are submitted for approval. Members are advised however that the LLFA are the ultimate authority on the drainage of the site and noting that they are accepting of the drainage strategy proposed, have confirmed that it meets the requirements of the drainage conditions imposed on the hybrid parent permission and do not consider that it is necessary to request further details either through this application or by the imposition of a condition, it is considered that the strategy is acceptable as submitted and that there is not sufficient justification to request additional details.

On the basis of the above, Members are advised that the proposal accords with policies EP1.7 and SD6.

The energy statement submitted with the application confirms that an improvement of at least 13% on Part L (2013) of the Building Regulations will be achieved by passive energy efficiency measures and the use of photovoltaic panels to produce on-site generation. Although alternative solutions such as solar hot water, biomass boilers, wind turbines and ground source heat pumps, none of these have proved feasible either for technical or amenity reasons. Notwithstanding this it is proposed to incorporate photovoltaics and air source heat pumps alongside a thermally efficient construction and energy saving measures. The photovoltaics will be positioned on the roof of the apartment building within the valley created by the M roof profile as well as on the roofs to the bungalows. Details of these installations in terms of their final size and design have not yet been provided however this can be secured by condition. On this basis the proposal is considered compliant with Core Strategy policy SD3.

The application is supported by a Crime Impact Assessment which has been considered by Greater Manchester Police. One of the objectors also raises the issue of the security of properties to the north of the site on Chester Road noting that the lack of any fencing to restrict access to the landscaped strip along this northern boundary would leave them vulnerable. This was also highlighted by GMP in their review of the proposals. In response to this the applicant advised that this northern boundary is made up of dense woodland and overgrown planting which impenetrable. As this is a deep area of planting they do not consider that additional fencing will be required in this area.

In this respect Members are advised that the northern boundary of the application site is currently formed by a well established leylandii hedge that rises up 9m in height. The application proposes that this will be reduced to 4m in height and that between it and the rear garden boundaries of the bungalows, extensive landscaping is proposed. As can be seen from the landscaping plan attached to this agenda, the landscaping of this belt will comprise the planting of a significant number of closely planted trees. In addition to this it is proposed that a 1.8m high weld mesh fence be erected along the application site side of the leylandii hedge for the entire length of the northern boundary. Whilst access into this belt of landscaping will not be restricted from its eastern end adjacent to Verdon Roe Avenue, it is considered that the nature and density of planting together with the protection afforded by the 1.8m weldmesh fence and existing leylandii hedge will ensure that the security of existing adjacent occupiers is not prejudiced.

In this context it is important to note that the recommendations made by GMP are to enable the development are a checklist to achieve their Secured by Design accreditation and to ensure that the development is as robust in terms of crime prevention as possible. Whilst this is a laudable aim, it does set a higher bar than necessary to be acceptable in planning terms. Noting the level and nature of landscaping proposed along this boundary together with the provision of a 1.8m high weld mesh fence along the leylandii hedge, it is considered that the security of these neighbouring occupiers will be safeguarded to an acceptable degree. On this basis it is not considered essential that this landscaped belt be enclosed to either end as well by further 1.8m high weldmesh fencing. On this basis the proposal is acceptable and will include measures to minimise opportunities for crime in compliance with Core Strategy policies H1, and SIE1.

In relation to pollution (contamination, noise and air), Core Strategy policy SIE-3 seeks to ensure a safe and satisfactory environment. Members are advised that surveys of the site have been carried out which have encountered no contamination of the soils. Gas protection measures are however required to ensure that the residential occupiers are not adversely affected by ground gases. As confirmed by the Council's EHO, on the basis of condition requiring the submission and approval of such measures together with a validation report assessing their effectiveness once installed, the development is acceptable in this respect.

With regard to noise and air pollution the main impact is likely to be that arising from the construction of the development however the submitted reports also assess the noise environment that future occupiers will be subjected to as well. Members are advised that given the scale of the development proposed, it is appropriate to manage the construction of the development through the imposition of a condition to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a construction management plan to ensure that noise and dust is contained to acceptable levels. Once complete and occupied, the development will also incorporate measures such as trickle ventilators and double glazing to windows as well as an appropriate external wall construction to ensure that future residents enjoy an acceptable living environment having regard to external noise. It is noted that external plant is proposed and that at present, no details of this or its impact on noise have been submitted for consideration. This is not unusual at this stage of consideration and such details can be secured by condition. On this basis the proposal accords with Core Strategy policy SIE-3.

