ITEM 2

Application Reference	**DC/082630**
Location:	Daisybank Nursery Somersby House Somersby Court Bramhall Stockport SK7 3EJ
PROPOSAL:	Variation of Condition 1 of permission DC027913, to increase the number of child places from 43 (as approved by DC053894) to 60.
Type Of Application:	Minor Material Amendment
Registration Date:	28.09.2021
Expiry Date:	23 23.11.2021
Case Officer:	Jane Chase
Applicant:	Daisybank Nursery
Agent:	Paul Butler Associates

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Area Committee – 4 objections

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Planning permission was approved in 2008 for the change of use of this premises from a dwelling to a day nursery on ground floor and residential accommodation above (DC027913 refers). This planning permission was subject to the condition that the maximum number of child places at the nursery shall not exceed 30 unless the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained.

Having implemented the development approved by the grant of DC027913, an application was submitted in 2013 to vary this condition to allow an increase in the maximum number of child places at the nursery to 43 (DC053894 refers). This application was approved in 2014.

This application seeks what is commonly referred to as Section 73 minor material amendment to planning permission DC027913. In this respect the variation of condition 1 attached to planning permission DC027913 is sought to allow for the use of the premises as a day nursery with up to 60 children. Permission granted under Section 73 takes effect as a new, independent permission to carry out the same development as previously permitted subject to new or amended conditions. The new permission sits alongside the original permission, which remains intact and unamended.

During the course of this application amended plans have been submitted to show the existing parking for 13 vehicles reconfigured to retain 13 spaces in a revised layout. These parking spaces will be laid out such that:

- To the front of the nursery there are 3 staff spaces adjacent to the eastern boundary as existing. It is proposed that this will include parking for the mini bus which is to be displaced from the development under construction to the side of the nursery (see planning history below)

- To the front of the nursery there will be a new disabled space

- To the front of the nursery the 4 existing spaces positioned side on to the garden are replaced with 6 spaces positioned end on to the garden

- The 2 existing spaces to the side of nursery building are removed and

- The 3 existing spaces to the rear of the nursery are retained.

Two ‘sleeping policemen’ originally proposed to the vehicle access into the site have been deleted from the plans however the driveway will be resurfaced. The application also proposes to reinstate a pedestrian route into the site parallel to the eastern boundary. Here the existing steps will be removed and replaced with a tarmac path at a 1:20 gradient. Access to and from Carrwood Road will be gained from an existing gate in the front boundary.

In support of their proposal the applicant advises as follows:

- The nursery has been operating since 2008 and provides care to pre-school age children, from young babies to toddlers. Over recent years there has been increased demand for places particularly from young families in the area having more children and wanting them looked after at the nursery.

- Stockport’s sufficiency surveys have confirmed that there are more 0-5 year old children in Bramhall than places in the area.

The application is supported by:-

- A Planning Statement

- A Highways Note and

- An Arboricultural Impact Assessment

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located on the north side of Carrwood Road and comprises a detached property set back from the road behind mature trees, a lawned area and hard surfaced forecourt. The nursery occupies the ground floor of the premises with a residential flat above which it is understood is occupied by the applicant. The applicant runs the nursery and employs a total of 12 members of staff.

The nursery shares an access with 4 detached houses which are positioned to the west (side) and north (rear) of the nursery building. To the east of the site is a flatted development and elsewhere in the wider locality are residential properties.

To the front of the building is an area of hardstanding that is used for drop off and pick up together with car parking for 7 vehicles and access. Between this forecourt and Carrwood Road is a lawned garden that provides circa 400m2 of amenity space for the nursery. The boundaries of the site to the front and sides are landscaped with mature trees and planting such that views of the nursery from the public domain are restricted. These trees are legally protected.

To the east (right hand side) of the nursery a 2 storey detached building is being constructed following the grant of planning permission (DC057014). As approved this would create a garage for the nursery mini bus together with additional floorspace. An application to vary this planning permission such that it removes the garaging is currently being considered by the Planning Authority and at the time of writing this report remains undetermined (DC082149).

The application site and wider locality is within the Bramhall Park Conservation Area.

POLICY BACKGROUND

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

The Development Plan includes-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted 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

HC1.3 Special Control of Development in Conservation Areas
CTF1.1 Development of Community Services and Facilities
CDH1.2 Non Residential Development in Predominantly Residential Areas
CDH1.6 Day care Nurseries

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

CS1 Overarching Principles: Sustainable Development
SD6 Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change
AS2 Improving Outdoor Sports, Community and Education Facilities and their Accessibility
CS8 Safeguarding and Improving the Environment
SIE1 Quality Places
SIE3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment
CS9 Transport & Development
T1 Transport & Development
T2 Parking in Development
T3 Safety & Capacity on the Highway Network

Supplementary Planning Guidance

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

Transport in Residential Areas
Day Care Nurseries

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.

