

ITEM 8

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Application Reference | DC/083939 |
| Location: | Fabrick 8 Warren Road Cheadle Hulme Cheadle SK8 5BT |
| PROPOSAL: | Erection of a block of apartments comprising nine 2-bed flats, with associated landscaping, car parking, bin & cycle store. |
| Type Of Application: | Full Application |
| Registration Date: | 18.01.2022 |
| Expiry Date: | 20220315 |
| Case Officer: | Jane Chase |
| Applicant: | Inspired Fabrick Ltd |
| Agent: | Bowker Sadler Architecture |

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Called up by Cllr Hunter.

Given the proximity of the development close to the boundary between Cheadle Hulme South and Cheadle Hulme North and the receipt of objections from residents within both Area Committees, the application is being referred to both Area Committees for comment, and then Planning & Highways Committee for determination.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a detached apartment building comprising 9no. 2 bed dwellings. The building would be positioned in the eastern corner of the car park to the residential development known as Fabrick (previously Sim Chem House). Being triangular in its footprint the building would measure up to 37.6m wide and up to 15.2m deep. 3 floors of accommodation are proposed with a flat roof over rising to a height of 10.2m. Photovoltaic panels are proposed to the flat roof.

The longest elevation of the building, that facing Fabrick, would accommodate a glazed entrance lobby at ground floor level with access to the ground floor apartments and stairwell access to those at first and second floor level. At first and second floor above would be external walkways giving access to the apartments at those levels enclosed to an extent by glass balustrading and perforated aluminium panels. The northern elevation facing towards the rear of houses on Lorna Grove would be largely blank other than 3 obscurely glazed windows (one at each level) serving living room/dining areas. At either end of this elevation would also be the side elevation of the balconies to 2 apartments at first floor level and 2 apartments at second floor level. The southern elevation facing the railway line and residential beyond would contain windows at all levels serving the apartments together with balconies at first and second floor level.

Externally, 9 parking spaces (including 2 electric vehicle charging points and 2 accessible spaces) are proposed to serve the development together with refuse stores, cycle storage and communal amenity space.

Aside from plans setting out the proposed development, the application is supported by a Design & Access Statement, Energy Statement, Drainage Strategy and Highways Technical Note.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located within the Cheadle Hulme District Centre and forms part of the surface level car park serving Fabrick, a development of 184 apartments. Within this car park are 136 parking space including 7 visitor bays accessed directly off Warren Road. The application site is positioned to the eastern extent of the car park and is roughly triangular in shape occupying a position along part of the north eastern and south eastern boundaries of the site.

Immediately to the west of the application site lies Fabrick, a substantial 6 to 7 storey building converted within the past 5 years from offices to apartments. The part of the building directly opposite the application site comprises 6 floors of accommodation with a flat roof above with the higher 7 storey wing being positioned to the south. Within this 6 storey elevation facing the application site are windows serving the apartments on all levels. Around this building (and from which the application site forms part of) is a large surface level car park serving this residential development which as existing comprises 136 parking spaces. To the north and north east of the application site is a surface level public car park accessed from Warren Road; beyond this are the rear gardens of houses on Lorna Road. To the south and south east is the mainline railway beyond which is a large 4 storey residential development.

The wider locality to the west comprises a mix of commercial, retail and residential uses within the District Centre. Here there is a mainline railway station and public car parks. This commercial character, beyond the public car park to the north east of the site changes to predominantly residential and it also does to the east and south east beyond the railway line.

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

EP1.7 Development and Flood Risk

L1.1 Land for Active Recreation

L1.2 Children’s Play

PSD2.5 Other Development in District Centres
MW1.5 Control of Waste from Development

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
AS1 The Vitality and Viability of Stockport’s Service Centres
CS8 Safeguarding and Improving the Environment
SIE-1 Quality Places
SIE-2 Provision of Recreation and Amenity Open Space in New Developments
SIE-3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment
CS9 Transport and Development
T-1 Transport and Development
T-2 Parking in Developments
T-3 Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network

Supplementary Planning Guidance

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.

Design of Residential Development
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.60 “To support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.”

Para.64 “Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments.”

Para.69 “Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should..... support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes;”

Para.86 “Planning policies and decisions should support the role that town centres play at the heart of local communities, by taking a positive approach to their growth, management and adaptation. Planning policies should..... define a network and hierarchy of town centres and promote their long-term vitality and viability – by allowing them to grow and diversify in a way that can respond to rapid changes in the retail and leisure industries, allows a suitable mix of uses (including housing) and reflects their distinctive characters; recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites.”

Para.98 “Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change.”

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

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

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

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 46; and*

d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.”

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

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

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

Para.119 “Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.”

Para.120 “Planning policies and decisions should:

- a) encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;*
- c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;*
- d) promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure).”*

Para.124 “Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

- a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;*
- b) local market conditions and viability;*
- c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;*
- d) the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and*
- e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.”*

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.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."

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

- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life."