Conclusions

Overall the scheme relating to the extra care development within Phase 2 for which reserved matters approval is sought is within the defined parameters agreed for the hybrid planning permission, there are no planning issues sufficient to warrant withholding permission, the proposal wholly accords with the prevailing policies of the Saved UDP Review, LDF Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework and represents sustainable form of development. Given that there are no material considerations to suggest otherwise; Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Paragraph 14 of the NPPF requires that the application be granted without delay subject to conditional control.

RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to conditions

BRAMHALL & CHEADLE HULME AREA COMMITTEE 10TH MARCH 2022

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Cllr Bagnall asked about the line of trees which the application states are outside of the application site; he thinks they are within the application site. The Planning Officer advised that the application had been amended and they are within the application site. They will be covered by the landscaping and management plan.

Cllr Bagnall also asked if we could maintain the height of this tree line by condition. The Planning Officer advises that this would be embodied within the landscape management plan.

Cllr Bagnall also asked if the chimneys are aesthetic or functioning and was advised that they are aesthetic.

Cllr Bagnall asked if the infrastructure for electric charging would enable more units to be installed at a later date. The Planning Officer advised that it was understood this would allow for expansion at a later date if required.

With regard to amenity space Cllr Bagnall sought clarification with regard to provision for the bungalows and apartments. The Planning Officer referred him to the report which addresses this.

It was also asked if permitted development rights would be removed like the rest of the garden village and was advised that in respect of the bungalows this would be the case.

Members heard representation from the applicant's agent who, amongst other matters, confirmed that 16 parking spaces would be provided with electric charging facilities and that this could be expanded in the future.

Cllr Bagnall asked the agent about the tree line running along the boundary of properties on Chester Road and asked if she was aware that there are 2 boundary lines there. The applicant responded however Cllr Bagnall commented that the boundary is past the line of trees with a gap. There have been issues before with establishing the boundary around the site and at present the rear of these properties can be accessed. Before this application goes to Planning & Highways this matter needs to be clarified as there may be a security risk which needs resolving.

Cllr Bagnall asked the agent about the chimneys and noted the views that residents benefit from. He asked if this could be discussed before the application went to Planning and Highways. The agent responded that she did not consider the removal of the chimneys to the bungalows as being necessary given their already low height and the distance from the houses on Chester Road. Any impact on the view would be minimal.

The Planning Officer commented that as the application has to go before Planning & Highways it would be useful to convene a meeting on site to discuss the issue relating to the boundary further. Cllr Bagnall agreed that this was a good idea. The agent advised that it is the intention to develop up to the boundary with houses on Chester Road and that it was not proposed to leave any strip in between. Notwithstanding that they would be more than happy to meet on site. Cllr Bagnall welcomed this.

The Planning Officer made further comment in relation to views afforded from neighbouring properties and reminded Members that no one has a right to a view over adjacent land. Prior to the redevelopment of this site there was a very substantial building that would have completely obscured any such views and that proposed would have much less of an impact. In addition to this Members were advised that the development proposed by this reserved matters application wholly accords with the parameters and building height plans approved by the original planning permission. Given the small size, height and width of chimneys to the bungalows and their low height, any interruption of views would not be unacceptable.

In commenting on the application Cllr Bagnall welcomed the affordable provision noting that it encompasses more than that set out in the hybrid consent. He welcomed the proposal to meet up on site to sort out the boundary treatment and stressed that he did not consider this an issue but rather that it needs clarifying. He would like conditions to secure a landscape management plan so that the height of the tree line to Chester Road can be controlled and he would like PD rights removed to the bungalows.

Members resolved to agree the recommendation subject to the boundary treatment being resolved and the conditions proposed by Cllr Bagnall. It was clarified that the site meeting proposed was not to be that by the visiting team of Planning & Highways but simply between the Planning Officer, Cllr Bagnall and the agent.