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*
>
> *b) a social objective*
>
> *c) an environmental objective"*

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

> *c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or*
>
> *d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
>
> > *i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
> >
> > *ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole".*

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

Para.38 *"Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way….. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible".*

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

Para.81 *"Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development."*

Para.93 *"To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:*

> *a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;*
>
> *b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community;*
>
> *c) guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;*
>
> *d) ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community; and*
>
> *e) ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services."*

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

> *a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;*
>
> *b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;*
>
> *c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;*
>
> *d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and*

e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places."

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

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

a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;

c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and

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

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

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

a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;

b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;

c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;

d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and

e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations."

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

Para.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 users 49; 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.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;*

b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and

c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation."

Para.194 *"In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation."*

Para.195 *"Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal."*

Para.197 *"In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*

a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."

Para.199 *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."*

Para.201 *"Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and

b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and

c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and

d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use."

Para.202 *"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."*

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)".*

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DC027913: Somersby House. Change of use of this premises from a dwelling to a day nursery on ground floor and residential accommodation above. Approved 2008 subject to the condition that the maximum number of child places at the nursery shall not exceed 30 unless the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained.

DC053894: Daisybank Nursery. Variation of condition 1 of DC027913 to allow an increase in the maximum number of child places at the nursery to 43. Approved 2014.

DC054301: Daisybank Nursery. Demolition of existing double garage and carport and erection of a detached two storey playroom/art room. Erection of a detached single garage & office with storage above. Refused 2014 on grounds of harm to the Conservation Area arising from the proposed two storey playroom/art room.

DC057014: Daisybank Nursery. Demolition of existing double garage and carport. Erection of a detached two storey playroom/art room and a single garage with office and storage above. Approved 2015.

DC082149: Daisybank Nursery. Minor Material Amendment of condition 1 of DC057014 to facilitate amendments to the external appearance and internal layout of the development approved. At the time of writing this report this application remains under consideration by the Planning Authority.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The occupiers of 22 neighbouring properties have been notified of the receipt of this application in writing.

In relation to the application as originally submitted (with no additional parking), 4 letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Increasing the capacity of the nursery will result in increased noise levels.

- There is not enough space on the property to accommodate 60 children safely as there is not enough outside space for children to play when outside.

- Carrwood Road is an extremely busy one not only in the morning and evening traffic rush but throughout the day with traffic backed up because of Bramhall Lane South Road which too is a very busy road. Additional children will result in additional air pollution and traffic jams.

- Since moving into our residence in 2010, we have faced constant issues with accessibility to our own homes. Parents of the children and staff of Daisybank Nursery continually block the entrance to Somersby Court and surrounding roads (like Rookwood Hill and St. Michaels Ave). We have even seen some park on our own lawns! Getting in and out of our properties has become increasingly difficult, and we fear the day that an ambulance or other emergency service vehicle is needed to access Somersby Court safely and effectively.

- Carrwood Road has already seen fatalities and gruesome injuries over the past years due to the amount of traffic, and increasing the number of children (and so, parents' vehicles) will pose a great safety hazard as there will be more parked cars on the road in proximity of an already dangerous junction.

- The road of Somersby Court is in a dire and disgraceful state from the amount of vehicles which come and go to the Nursery. It has been worn down and has several dangerous potholes which we have to navigate very carefully (although it is often inevitable that our vehicles fall victim to these potholes due to the parents' parking on Somersby Court). Not once have the owners of Daisybank Nursery / Somersby House approached us to try to contribute towards repair of the road.

- Drop off and pick up of children causes congestion on both Somersby Court and Carrwood Road where cars enter and exit. This is close to the junction with Bramhall Lane South and Rockwood Hill and the tailback can extend considerably. Congestion is exacerbated by parking of staff and parents and it narrows the road. Frustration is felt by residents along Carrwood and Somersby and by drivers using the route who are unable to proceed normally. This translates to unsafe conditions on Bramhall Lane South, Carrwood Road and the junction between them which has already seen fatalities.

- Parents park on the access drive to load or unload children causing problems when a car attempting to leave meets one trying to enter. Early or late arrivals can enter Somersby too quickly and have to avoid children and pedestrians as well as parked vehicles.

- We are suffering a loss of privacy due to the nursery staff parking. Although planning permission has not been approved for a parking space to the side of the nursery building, they continue to park 2 cars there and have also begun to reverse park 2 vehicles on the grass section behind the nursery which just accommodates them. These vehicles are large new SUV types which are high and have lights constantly on when running. Their lights shine straight into our home and illuminate the lounge, dining and hall areas all the way into our bedroom.