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

DC/063865 – Sim Chem House. Prior approval for change of use from Office (Class B1 (a) to dwellinghouse (Class C3). Prior Approval Not Required 2017

DC/065630 - Sim Chem House. Confirmation that the lawful use of Sim Chem House is B1(a) Offices and as such, the change of use to C3 Residential is permitted by Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Granted 2017

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The application has been advertised by way of a site notice. The occupiers of 275 properties have also been notified in writing.

15 letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:-

- Increased traffic congestion on Warren Road especially at peak times.
- Lack of parking on street and within the development which as existing causes overspill along nearby residential streets. This will be worsened as a result of the development.
- Loss of parking to the existing flats. Some existing leaseholders have specifically chosen the car park spaces which they hold lease agreements for, these spaces were chosen as they have a direct line of sight from their apartments, the proposed site plan indicates that the developer plans to replace these 'owned' spaces, with spaces for the new building - the developer does not hold the leasehold agreements for the spaces they plan to replace.
- The existing building only has 6 guest spaces at the front of the building, these spaces are always at full capacity, with the addition of 9 new apartments to the site, guest parking will not be adequate.
- Adverse impact on air quality from additional traffic.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to houses on Lorna Road.
- Overbearing to houses on Lorna Road.
- Loss of light to existing flats in Fabrick.
- Loss of privacy to existing flats in Fabrick.
- Loss of views from existing flats in Fabrick and a loss of visual amenity.
- Increased noise from the occupation of the proposed flats.
- Loss of light to properties on Lorna Road.
- The proposed development has an industrial appearance to it rather than a welcoming residential appearance.
- Due to general poor drainage via clay soil in Cheadle Hulme and lowered ground on Lorna Road the gardens are commonly waterlogged which will be adversely affected by having less direct light and heat.
- Additional bin storage rubbish has potential for additional vermin
- Lack of GP surgeries and schools to service more residential development.
- Impacts of the construction works in relation to noise, traffic and obstruction within the site.
- Reduction in property values.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Highway Engineer - In response to concerns regarding level of parking provided with the development a parking survey was undertaken the scope of which was previously agreed with Officers. This demonstrates that whilst the development would result in a loss in available spaces, that there would be spaces left for 100% parking for occupiers of the development. Given the location of the development and accessibility to local amenities and public transport the proposed development is judged to provide an acceptable level of parking.

The level of traffic generated by the development remains less than that from the historical site use and therefore raises no concerns regarding impact on the operation of the local highway.

The existing vehicular access is reused.

A cycle store is to be provided.

Two vehicle charging points are provided for the 9 apartments. Further details of the equipment to be provided and of future-proofing of the development is required and I recommend that this be secured by condition attached to any approval.

Given the potential impact of the construction works on adjacent premises I recommend that a construction method statement be submitted and assessed before commencement.

No objection subject to conditions.

LLFA - Infiltration has been discounted from a desk top assessment which would need to be confirmed during detailed design. They are discharging 50% brownfield to the watercourse which should be ok subject to confirmation of ground conditions. There is no indication with respect to source control. The strategy is acceptable in principle subject to resolution of the above which could be controlled by conditions.

United Utilities - Following our review of the submitted Drainage Strategy, we can confirm the proposals are acceptable in principle to United Utilities and therefore should planning permission be granted we request a condition is attached to any subsequent decision notice requiring compliance with the drainage strategy submitted with the application prior to the occupation of the development and to ensure that no surface water will drain directly or indirectly into the public sewer. The approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Planning Policy (Energy) - The energy statement for this development is in broad compliance with the Core Strategy Policy SD3 showing evidence of consideration of low / zero carbon technologies for their technical feasibility, however no costs have been explored.

The statement suggests that solar photovoltaics are a feasible technology for use on the roof of this development, however no commitment has been made to deliver this technology as part of the development. I suggest that the use of a modest array of solar photovoltaics is explored further by the developer, to offset electricity used in the communal and external areas i.e. for lighting, intercoms and other electrical equipment. The cost of panels has become increasingly affordable in recent years. This will help to offset electricity used by future residents of the development and thus further reduce CO2 emissions and energy bills. This is not a policy requirement,

but should not be costly to implement and may have benefits when marketing the scheme to future residents or investors.

Please be aware that building regulations standards are changing on 15 June 2022. Uplifts to Part L & Part F of the Building Regulations have set new minimum standards for fabric efficiency and energy efficiency, and a new Part O and Part S have been introduced. Under the new regulations, carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from new build homes must be around 30% lower than previous standards. It is the responsibility of the developer to comply with relevant building regulations standards. New SAP calculations may be required as a result of the new requirements. Developers should contact their architect or a building control body for more advice.

A commitment to a “fabric first” approach, coupled with sustainable technology, will help to ensure 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.

ANALYSIS

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (para10). Para 11 of the NPPF reconfirms this position and advises that for decision making this means:-

- approving developments that accord with an up to date development plan or
- where the policies which are most important for the determination of the application are out of date (this includes for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing), granting planning permission unless:
 - the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of importance provides a clear reason for refusing planning permission or
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

In this respect, given that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing, the relevant elements of Core Strategy policies CS4 and H2 which seek to deliver housing supply that are considered to be out of date. There are no assets or areas of importance material to the consideration of this application so that being the case, the tilted balance as referred to in para 11 of the NPPF directs that permission should be approved unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This assessment is set out below.