- The minivan garage we understand, is to be converted to a play area in order to accommodate the proposed increase in places and support the gym business. The fitness for purpose of these spaces for these activities and the space requirements for those places are unknown to us but the lack of garaging of the minivan will mean the continued use for staff parking on the

side and back of the nursery property and the continuation of visibility into our home which we oppose.

- There are restrictive covenants in place to protect the residents of all four adjacent dwellings. Covenants in terms of accessibility have now been broken by the present owners of Somersby House, and we are considering legal advice. We are just unable to simply access our homes during peak times.

20 letters have been received supporting the application on the following grounds:

- Our son has attended Daisybank since January 2019 and we have been so pleased with the care, early years education and support provided by the nursery over the last few years. Our daughter was born in March 2020 and is one of the original lockdown babies, unfortunately we are still waiting for a suitable place to become available at Daisybank as our first-choice nursery that we would very much like her to attend. It would really help us to have both children at the same nursery and it will greatly help our daughter's transition into early years education if she could attend somewhere we are very comfortable and familiar with as opposed to starting somewhere new which is further away from our home.

- We are residents of Carrwood Road and our proximity to Daisybank is very fortunate and it has greatly assisted us being able to walk to the nursery each day. It is frustrating that we are having to look for alternative childcare solutions which will undoubtedly involve travelling by car which is undesirable, particularly on days when we are working from home and have no other need to travel. In fact, two new families moved into our road recently and they have all requested places for their pre-school age children at the nursery since moving into the local community, which illustrates how sought after their places are in the immediate neighbourhood alone.

- Daisybank has been and continues to be a well-loved and fantastic early years childcare provider in the local area and we would be thrilled if our daughter could join her brother at the nursery if the overall capacity for new children can be increased.

- As parents of one child who has attended for 3 years and one who is looking to start February, I cannot begin to explain the exception service and attention given. The services provided are essential, especially when the demographics of the surrounding area are changing so much, with younger families moving in. Without additional spaces at high quality nurseries then so many children of future generations will be left behind others. Now is not a time to be stifling the growth of established educational and childcare settings. Especially those that are so central to local communities.

- We live around the corner on Bramhall Lane South and walk to and from nursery, I also notice a number of other families walk to the nursery from the surrounding area and the parking facilities always seem to be plenty for the parents with no major issues/backlogs. I understand there is a need for additional nursery places also to accommodate siblings, it is so important for families to be able to send siblings to the same nursery, and Daisybank really foster the relationship between siblings whilst at nursery together which is invaluable and really helps the younger sibling settle and develop.

- Our family is expected to grow in the next few years and we would be looking to use the nursery for future siblings meaning the increase in places would be very important to us. Our primary mode of travel is via a short walk to the nursery which I know is the same case for most other parents, meaning the increase would not be a concern to parking / traffic.

- The nursery has a parking system is place which means there's no need for parking on the main road and I believe 35% of children attending Daisybank walk to and from nursery. Therefore, I believe the nursery is contributing to meeting Stockport Council's Core Strategy by identifying needs of existing parents and providing childcare provision.

- We live locally and alternated between driving and walking our daughter in, we have always found the drop off and pick up to be extremely well managed especially around parking.

- We were extremely lucky to be able to get a space for our son also. After looking around many nurseries, Daisybank far outshone all others. I would have been devastated had we have had to split up our children, if a space had not been available. On these grounds I feel it is imperative that the application by Daisybank should be accepted. They are of such value to our family, and many more. I think it would be a huge benefit to the families of this area to be able have their children looked after by Daisybank.

- Myself, my husband and our two boys live 400 meters from the nursery. Currently our oldest attends the nursery three days a week and we hope our youngest one will also be able to join the nursery from June next year. The nursery is a very valued part of our family life. It has allowed myself and my husband to continue with full time work. The nursery and its staff are valued when it comes to our son's development, not only educationally but also on a social level. Residing so close to the nursery also makes it so accessible for us meaning we can walk there and back in a matter of minutes. Not only is this better for the environment but it is so easy and convenient for us also.

- Through conversations with neighbours, friends and fellow school parents it is clear that there is a need for additional nursery places to support families living in and around Bramhall. Many of our friends have been unable to secure a nursery place or have been forced to book a nursery place when their child is only a few weeks old and before they have planned their return to work. As Daisybank is one of the most popular nurseries in the local area it would benefit the children and families to have space for additional places to accommodate this need.

<u>In response to the application as amended to include additional parking a further 3 letters have been received objecting on the following grounds</u>:

- The amended plans do not overcome our concerns. Having additional parking to the rear of the nursery will increase accessibility issues to our home.

- The 6 drop off / pick up spaces in the front of the nursery will just cause more chaos in terms of accessing our own properties. There is not enough room for 6 cars and 3 staff spaces - waiting parents will just be jammed and gridlocked. It is nonsensical and traffic flow will be confusing. It will also be a major eyesore.