Housing Delivery

In terms of housing need, the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirement. The supply of specific deliverable sites should in addition include a buffer of 20% where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply.

In response to this it should be noted that the Council is in a continued position of housing undersupply and only has a 2.6 year supply vs the 5 year supply plus 20% as required by the NPPF. Having regard to this continued undersupply it is important that the development potential of sites are explored to their maximum potential subject to there being no adverse impact on the locality and amenity.

The NPPF at para 119 confirms that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes while safeguarding the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Para 124 confirms that planning decision should support development that makes efficient use of land taking into account several factors including the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting and the importance of securing well designed and attractive places. Where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing need it is especially important that policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. Local planning authorities should refuse planning applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land (para 125).

Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that a wide range of homes are provided to meet the needs of existing and future Stockport households. The focus will be on providing housing through the effective and efficient use of land within accessible urban areas.

Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy directs new residential development towards the more accessible parts of the Borough identifying 3 spatial priority areas (Central Housing Area; Neighbourhood Priority Areas and the catchment areas of District and Large Local Centres; and other accessible locations). This policy confirms that the focus is on making effective use of land within accessible urban locations with the priority for development being previously developed land in urban areas.

Core Strategy policy CS3 confirms that developments in accessible suburban locations may be expected to provide the full range of houses from terraced properties to large detached and should contain fewer flats. Within District Centres housing densities of 70 dwellings per hectare (dph) is commonplace.

The provision of housing on this brownfield site in the District Centre with good access to services and public transport is therefore welcome in principle and the proposals comprising 9 apartments would assist in addressing this undersupply. The proposal is therefore compliant with policies CS2 and CS4.

The density of the development equates to 100 dwellings per hectare. Noting the location of the site within a District Centre where higher density development is expected to be located, that proposed accords with the aims of the Development Plan and NPPF. Notwithstanding this, the consideration of density is not simply the application of a numerical figure and regard also has to be paid to the impact of the development upon the character of the area, amenities of existing and future occupiers together conditions of highway safety. Subject to a satisfactory assessment in this respect (set out below), the density may be considered acceptable and in generally in compliance with policy CS3.

Impact on the Character of the Area

Policy H1 of the Core Strategy confirms that development should be of a high quality, respond to the character of the area within which they are located and provide for good standards of amenity. This is reinforced in Core Strategy policy CS8 which welcomes development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard

and which makes a positive contribution to a sustainable, attractive, safe and accessible built and natural environment. Policy SIE-1 of the Core Strategy also confirms that development which is designed to the highest contemporary standard, paying high regard to the built/and or natural environment within which it is sited, will be given positive consideration. Specific regard should be paid to the use of materials appropriate to the location and the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings (particularly with regard to height, density and massing of buildings).

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

Planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; 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); establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development.

The Council's SPD 'Design of Residential Development' sets out a clear indication of the Council's expectations and helps the Council make consistent decisions on planning applications in relation to residential developments.

The application site and surrounding locality is dominated by the mass of Fabrick. Rising up to 7 storeys high and extending for a total length of circa 100m it is an imposing building in the District Centre and in views from outside of the Centre looking in. The recent elevational alterations associated with the conversion of the building have significantly enhanced its appearance and the contribution that it makes to the character of the locality. To the west of the site lie lower and smaller scale commercial developments within the District Centre, the south is the mainline railway line beyond which is a 4 storey retirement living development. To the north/north east is a surface level car park beyond which are 2 storey semi detached houses on Lorna Road (outside of the District Centre and within a Predominantly Residential Area).

The proposed development would be positioned within the car park serving Fabrick and in aspects from the north, looking along Warren Road towards the railway line, from the north east as seen from the gardens of houses on Lorna Road and from the south east, from the retirement development on the other side of railway line, it would be viewed in the context of this substantial and tall building. In terms of scale the development seeks to present a transition between the 6 storey mass of Fabric

on this part of the site and the lower 4 storey height of the retirement development and 2 storey residential properties on Lorna Road.

The design approach utilises contemporary detailing and materials along with a flat roof. The elevation facing Fabrick would be stepped to afford access to the ground floor and upper floor apartments. The ground floor would be mainly enclosed with glazing to the enclosed entrance lobby. Above, the access deck to the apartments at first and second floor level would be semi enclosed by perforated aluminium panels and 1.1m high glass balustrades to afford and light and ventilation to this communal area. To either end of this elevation are rendered elements. The elevation facing Lorna Road would be largely blank and also finished in render. Here are limited openings comprising only 3 windows (one at each level) and glass balustrades to the 2 balconies at upper level (one at each level). Finally, the elevation facing towards the railway line and retirement development would be stepped and largely finished in glazing albeit broken up with vertical rendered panels and horizontal cladding.

Noting the height, massing and character of existing development on and adjacent to this site, it is considered that the proposed development presents an appropriate response. The development will be largely viewed in the context of Fabrick and the materials and detailing proposed will reflect that of this existing building thus tying the two together in terms of their appearance and form. The height of the development being significantly lower than that of Fabrick acknowledges the presence of this building however provides a transition to the lower 2 storey residential development on Lorna Road whilst at the same time reflecting that of the retirement development to the other side of railway.

Externally tree planting is proposed to the northern corner of the building. To the north east elevation facing Lorna Road and south east elevation facing the railway line, 1m high pre planted fencing is proposed to enclose the private terraces of the ground floor apartments which themselves would be planted with a variety of shrubs. Beyond these areas a communal amenity space is proposed running alongside the boundary with the railway line. This area would soft landscaped mainly in grass but with a native hedge planted to the boundary.

The provision of such landscaping will assist in softening the appearance of the development as well as enhancing its setting. Currently views from the north east and south east are dominated by hardsurfacing, parked cars and the bulk of Fabrick. Whilst being proposed in the context of additional built development, the provision of soft landscaping is welcome and will enhance the visual qualities of the area.

For the above reasons, the proposal in terms of its impact on the character of the area is considered acceptable and compliant with policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 of the Core Strategy along with advice contained within the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Core Strategy policy H1 confirms that good standards of amenity and privacy should be provided for the occupants of new and existing housing. This is reinforced by policy SIE1 which confirms that satisfactory levels of amenity and privacy should be maintained for future and existing residents. The NPPF confirms that development should create places that promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The layout of the development and its impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers has been considered in the context of advice contained within the Council's Supplementary Design Guidelines 'Design of Residential

Development' with regard to the siting, height and relationship of the development with neighbouring properties. In this respect, noting the 3 storey nature of the proposal there should be a distance of 28m on the private or rear side of dwellings and 15m between habitable room windows and a blank elevation or elevation with non-habitable rooms and 9m between habitable room windows and the site boundary. Compliance with these standards should ensure that an unacceptable impact in relation to residential amenity does not occur. In the first instance it should be noted that the main aspect afforded from the proposed development is to the south east, towards the retirement development on the other side of the railway line. That facing Fabrick contains the entrances to the apartments and that facing Lorna Road is largely blank.

As noted above, the eastern elevation of Fabrick contains windows to the apartments on all levels. The proposed western elevation facing Fabrick would be positioned 15.2m from the facing elevation of Fabrick at its closest (to the south of the proposed building) increasing to 20.2m at its furthest point (to the north of the proposed building). The only openings to this elevation would be those to the communal lobbies, the front doors and lobbies to the apartments and to the post and parcel room, stores and plant rooms. None of these openings are to habitable rooms and thus the siting of this elevation 15.2m to 20.2m complies with and exceeds the 15m required by the Council's SPD. It should also be noted that many of these openings are positioned within the enclosed entrance lobby at ground floor level and the semi enclosed access deck at first and second floor level and thus are further from the facing elevation of Fabrick as set out above.

Notwithstanding compliance with and exceedance of the space standards set out in the SPD, it is proposed that the windows to the lobbies of the apartments at the southern end of the building would be fitted with obscure glass. The ground floor lobby window to plot 3 which in any event is in a position relative to Fabrick exceeding the standards set out in the SPD, will have a cill level circa 1.6m above ground level which is likely to limit views to Fabrick.

The only other openings to this elevation are the 2 balconies at the northern corner of the building (one at first floor, one at second floor). These balconies are small in size (4m²) and triangular in shape; as such this will restrict their use in terms of positioning any furniture upon them for sitting out. Having regard to this and noting their position over 20m from the facing elevation of Fabrick, it is not considered that they would afford unacceptable levels of overlooking to the neighbouring occupiers.

In terms of impact on visual amenity, Members are advised that neighbouring occupiers do not have a 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.

Clearly that proposed will change the outlook for neighbouring occupiers. From within Fabrick those on the ground to second floor will be facing the proposed west elevation. Whilst this is clearly a wide elevation, it is articulated in such a way as to add interest and is staggered such that it is not a single elevation but rather benefits from recesses and projections. Given the compliance with the space standards in the SPD thus indicating that there will not be an unacceptable impact on amenity in relation to privacy, it is also considered that the development will not be overbearing or result in a loss of visual amenity.

In terms of loss of light, the existing elevation of Fabrick facing the proposed development has an easterly aspect. As such it is expected that due to the undeveloped nature of the adjacent application site and that of the adjoining car park beyond the site to the north east, occupiers of these apartments will enjoy direct sunlight in the morning only with the sun tracking behind Fabrick as the day progresses. Being directly to the east of these apartments, the proposed development will obscure sunlight to the lower levels at times in the morning although it is expected that for a period mid to late morning where sunlight is able to penetrate the space between that existing and proposed from the south, there will be no impact. It is also noted that from late morning, early afternoon as the sun tracks behind Fabrick to the west, there will be no impact on sunlight beyond that existing.