- The addition of '2 sleeping policeman speedbumps' is superfluous. The main issue we have is not speeding but congestion. We also do not have pedestrian pavements, so the bumps will be a hindrance when we have to take the bins, walk up the road at night or for those pushing buggies. They should be removed from the plans. The road is also still in a very poor state and needs total resurfacing - which the nursery still refuses to do.

- We are concerned that the Highway Engineer not been involved in the discussions regarding the new drop off/pick up zone. If they have had any involvement why have we not been informed of their findings?

- The trees on the central island that is to be removed are protected so permission will have to be approved for their removal.

- The new drop off/pick up zones has allocated only 6 parking spaces. There are no guide lines as to which way parents should enter or leave the site cartilage and this will cause huge disruptions, blocking in parked cars and causing major congestion. This could be extremely dangerous for all of the parents and particularly the young children.

- In March 2014, the nursery applied for the grass verge around Somersby House to be converted into a lay-by. They were refused permission as the loss of garden setting would fail to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Bramhall Park Conservation Area. If these lay-bys were now granted, it would be grossly unfair on the residents of Numbers 2, 3 and 4.

In support of the amended plans the following comments have also been received:

- Putting in a pedestrian route from Carrwood Road via the existing gate is an excellent idea. We have often wondered why this had not been carried out earlier. This will be much safer for the minority of parents, who prefer to walk their children to the Nursery.

- For the past 2 months, the minibus has not been parked at Daisybank Nursery, freeing up an extra 2 parking spaces for parents and staff. Traffic has flowed far more smoothly and now the potholes have been filled in, all the parents use the drop off /pick up zones correctly.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Early Years Provision – support the application. In Bramhall there is a need for additional 0-5 years places and particularly in the 0-3 years age range. These younger children cannot be accommodated by the local maintained nursery classes who mainly take aged 3 and 4 year old children. So an increase at Daisy Bank Nursery should not directly impact on a school nursery place. We know from our sufficiency surveys that there are more children aged 0 – 5 years than places available in the Bramhall area. We also know that some parents travel further afield for places which may be a preferred choice but may also be because there is not enough local provision.

Occupancies in the day nurseries and pre-schools is over 90% in the area suggesting that they have little capacity for additional children. As the applicant believes that many of the additional children will be siblings of existing children at the

nursery, such as new babies, this will also have reduced impact on any additional traffic in the area. It is also understood that there will be sufficient parking.

Highway Engineer- in response to the application as amended, the drawing shows the hardstanding area to the front of the property to be reconfigured with an area of landscaping removed to enable an increase in parking provision. The area would be formed with 6 drop off/pick up spaces for parental/guardian use, 2 staff spaces, space for a minibus and a disabled person space. To the rear of the property there would be 3 family/staff parking spaces laid out.

The revision to the frontage hardstanding area and removal of a circulatory landscaped area will enable a layout that is more practical and one that should not give rise to unacceptable risk to the safety of parents and children. I am satisfied that the provision of 6 drop off / pick up spaces will be adequate to meet the likely and realistic needs of a 60 place day nursery. I am also comfortable from observation on site and the surrounding area and from discussion with the applicant that the provision of 2 staff spaces plus a disabled space to the front in conjunction with the family/staff parking to the rear will be adequate to meet likely and realistic staffing needs.

It is important to note that some existing staff reside in the property so I feel it is necessary that some form of restriction is imposed should permission be granted, to ensure that the use as a day nursery remains ancillary to the residential use at the site at all times. This will avoid a separate business being established or taking over within part of the property which may not employ the residents and consequently would have a greater staff parking demand.

This revised drawing and discussion with the applicant also acknowledges improvement to the means of access to the site both for vehicular and pedestrian traffic that would be delivered as part of the nursery expansion.

An existing pedestrian link from Carrwood Road would be improved with landscaping and steps to be removed, the route regraded to a 1:20 incline and a new surfacing provided. This would ensure a safer and suitable alternative means of access for pedestrians, the matters of detail being capable of conditional control.

The existing shared vehicular access link into Somersby Court would be resurfaced and traffic calming measures installed to reduce the risk of excessive vehicle speed. This would ensure a suitable environment and means of vehicular access to the site, mitigating for the likely small increase in vehicle passage that would arise as a consequence of a nursery expansion. The matters of detail are capable of conditional control.

In summary I am satisfied that the improvements to the means of access for vehicular and pedestrian traffic will ensure that safe and suitable access arrangements are provided for a nursery to the scale proposed and I see no reason to express concern. Adequate provision would be made for staff and parent/guardian parking and drop off/pick up within the site which should ensure that overspill parking does not unacceptably affect the shared driveway or nearby highway network.

Condition:

No work shall take place in respect to the improvements to the means of vehicular and pedestrian access to the site until drawings and details of the works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include resurfacing works and the provision of traffic calming on the shared

driveway and landscaping and steps removal, regrading and resurfacing to the pedestrian walkway. The expansion to the nursery and increase in children numbers shall not be implemented until the improvements to the means of access have been provided in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

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

Condition:

No work shall take place in respect to the improvement to the car parking and drop off/pick up facilities to be provided for the nursery until details and drawings showing how the areas will be constructed, surfaced, drained, marked out and any signage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The expansion to the nursery and increase in children numbers shall not be implemented until the improvements have been provided in accordance with the approved details and the car parking and drop off/pick up facilities shall thereafter be retained and shall remain available for use.

Reason:

To ensure that adequate parking and drop off/pick up facilities are provided and that they are appropriately located and are of a safe and practical design, in accordance with Policies SD-6 ‘Adapting to the impacts of climate change’, SIE-1 ‘Quality Places’, T-1 Transport and Development’, T-2 ‘Parking in Developments’ and T-3 ‘Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network’ of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

Condition:

The nursery hereby approved shall be for a maximum of 60 children and shall remain ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Somersby House. The nursery or dwelling shall at no time be used, let or sold as a separate business or dwelling.

Reason:

To ensure that the proposed development does not result in a level of vehicle movements to / from the site greater than the level considered as part of the planning application and that an appropriate level of parking is provided, having regard to Policies T-1 ‘Transport and Development’, T-2 ‘Parking in Developments’ and T-3 ‘Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network’ of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

Condition:

The expansion to the nursery and increase in children numbers shall not be implemented until covered and secure storage for a minimum of 2 cycles, 6 scooters and 4 buggies/prams have been provided in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall then be retained and shall remain available for use at all times thereafter.

Reason:

To ensure that safe and practical cycle, scooter and buggy/pram facilities are provided so as to ensure that the site is fully accessible by all modes of transport in accordance with Policies CS9 ‘Transport and Development’, T-1 ‘Transport and Development’, T-2 ‘Parking in Developments’, T-3 ‘Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network’ and SIE-1 ‘Quality Places’, of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

Condition:

Within 6 months of the nursey expansion hereby approved having been implemented a travel plan for the nursery shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and have been brought into operation. The approved travel plan shall then be operated at all times that the nursery is in use and shall be reviewed and updated on an annual basis in accordance with details that shall be outlined in the approved plan. The travel plan and all updates shall be produced using the online TfGM Travel Plan Toolkit and in accordance with national, regional and local best practice guidance and shall include the following:

- details of existing car, cycle and scooter parking within the site (for staff, parents/guardians and children) and details of additional cycle and scooter parking to be provided, if required, to encourage sustainable travel to and from the site;

- details of vehicle, pedestrian and cycle routes to the nursery from the surrounding highway and footway network and any improvements considered necessary;

- survey information about staff and parent/guardian travel habits and targets for the future;

- details of measures and initiatives to reduce car usage and promote sustainable, healthier and safer travel to the nursery, a timetable for their implementation and how these will be reviewed and amended over time to take into account changes in staff or child numbers or other changes that may affect travel to / from the nursery;

- details of initiatives to discourage parents/guardians from being reliant on car travel to and from the nursery and staff from driving to and from the nursery;

- details of how affected parties will be consulted, how the travel plan will be publicised, operated and how staff and parents/guardians will be encouraged to adopt 'green travel' measures and

- details of how the travel plan will be monitored, reviewed and updated.

Reason:

To ensure that measures are implemented that will enable and encourage the use of alternative forms of transport to access the site, other than the private car, in accordance with Policies CS9 'Transport and Development', T-1 'Transport and Development' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD and saved policies CDH1.2 'Non-residential development in predominantly residential areas', CDH1.6 'Day care nurseries' and

CDH1.9 'Community facilities in predominantly residential areas' of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan.

Conservation Officer: No objection to the proposed variation in the number of places at the nursery. It is noted that the parking layout requires modification in association with the increased number of places and this will result in the loss of tree indicated as G2. The expanded areas of car parking and associated hard standings are set well back from the site frontage and screened by tall trees. Subject to suitable replacement tree planting it is considered that the proposal, taken as a whole, will not result in a harmful impact upon the special character and appearance of the wider Bramhall Park Conservation Area.

Tree Officer: The proposed development is within or affected by a Conservation Area (Bramhall Park). There are legally protected tree within this site or affected by this development (Bramhall Lane South No.3 1987).

The proposed development will have a negative impact on trees and hedges from potential encroachment. Damage may also occur from machinery working in close proximity of the trees within the site. The sites front and rear boundary has a good level of vegetation and trees and as such the loss of trees this will have a negative impact on amenity and biodiversity unless replacement planting is secured through a landscaping plan.