With regard to the potential impact on properties on Lorna Road it is noted that these properties are separated from the application site by a car park accessed from Warren Road that runs along the north eastern boundary of the application site. The proposed 3 storey building would be positioned 15.2m from the rear garden boundary of these houses and 29m from the rear elevation of the closest house. The north east elevation facing these houses would be largely blank save for three windows, one at each level, all of which would be obscurely glazed. Views from these windows would therefore be restricted and not give rise to the overlooking of properties on Lorna Road.

Plots 6 and 9 at first and second floor level have 2 balconies each (1 to the north corner of the building and 1 to the south east elevation facing the railway line) all of which would be positioned side on to properties on Lorna Road. The balconies to the north corner would be positioned 15.2m from the closest rear garden boundary on Lorna Road and 29m from the rear elevation of the nearest house. The balconies to these plots on the south east elevation facing the railway are positioned even further away being 17.4m from the rear garden boundary of houses on Lorna Road and 33m from the closest rear elevation.

The Council's SPD offers no advice with regard to the separation of balconies from adjacent habitable room windows however given that these distances are in excess of what would be an appropriate in the Council's SPD between directly facing habitable room windows (28m), it is not considered that they will give rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy to properties on Lorna Road.

The remaining balconies to first and second floor level in the south east elevation facing the railway are to plots 4, 5, 7 and 8. Those to plots 5 and 8 are enclosed to the side by solid walls. As such it will not be possible to secure views of properties on Lorna Road unless users hang over the balustrades enclosing the balconies. Given that such an action is not typical of normal use and noting that these balconies are even further away from Lorna Road (21m to the rear garden boundary and 39m to the closest rear elevation), it is not considered that their use will give rise to the overlooking of properties on Lorna Road. Those at plots 4 and 7 whilst not enclosed are even further still from Lorna Road and the footprint of these balconies is such that views from them towards Lorna Road will be obscured by the proposed building itself.

Given the degree of separation not only from the rear garden boundary of properties on Lorna Road but from the properties within those plot, it is not considered that the proposed development will appear visually obtrusive or overbearing when viewed in the context of the significantly larger building behind. Given also the height of Fabrick

and the position of the development relative to that building, it is not considered that there will be a loss of light arising from that proposed to properties on Lorna Road.

With regard to the impact upon properties to the south east of the application site, the closest neighbouring development here is the retirement living on the other side of the railway line. The proposed development will at its closest, be positioned over 43m from these neighbouring apartments extending to 51m. Even allowing for the fact that the aspect from the proposed development is directed towards this neighbouring development, given the degree of separation which significantly exceeds the suggested 28m in the Council's SPD, it is not considered that a loss of privacy or visual amenity will arise. Being to the north of these neighbouring occupiers the proposed development will have no impact in terms of loss of light.

Finally it should be noted that whilst the land to the north east of the application site is used currently as a car park, the proposed development should be of such a form and siting that it would not stifle the redevelopment of this adjacent site should it ever be proposed. It should also be ensured that the amenities afforded from the proposed development are not reliant upon adjacent land remaining in an open use. Noting that the proposed development is mainly orientated towards the railway line, it is considered generally acceptable in this respect. It is however noted that 3 windows would face the boundary with this adjacent site and that they would be positioned 3m from the boundary with it. The Council's SPD advises that for 3 storey development there should be a separation of 9m between habitable room windows and the site boundary; this is mainly to ensure that an unacceptable overlooking of adjacent sites does not occur. Given that these windows are to be obscurely glazed and noting that the main aspect is towards the south east, it is concluded that there will not be overlooking of this site. Furthermore, it is considered that users of these rooms will have limited reliance on these side facing windows in terms of affording them an acceptable level of amenity because of their obscure glazing and the orientation of the main aspect. As such, were development ever proposed on this adjacent site, it is not considered that the development currently proposed would stifle or prejudice it.

It is noted that objections have been made on grounds of increased noise and disturbance through the construction of the development as well as through its occupation. Given the nature of the proposed development and proximity to neighbouring occupiers, particularly those within Fabrick, the imposition of a condition requiring a construction management plan will satisfactorily address such concerns. This would be required to detail hours of construction, parking for contractors, deliveries of materials, welfare facilities etc. In terms of the occupation of the development, a residential development would not generate levels of noise and disturbance sufficient to cause harm to other residential occupiers. Noting also the location of the site within a District Centre where background levels are higher than in other more wholly residential parts of the Borough, such objections cannot be sustained.

Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development represents a change for many of the neighbouring occupiers, it is concluded for the above reasons that an unacceptable impact will not arise. As such the proposal is considered to be compliant with policies H1 and SIE1 of the Core Strategy and advice given within the NPPF.

The consideration of amenity also extends to the future occupiers of the site. The main issues in this respect apart from the siting of the building relative to neighbouring occupiers to ensure an acceptable level of privacy (and which is dealt

with above) is amenity space provision and the quality of the internal environment in relation to noise and vibration from the adjacent railway line.