Temporary protective fencing is required and contractors should be made aware of this and that access to these areas is limited so as to prevent compaction, accidental damage or spillage of chemicals on the root zones of the trees. No machinery, materials or temporary facilities should be stored within the root zone of the trees whether they are surrounded by hard-standing or not. If this is conditioned and complied with then there will not be a negative impact on the site and surrounding environment.

The parking bays must be constructed as per the recommendations in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and a landscaping plan to show how they intend to replace the lost trees from group 2.

The following conditions are required if the scheme is approved;

Condition:

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

Condition:

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

Condition:

No development shall take place until details of all proposed tree planting, including the intended dates of planting, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being brought into use.

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, granting planning permission unless:

- the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of importance (that is those specifically relating to designated heritage assets (Conservation Areas and listed buildings)) 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 policies which are most important for the determination are not out of date, the tilted balance as referred to in para 11 of the NPPF directs that permission should be approved unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect the adjacent Conservation Area provide a clear reason for refusing permission; or the adverse impacts of granting permission (such as impact on the character of the area, residential amenity, highway safety or trees for example) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The principle of a day nursery on this site has already been established through the grant of DC027913. Notwithstanding that it is appropriate that the expansion of this facility through an increase in places offered is assessed against the same policy background as that originally applied to ensure that the nursery as extended remains policy compliant.

Saved UDP review policy CDH1.6 allows for day care nurseries providing that there is parking in accordance with the Council's standards, a drop off facility, the facility is of an appropriate scale in terms of numbers of children and the impact on traffic generation and noise; is in sufficiently spacious grounds; operates from 8am to 6pm on weekdays only; includes a landscaping scheme to provide for screening of neighbours from parking and plays areas and is located in a detached property. 7m2 of amenity space for every 2 children should be provided. Policy CDH1.6 also confirms that nurseries will be permitted provided they are located in a detached property (unless the premises attached to the proposed day nursery are in a non-residential use).

Saved UDP review policy CDH1.9 confirms that community facilities in Predominantly Residential Areas will be permitted provided that there is no overriding detrimental effect on the amenity of the area by reason of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion or traffic generation; that there is adequate car

parking provision and that the proposal does not prejudice highway safety and is accessible by sustainable transport modes.

Saved UDP review policy CTF1.1 allows for additional community facilities provided that they are served by sustainable transport modes; have satisfactory access, parking and landscaping; there would be no harm to residential amenity; no harm to employment areas or Green Belt and no loss of urban open space.

The Core Strategy at policy AS2 seeks to ensure there are sufficient indoor sports, community (including health care facilities) and education facilities. The written text to this policy confirms the position that Stockport needs more childcare services.

In response to this policy position Members are advised accordingly:

The Council's Early Years Officer has confirmed that there is a need for additional nursery provision in the Bramhall area; this reflects the position as set out in the supporting text to policy AS2. The applicant has also evidenced through their submission that there is a demand from parents with children already at the nursery for additional places so that they are not faced with the prospect of siblings being in different nurseries or having to find alternative provision for both (this is corroborated by comments made by those in support of the application). The need for this accommodation is therefore not disputed.

The nursery as existing and proposed is accommodated within a detached building. Apart from the 3 spaces proposed to the rear of the building (2 of which are existing), all the activity associated with the nursery is contained to the front of the site, away from the adjacent residential dwellings. The hours of operation are not controlled by the original planning permission however the applicant advises that they will remain as existing and will continue to comply with the requirement of 8am to 6pm, weekdays only.

Whilst the nursery shares an access to Carrwood Road with neighbouring residential properties within the wider site, it is considered to be positioned in sufficiently spacious grounds. The nursery makes use of the lawned area to the front of the building which is positioned away from the private amenity space of these neighbouring houses and separated from them by the access drive, parking areas and the nursery building. To the east of the site is a flatted development however this is positioned away from the treed boundary of the application site and separated from it by its driveway. Even allowing for the additional children proposed, the amenity space which is circa 400m2 in area meets the requirement of 7m2 for every 2 children (210m2).

In terms of the use of the amenity space and objections from neighbours regarding increased noise arising from the proposed expansion of the nursery, the applicant has provided the following statement regarding the use of this space:

The current children at Daisybank per day total approximately 40.

25 are under two

15 are over two.

Most children are very young and as such are not making much noise.

Nursery routine is usually that 12 children are out on the Daisy bus on a trip away from the setting. Out of the 28 children remaining, 12 would be young babies and are either in their nursery room or in their prams at the park. Small groups of toddlers are taken into the garden, at around 11am, for an hour or so, and then in the afternoon after their sleep, at around 4pm. Occasionally on a beautiful day, there may be more in the garden when the bus comes back from its trip and the children go to have a play just before their lunch is ready. The garden is c30m long by 22m wide. The children's mud kitchen area, playhouse and slide are the furthest away from our nearest neighbour in Somersby Court (No.1). The children playing there are approximately 50+ metres away No. 1. The children's' toys in the garden are exactly as my children used 30 odd years ago and consist of the Daisybank Playhouse, slide etc. which are out of sight.