Comprising 9 no. 2 bed apartments, to accord with the Council's SPD there should be a provision of 315m² of communal amenity space (35m² per apartment). The application proposes circa 110m² in the form of a landscaped communal garden. In addition to this each of the ground floor apartments would have a private garden area (circa 55m² to plot 1, 43m² to plot 2 and circa 39m² to plot 3). All the other apartments would have private balcony space (4m² to plots 4 and 7, 7.5m² to plots 5 and 8 and 2 balconies each to plots 6 and 9 totalling circa 8m² each).

Clearly the communal provision significantly less than suggested as appropriate by the SPD. There are however considered to be factors that justify a reduced provision in this respect. Officers would argue that urban and suburban commercial locations such as this are precisely those which should be considered as an exception. In these locations where higher density developments are encouraged not just by the Council's Core Strategy but also by Government guidance in the form of the NPPF, it would stifle the development potential of sites, if rigid adherence with the SPD to the same level as considered appropriate in rural areas, were expected. In this instance, whilst the proposed development is deficient having regard to the standards in the SPD, all residents will have access to some outdoor amenity space which is capable of being put to meaningful use.

This approach has been accepted with regard to other developments within the District Centre such as that at the former Butterworth's Bakery on Mellor Road where there is a reduced provision and at the former Lerryn House on Warren Road where there is no provision. Fabrick immediately adjacent to the application site has the benefit of a roof garden however this does not meet the full requirement of the SPD (although it is accepted that the conversion of this building did not require express planning permission being permitted development).

It should also be noted that in considering appeals against the refusal of planning permission, Inspectors routinely have regard to the proximity of sites to areas of public open space. In this respect the site is within 200m of the park on Station Road (Oak Meadow) which would afford future residents amenity in addition to that proposed within the development.

With regard to noise, Core Strategy policy SIE3 seeks to ensure the creation of successful communities such that future occupiers are not subject to unacceptable levels of noise or vibration. Being positioned adjacent to a railway line, the development should be constructed such that levels experienced by those occupying the development are managed to an acceptable level. This matter is typically considered by way of a noise and vibration assessment. In this location this consideration would not go to the heart of whether permission should be approved or refused and as such, noting the lack of an assessment in this respect in the current submission, a condition could be imposed to secure such details prior to the commencement of any above ground development.

For the above reasons and subject to the imposition of a condition requiring a noise and vibration impact assessment together with the provision of appropriate mitigation measures within the construction of the development, it is considered that the proposal will provide the future occupiers with an acceptable level of amenity. The proposal therefore accords with policies H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 of the Core Strategy DPD.

Highways and Parking

Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 all seek to ensure that development is in accessible locations and those which reduce the need to travel by car will be supported. To facilitate this reduction, development will be focussed on the existing centres as these are the most accessible and already provide a wide range of services and amenities. New development that will generate significant numbers of trips will be required to be sustainably accessible by public transport, cycling and walking. Development should provide parking (car and cycle) in accordance with the Council's standards. Developers will need to demonstrate that developments will avoid resulting in inappropriate on street parking that has a detrimental impact on highway safety and that they also avoid impacting negatively on the availability of public car parking. Development should be of a safe and practical design with safe and well designed access arrangements, internal layouts and parking.

The NPPF at Chapter 9 confirms that in considering applications it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be or have been taken up given the type of development and its location. Safe and suitable access to the site should be achieved for all users. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. 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.

In response to that policy position, the principle of residential development in a District Centre location is clearly acceptable as residents will have convenient access to public transport services, access to services and amenities and opportunities to walk and cycle to access such. The site is in a sustainable location and is considered suitable for residential development consistent with policies CS9 and T1 of the Core Strategy.

In terms of traffic generation there is no concern with regard to the provision of 9 additional apartments especially when regard is had to the former office use of the site which was of a far greater intensity in traffic terms. It should also be noted that the overall parking provision within the wider site will be reduced by 28 spaces to 108 spaces (including the provision of 9 spaces to serve the proposed development). Even allowing for a small increase in traffic movements to and from the site in relation to deliveries and visitors, it can still be concluded that there will be a reduction in traffic from that which historically existed and which currently exists. The proposed development is not of a scale nor in a location where an air quality assessment would be required. On this basis objections relating to traffic congestion and an increase in air pollution cannot be sustained.

In terms of parking provision the application needs to demonstrate that sufficient parking will be retained to satisfactorily accommodate the demand generated by the occupation of Fabrick and that sufficient parking is provided to serve that proposed (subject to not exceeding the Council's maximum standards). As Members will be aware the Council's parking standards are maximum standards and require up to 2 parking spaces per dwelling. It is however accepted that apartment living can result in reduced demand for parking compared with houses and that in accessible locations such as this, there is a case to be made for not requiring parking up to the maximum standard noting that such locations are attractive to those who do not or chose not to have a car on account of their public transport connections and proximity to services.