Our closest neighbours are, in fact, at Rookwood Hill, consisting of eight flats. Those neighbours are happy to see children and have said they never hear them cry or making an excessive amounts of noise. I would also like to add that property numbers 2, 3 and 4 Somersby Court are out of sight and sound of all the children. Along with this, neighbours at No.s 2 and 3 bought their properties long after Daisybank nursery was established, so they were aware that there would be children out and about.

Having considered the above it is concluded that the use of garden area is limited to the extent that the increase in those attending the nursery would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance. Clearly there is a proportion of the children attending the nursery that are too young to use the garden and the older children use it on a rota basis at differing times of the day. As such it is not considered that there will be large numbers of children using the garden at any one time and that there will be periods within the day when it is not used at all. On this basis it is not considered that the use of this garden area will result in a material increase in noise levels as a result of the expansion in child places sought.

The revisions to the forecourt will result in the loss of a circular landscaped area in front of the nursery building which currently accommodates a silver Birch, Contorted Hazel, Amelanchier, Cherry & various shrubs. Whilst there will be some biodiversity and amenity value from this planting, given the small size of this bed and the species it accommodates, that value is relatively limited. Noting that the Tree Officer has no objection to its removal subject to the provision of replacement planting elsewhere in the site (which can be secured by condition) it is not considered that there will be an unacceptable impact arising from the loss of this small area. Other conditions as requested by the Tree Officer can be imposed thus ensuring that no further tree loss arises and that retained trees are adequately protected from the impact of resurfacing works. On this basis the proposal is compliant with the policy position set out above as well as in relation to policy SIE3 of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that development proposals incorporate appropriate landscaping.

In terms of highway issues, the original approval for 30 children included 9 parking spaces (6 for the residential occupiers/staff and 3 for pick up/drop off) together with parking for the mini bus in the garage (10 in total). When permission was approved for 43 children the parking was increased to 10 spaces (6 for the residential occupiers/staff and 4 for pick up/drop off) together with parking for the mini bus in the garage (11 in total). Notwithstanding this approved position it appears that the existing layout comprises more parking with 2 additional spaces having been provided to the side of the nursery building. This current application proposes 12 spaces plus parking for the mini bus (13 in total)

and as such whilst increasing parking beyond that approved, proposes the same level as existing (albeit in a different layout with the 2 unauthorised spaces to the side of the nursery deleted and a revised/increased arrangement to the front of the nursery).

The Council's Highway Officer has been instrumental in seeking revisions to the application in terms of securing a revised parking layout, the resurfacing of the drive and reinstatement of the pedestrian footpath. As such he is confident that the level of parking and measures proposed will accommodate any additional demand arising from the expansion of the nursery and that the layout of the parking is such that it can be used safely without hindering access to and from neighbouring properties.

Noting that permission is being sought under application DC082149 to retain the approved development to the side of the nursery without the provision of garaging for the mini bus parking, replacement provision in this respect has been secured as part of this application to increase child places (as it also will in relation to the consideration of DC082149). Conditions can be imposed as have been requested by the Highway Engineer.

The two parking spaces to the side of the nursery that objectors reference as having previously been refused permission are not proposed as part of the revised layout; this should address their objections to these spaces. It should however be noted that the application which they previously formed part of and which was refused planning permission (DC054301) was actually refused due to the impact of the proposed building to the other side of the nursery upon the Conservation Area rather than that of these parking spaces.

The resurfacing of the driveway should address residents' objections to its current condition and ensure that the application site and neighbouring residential properties have an access that is safe and practical to use. Objections to the traffic calming measures are noted. These were offered by the applicant however were not considered essential by Highway Engineer given that traffic speed is not considered to be excessive over this short length of driveway. To address the objections of residents and with the verbal agreement of the Highway Engineer, they have been removed from the proposed site layout. The condition requested by the Highway Engineer requiring details of these calming measures can be amended to delete reference to them.

On this basis the proposal is compliant with the policy position set out above as well as in relation to Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 which seek to ensure that development is accessible my sustainable modes of travel, is of a layout that is safe and practical to use and secures sufficient off street parking.

The Council's Conservation Officer has considered the proposal in terms of the parking and landscaping works and confirms that he has no objections. Details of the works of landscaping, hard and soft, can be secured by condition and in this respect it is considered that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this respect the proposal is compliant with the policy position set out above as well as that in relation to policies HC1.3 and SIE3 which seek to ensure that development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

In response to objections not addressed above, Members are advised that the presence of restrictive covenants on the use of land and property is not material to the consideration of a planning application. Should it be considered that such

covenants are being breached then this is a civil law matter that should be pursued on a private basis.

In conclusion, Members are advised that the proposal is compliant with the policy position outlined above and having regard to the tilted balance in favour of development as set out in para 11 of the NPPF, it is recommended that planning permission be approved subject to the imposition of conditions as set out above.

RECOMMENDATION Grant

BRAMHALL AND CHEADLE HULME SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE 23RD JUNE 2022

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Cllr Vine noted the pressure for nursery places and the excellent quality of the nursery but think that the application is fundamentally flawed. Not happy with the tree loss proposed in terms of biodiversity but also the function that this island forms in terms of providing a circulatory arrangement. Why are the 6 spaces proposed in the place shown on the plans. The PO commented that these tree must be removed to provide the manoeuvring space for the car parking and would be replaced (as required by condition). The replacement planting hasn't been identified yet but can be accommodated in the site. Cllr Vine noted that screening must be provided and if you take out the island of planting then the screening is lost. The PO advised that this needs to be considered in the planning balance. Cllr Vine commented on the pedestrian pathway which leads to the car park which will lead to conflict between car and pedestrians. The PO noted that the access was introduced for pedestrian access safety.

Cllr Bagnall 11 spaces are mentioned but 13 spaces are to be retained – explain. The PO explained that 11 are required by a previous application but in reality they have 13 spaces including 2 to the side of the building. Neighbours object to these spaces so they have been removed and replaced elsewhere. Re the drop off and pick up points, are these time restricted – no. So cars could be left there all day? PO – the operator would have a management plan which would most likely prevent this. Re the driveways for the houses, is there any protection for them? No. To what standard will the resurfacing of the driveway be done – this will be secured by condition, the existing driveway is potholed so there will be a desire to resurface this.

Cllr Wyatt referenced the application to remove the garaging, why has that not been decided? PO – can't answer but has no impact on this application. How many staff – 12.

Cllr Vine – would the applicant be paying for the resurfacing and would it go to the houses. PO – would only be within the site edged red, can't answer who will pay for maintenance, covenants are not material to this application.

Cllr Holt – can you confirm that the pedestrian path will go into or around the car park. PO – there are 2 banks of parking spaces so there will be an opportunity to walk between those spaces. Cllr – could it be marked out. PO – could deal with by condition.

Objector spoke against – since 2008 more noise, disturbance and visual intrusion. All the children will be in the rear of the new extension causing harm to the neighbours through noise. Removal of spaces to the side is welcome. Loss of lawn

and greenery, cars instead of landscaping. Use at present causes issues relating to highway safety. No safe access to the site given the level of use.

Cllr Vine – sent us a number of photos of parked cars, is this causing a big impact. Yes – very disturbing and restricts access to residential properties. Does the area of land to the side of the house get used for parking – yes. Note photos of cars queuing backed out onto the road. Believe the space in front would not be fit for purpose.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application. Some of the neighbours have moved in well after the nursery set up, had they considered this a problem they perhaps should not have moved in. Lived in the house for 30 years and opened the nursery 15 years ago. Increased demand for places especially from parents with children already there. Will also help address wider shortfall in Bramhall. Worked closely with the Council in terms of the application. Parking is well away from the neighbours. Spaces to the rear are for family some of whom work at the nursery. The driveway will be resurfaced to the nursery and the pedestrian path reinstated. Parents do not leave their cars at the nursery all day.

Cllr Vine – Daisy Bank is a good nursery and that some spaces will be taken those with children already there. Very concerned re the plans. Where will the scooter, buggy and pram parking going – on the patio where there is plenty of room. Will you maintain the driveway – yes.

Cllr Bagnall – explain drop off. Answer - usually about 8.30 and then parents off to work, busy period again at the end of the day but it is quiet in between this period. Allocating time slots to parents for drop off and pick up.

PO – highway engineer has suggested a travel plan which should assist with some of the issues.

Cllr Vine – concerns re parking, their layout and how they can be accessed. Causes concern with conflict with other cars waiting to park etc. People do park to the side of the house and will continue to do so. (The applicant interjected and said they have a parking attendant to help manage drop off and pick up). Loss of screening to no.1 from the removal of the planted bed. Not enough consideration to houses. Users of the spaces to the rear would have to back out. Might need a site visit.

Cllr Holt – went to the site today with Cllr Bagnall; it's a fabulous nursery. Congestion is the problem. It was difficult to turn around when they went on site. Want reassurance that vehicles can turn in a safe manner without encroaching upon neighbouring property. Spaces should be marked out on site.

Cllr Bagnall – welcome site visit. Very well run nursery and understand demand, need a balance though between that and residential harmony. Helpful to carry out a site visit with the spaces marked out.

Site Visit agreed. Monday 4th July 2022, PHR on 7th July 2022.