Notwithstanding that position, the applicant has been asked to demonstrate that the amount of car parking proposed relative to the overall number of residential units that would be on the site will be adequate and will not lead to overspill parking problems and consequent highway operation and safety concerns. In this respect the applicant was advised to undertake surveys of the existing car park in terms of the exact number of parking spaces within the site and clarity on the number of residential units and level of occupancy of the site with the level of parking recorded every 30 minutes. The applicant was advised to carry out 2 parking surveys in accordance with the Council's guidance on car parking surveys for new development, on weekdays between 06:00-10:00 and one on a Sunday between 18:00-22:00 and outside of school holidays.

These parking surveys have been undertaken and were conducted on Sunday 12th September 2021, between 18:00-22:00, and on Tuesday 14th September 2021 and Thursday 16th September 2021, between 06:00-10:00. The parking survey covered all 136 on-site parking spaces associated with the existing 184 apartments, although it should be noted that only 183 apartments were occupied on the date of surveys. Having regard to this, the parking survey data has been factored up in order to identify the estimated demand of the Fabrick site when fully occupied. The peak parking demand occurred on Thursday 16th September 2021 at 06:00, whereby 98 spaces were occupied and 38 spaces were available. Noting the vacancy of one apartment this was rounded up to a peak parking demand of 99 spaces with the site fully occupied, resulting in 37 spaces available.

From this it is noted that the full occupation of Fabrick as existing gives rise to the use of 99 out of the 136 spaces available with 37 spaces being available at all times; this equates to a 72% demand for parking. This reflects the view expressed above that car ownership of those living in apartments in locations such as this is typically lower than that associated with dwellings located further from designated centres. Of these available spaces, the proposed development will result in the loss of 28 spaces leaving 9 for use by the residents of the 9 apartments proposed by this application. Despite the loss of existing parking proposed by this application, it is clear from these surveys that the proposed development will not extinguish spaces that are used by the existing residents. Furthermore, noting the 72% demand arising from the existing occupation of Fabrick, it is considered that a 100% provision for the proposed development will deliver sufficient parking to cater for demand arising from that occupation.

Based on the above evidence it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed development retains sufficient parking to satisfactorily accommodate the demand generated by the occupation of Fabrick and incorporates sufficient parking to accommodate the likely demand from that proposed. Noting that the Council's standards are maximum standards and thus allow for a reduced provision depending on the location and nature of development proposed, it is considered that a 74% parking provision for the site as a whole is appropriate and can be accommodated without unacceptable impact on highway operation and safety by virtue of likely overspill parking.

The Council's standard also require the provision of accessible parking spaces (minimum 10% provision), cycle parking (1 per dwelling minimum) and electric vehicle charging points (16% based on likely date of occupation). That proposed with the exception of the cycle parking which provides for 8 spaces not 9, complies with the adopted standards. Notwithstanding this slight shortfall in cycle parking provision, noting that no details of this facility have been provided, other than it being indicated on the site layout, it is considered that this can be rectified by the imposition of a

condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of details to secure 9 cycle parking spaces. A condition can also be imposed to secure details of the electric charging points as well as that relating to the marking out of the parking spaces.

For the above reasons the proposal is considered compliant with Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 together with advice contained within the NPPF.

Other Matters

Saved UDP Review policies L1.1 and L1.2 together with Core Strategy policy SIE2 and the supporting SPD (Open Space and Commuted Sum Payments) confirm that there is an under provision of children's play and formal recreation in the Borough compared with the resident population. Residential developments are therefore expected to make provision for such facilities either on site (if they are large enough to accommodate) or by way of a commuted sum payment calculated in accordance with the formula set out in the SPD. The development proposed on account of the nature of the site would be expected to make provision in this respect by a commuted sum payment secured by S106 in the event that planning permission is approved. Subject to the completion of a S106, the proposal would be compliant with this policy position.

The application site is not identified on the UDP Proposals Map as being in an area liable to flood and the Environment Agency identify the site as being within Flood Zone 1. Having regard to the size of the site and scale of the proposed development there is no requirement for the application to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. Notwithstanding this, policy SD6 requires all development to be designed in such a way as to avoid, mitigate or reduce the impacts of climate change. In this respect development is required to incorporate sustainable drainage systems so as to manage run off water from the site. Given the small scale of the proposed development, compliance with this policy is not required to be demonstrated at this stage, however, in the event that planning permission is approved at later date a condition would require the submission and approval of a SUDS compliant drainage scheme for the site.

Policy SD3 requires development to demonstrate how it will assist in reducing carbon emissions through its construction and occupation through the submission and approval of an energy statement. The statement correctly notes that comprising nine flats, the development does not trigger Stockport's carbon reduction policy target thresholds; the dwelling will however be built to exceed the minimum current Part L Building Regulations. Notwithstanding the comments of the Planning Policy Officer, the provision of photovoltaic panels is shown on the roof plan. Further details of these in terms of their installation and projection above the flat roof can be secured by condition. On this basis the proposal is in accordance with policy SD3.

In response to objections not addressed above Members are advised accordingly:

The allocation of specific parking spaces within the existing development is a private matter between the landlord and tenants. Noting that the level of parking provision is considered acceptable it is not a matter in which the Local Authority would have interest or would intervene.

The provision of refuse storage is essential in development such as that proposed. Proper use should ensure that issues relating to vermin are managed

to acceptable levels however this is not a matter that would prevent the grant of planning permission. It is proposed that refuse be positioned adjacent to the north east elevation of the building between it and the boundary with the adjacent car park. A condition can be imposed to secure details of how this area will be enclosed however beyond that, problems relating to vermin are not for the Planning Authority to consider and would be dealt with by other agencies.

The impact of development upon property value whether negative or positive is not a material planning consideration.

Applications for residential development particularly of this small scale are not expected to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity in medical services or education to cater for the future occupiers.

Conclusions

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is clearly set out in Chapter 2 of the NPPF. Noting that there are elements of policy CS4 (in relation to the delivery of housing) that are out of date, paragraph 11 confirms that for decision making this means granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

The delivery of residential development on this site accords with policies CS2, CS4 and H-2 of the Core Strategy.

There will be no harm to the character of the area nor amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. In this respect the proposal is in compliance with policies CS4, H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 of the Core Strategy.

The development will cause no adverse impact upon conditions of highway safety, proposes access and layout that is safe and practical to use and parking in accordance with the Councils standards. The proposal is thereby compliant with Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3.

Through a S106 the proposal will make provision to the provision and enhancement of formal recreation. In this respect the proposal is compliant with saved UDP Review policies L1.2 and L1.2 together with Core Strategy policy SIE2.

Issues relating to drainage and energy efficient design will be assessed through the imposition of conditions thus ensuring compliance with Core Strategy policies SC3 and SD6.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is clearly set out in Chapter 2 of the NPPF. Noting that there are elements of policy CS4 (in relation to the delivery of housing) that are out of date, paragraph 11 confirms that for decision making this means granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

For the reasons set out in this report it is not considered that there would be any adverse impacts arising that would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As such in accordance with para 11 of the NPPF it is recommended that the application should be approved subject to the S106 and conditions referenced in this report together with others considered reasonable and necessary.

RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to conditions and S106.

UPDATE from Cheadle Area Committee 05 April 2022

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

There were no speakers against the proposal, the agent spoke in favour. Cllr Meller asked the agent about the SUDS proposal, and whether they were able to share any details or comments. The agent commented that a drainage strategy has been created and this includes attenuation to slow the rate of discharge. [Note – the report recommends a drainage condition]

Members debated the proposal:

Cllr Roberts commented that the proposal is really good, attractive, not too tall and located in a sustainable brownfield location. Cllr McCann agreed. Cllr Morrison spoke to state that they agreed somewhat and that the scheme has merit, however concerns were raised regarding the loss of parking - although the report covers it well, there are concerns about future impacts. Cllr Meller was supportive of development near transport infrastructure and on a brownfield site, and echoes Cllr Morrison's concerns with regard to parking. Additional SUDS info would be welcomed. Cllr Julian spoke to raise concerns regarding highways and car parking in the area.

The Committee recommended that the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee consider drainage issues, parking issues and general impact on the area. The Committee recommended granting, subject to conditions and S106.

UPDATE from Bramhall and Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee 07 April 2022

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Cllr Hunter sought clarity from the presenting officer on the timing of the parking survey and whether it was agreed with the Council's Highway Engineer.

Cllr Bagnall sought clarity from the officer on electric vehicle charging futureproofing measures. The officer confirmed that infrastructure would be required to allow for future expansion of electric vehicle charging points.

Cllr McGahan asked whether two car parking spaces for each new home is the right ratio. The officer confirmed that was a maximum car parking policy standard rather than a minimum requirement.

The agent (scheme architect) then spoke in favour of the proposals confirming that the car park serving the Fabrick development where the proposed building is located is a private, access controlled car park for residents and not available for public use.

Cllr Hunter sought clarity from the agent on a number of points.

The planning officer then confirmed that the timing of the parking surveys were agreed with the Council's Highway Engineer as confirmed in the consultation responses section of the officer report.

Cllr Hunter expressed concern that ward councillors were not made aware of pre-application discussions given the controversial and strategic nature of the proposals. He also expressed concern about the lack of car parking capacity in Cheadle Hulme District Centre and the removal of 28 car parking spaces currently serving the existing Fabrick development. Cllr Hunter confirmed that he does not support the recommendation and stated that the objections from local residents are legitimate, well made and hard to refute. He also expressed concerns about the impact of the development on the outlook of existing residents.

Cllr Hunter then requested that it be recommended that the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee undertake a site visit before determining the application.

Cllr Bagnall supported the recommendation for a site visit.

Cllr Foster-Grime then echoed the comments of Cllr Hunter and expressed disappointment that the applicant had not involved the local community before submitting the application given the strategic nature of the application. She then also supported the recommendation for a site visit requesting that the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee carefully consider the comments made by councillors and local residents when making their decision.

Cllr McGahan then commented that parking remains despite the availability of public transport services.

Cllr Hunter then stated that he is supportive of residential development in the town and district centres in principle.

The committee then supported the motion for a site visit and for the application to be determined by the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee.