

#### **ITEM 4**

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/083333</b>
<b>Location:</b>	Holly Head Hollywood Road Mellor Stockport SK6 5NS
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Renovation and extension of the existing barn building at the former Bleachworks off Hollywood Road to form 1 no. residential dwellinghouse, with associated landscaping and the erection of an additional barn and feed store.
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Full Application
<b>Registration Date:</b>	23/11/2021
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	18/01/2022
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Mark Burgess
<b>Applicant:</b>	MPS Construction Ltd
<b>Agent:</b>	Jennings Design Associates

#### **DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS**

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

#### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

Full planning permission is sought for the renovation and extension of an existing redundant barn building at the former Holly Head Bleachworks, Hollywood Road, Mellor to form 1 no. residential dwellinghouse, with associated landscaping and to include the erection of a barn and feed store.

The existing main building would be converted into a two storey dwellinghouse with associated external alterations, including the retention of the two existing arched entrances of the former stabling range. A contemporary two storey extension is proposed to the South Western elevation and a more traditional two storey extension is proposed to the North Western elevation, along with a balcony to the North Eastern elevation of the existing main building.

The proposal would include the erection of a single storey and part subterranean barn and feed/grain store building to the South West of the existing main building, to be used in conjunction with the applicant's management of the associated landholding.

Access to the proposed dwellinghouse would be taken via an existing access track which takes access from Hollywood Lane to the South West. Parking and turning facilities would be provided within the site. Proposed hard and soft landscaping

within the site would comprise a variety of grassed areas, tree and shrub planting, wildflower grassland, hard surfaces, retaining walls and water cascades/pools.

Members may recall a previous planning application at the site (Reference : DC061367), for the restoration and conversion of the buildings at the site to form a dwellinghouse. This application was granted by the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee on the 28<sup>th</sup> July 2016, following consideration and recommendation by Marple Area Committee.

The application is accompanied by the following supporting documents :-

- Planning Statement.
- Design and Access Statement.
- Heritage Assessment.
- Update Bat and Bird Survey.
- Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study.
- Structural Report Letter.

The scheme has been amended since its original submission in order to address issues raised by the Council Conservation Officer.

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

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site comprises the former 'Holly Head Bleachworks' on Hollywood Road in Mellor. The site accommodates a former stabling range building and workshop building which are the sole upstanding elements of the former Bleachworks, demolished in the early 1930's. The former stabling range comprises a long, narrow, stone-built tall barn-like three-bay structure to which is attached a lower two-bay cart shed to the North East. In addition, there is a single storey detached workshop building to the East.

The buildings were originally used as a Cotton Mill in the late 1780's, however became a Bleachworks in the 1830's. In the mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> Century, the buildings were enlarged, with the waterwheel being replaced by steam power. The wider site forms the legacy of the mill in the form of scattered ruins, the mill dam and culverted waterways, which originally fed its waterwheel and, subsequently, steam engines. Since the closure of the Bleachworks, the site has been used for agriculture.

Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is taken via a narrow track leading to Hollywood Road to the South and there is a public footpath adjacent to the site which passes close to the site entrance.

The site is adjoined to all sides by open fields/agricultural land, well separated from the nearest residential properties to the North East, South East, South West and North West.

## **POLICY BACKGROUND**

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

The Statutory Development Plan for Stockport comprises :-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (saved UDP) adopted on the 31st May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; and
- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy DPD) adopted on the 17th March 2011.

The application site is allocated within the Green Belt, as defined on the UDP Proposals Map and within the Ludworth Moor Landscape Character Area. The following policies are therefore relevant in consideration of the application :-

#### Saved UPD policies

- LCR1.1 : LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS
- LCR1.1A : THE URBAN FRINGE INCLUDING THE RIVER VALLEYS
- EP1.7 : DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK
- GBA1.1 : EXTENT OF GREEN BELT
- GBA1.2 : CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT
- GBA1.5 : RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT
- L1.1 : LAND FOR ACTIVE RECREATION
- L1.2 : CHILDRENS PLAY
- MW1.5 : CONTROL OF WASTE FROM DEVELOPMENT

#### Core Strategy DPD policies

- CS1 : OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – ADDRESSING INEQUALITIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE
- SD-1 : CREATING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES
- SD-3 : DELIVERING THE ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES PLAN – NEW DEVELOPMENT
- SD-6 : ADAPTING TO THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE
- CS2 : HOUSING PROVISION
- CS3 : MIX OF HOUSING
- CS4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING
- H-1 : DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
- H-2 : HOUSING PHASING
- H-3 : AFFORDABLE HOUSING
- 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
- CS10 : AN EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT NETWORK
- T-1 : TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT
- T-2 : PARKING IN DEVELOPMENTS
- T-3 : SAFETY AND CAPACITY ON THE HIGHWAY NETWORK

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents

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

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

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF, initially published in March 2012 and subsequently revised and published in July 2021 by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole'.*

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

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

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

Paragraph 219 states '*existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.*

#### National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

#### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- DC071667 : Discharge of Conditions 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 17, 20, 21 and 22 of planning permission DC061367 : Discharged – 23/05/2019.
- DC061367 : Restoration and conversion of buildings at the former Holly Head Bleachworks to form a dwelling and garage : Granted – 28/07/2016.
- DC059051 : Change of use of agricultural building to dwelling with associated permitted building works : Prior Approval Refused – 10/09/2015.
- DC056952 : Change of use of agricultural building to dwelling with associated permitted building works : Prior Approval Refused – 14/01/2015.

#### NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

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

No letters of representation have been received to the application.

## **CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

### **Conservation Officer**

#### **Comments of 28/02/2022**

The former Holyhead Bleachworks is included in the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record and therefore, under the National Planning Policy Framework it represents a non-designated heritage asset that possesses a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Whilst much of the original bleachworks complex has been lost over time, the conversion of the 2 remaining structures – the stable block and workshop – to residential use is to be welcomed because it provides a means by which the surviving historic fabric of the buildings can be preserved into the future.

A previous proposal for conversion was approved in 2016 (DC/061367) and this did not involve any extension of the existing buildings, with the proposed residential curtilage tightly drawn around the existing buildings and the general appearance of the external elevations maintained, particularly to the south facing elevation. Some amendments to the external design were incorporated into the design prior to approval to ensure a suitable scheme was achieved.

The current submitted scheme contains some significant amendments to the previous approval, including a contemporary 2 storey extension to the south west, a two storey rear extension to the north west, a raised platform to the east elevation to form an private amenity area and extensive alterations to the original fabric. These alterations are proposed to include the removal of much of the original walls to the stable block (both gables and rear walls, and the introduction of large rooflights would involve loss of a large area of roofing. It is unclear from the proposed plans whether the large Gothic arched internal wall would be retained or altered - a sectional drawing would be helpful to indicate how the introduction of a new floor and internal circulation may impact upon this key architectural and historic feature of the original building.

Handled with care, the principle of extending the original building should not result in harm to the heritage significance of the surviving structure. However I have concerns that the extent of alteration / extension proposed in the current scheme would be harmful to that significance and result in substantial removal, alteration and partial demolition of the surviving historic fabric.

I would recommend the current design is reviewed and amended to ensure the existing structure is retained and sympathetically repaired, with any extensions designed to ensure the original walls are retained.

The Heritage Assessment does not appear to recognise the degree of alteration proposed as part of the amended scheme and it is recommended that this document is reviewed in order to inform any revised proposals.

**Further comments of 01/04/2022, following submission of amended plans/information :-**

The former Holyhead Bleachworks is included in the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record and therefore, under the National Planning Policy Framework it represents a non-designated heritage asset that possesses a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Whilst much of the original bleachworks complex has been lost over time, the conversion of the 2 remaining structures – the stable block and workshop – to residential use is to be welcomed because it provides a means by which the surviving historic fabric of the buildings can be preserved into the future.

A previous proposal for conversion was approved in 2016 (DC/061367) and this did not involve any extension of the existing buildings, with the proposed residential curtilage tightly drawn around the existing buildings and the general appearance of the external elevations maintained, particularly to the south facing elevation.

The current submitted scheme incorporates additions and amendments to the previous approval, including a contemporary 2 storey extension to the south west, a two storey rear extension to the north west, a raised platform to the east elevation to form a private amenity area and a number of alterations to the original fabric.

In light of these revisions, the design of the current proposal has been reviewed in detail in order to ensure the retention of the existing structure is maximised and sympathetically repaired, with the design of the extensions amended to minimise any harm to the heritage significance of the surviving structure. Amended plans have been prepared and submitted in accordance with this advice, addressing my initial concerns. From a conservation and heritage perspective, I would therefore support the proposal as it represents a means of preserving the heritage asset and its significance for the future, ensuring it has a long term viable new use.

#### Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service

The application is supported by a Heritage Assessment (HA) compiled by Garry Miller Heritage Consultancy (2015, revised 2021), which includes a detailed historical analysis of the site, an appreciation of the site's importance in its wider industrial context, and an overview of the proposals' impacts on the surviving stabling range and workshop associated with the former Holly Head bleachworks. Information is presented with reference to current national and local planning policy, but whilst the analysis of the extant buildings includes useful photographs and descriptions there is no mention of below-ground impacts of the proposed development on potential archaeological remains.

The stabling range potentially pre-dates (late-18th century) the establishment of the main bleachworks buildings (early 19th century), it was then adapted and used as part of the wider bleachworks complex before being returned to having an agricultural function after the bleachworks closed in the 1930s. The extant workshop building probably dates to the early-mid 19th century and similarly shows evidence of phasing. Some of this redesign and re-use over time is evident on photographs of the standing buildings as depicted in the HA, but the buildings should be the subject of a scheme of more detailed historic building recording, to preserve by record their current state of survival prior to further alteration, demolition, concealment or loss of historic fabric.

The historic buildings survey should be undertaken by an appropriately qualified specialist, to the equivalent of a Historic England Level 2-3 record (2016, *Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice*). This will include measured floor plans and phased plans of the buildings, detailed photographs of elevations, rooms, and features of architectural/ archaeological interest, a detailed written description of the historic fabric, history, and comparative analysis, and an assessment of significance of the buildings and their components. The records should inform on the requirement for further watching briefs during the soft-strip of any of the buildings that might reveal further fabric or features that would enhance the record.

The application is also supported by a Landscape Masterplan illustration. The proposed location of a partially subterranean barn/store is shown to the south of the main stabling range, along with landscaped areas, road access, ponds and rockery. These features have the potential to impact on buried remains of the bleachworks complex that are depicted on historic maps. The HA demonstrates that there is evidence for survival of numerous features of the wider bleachworks complex across the site, including features associated with the water-power systems, but there is not a plan to show where these surviving elements of the site are located.

Rather than recommending the production of a Desk-Based Assessment of the site, GMAAS are of the opinion that any below-ground potential, and any additional above-ground potential, could far better be determined by an archaeological walkover and photographic survey, undertaken to Level 1-2 as described in Historic England's (2017) *Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes: A Guide to Good Recording Practice*. This would enable the creation of a detailed and measured plan of all surviving (and potentially surviving) elements of the site, which could be used alongside the development proposals to identify areas where further building recording and/or archaeological evaluation trenching would be required to mitigate development impacts.

There may be opportunities for some elements of the ground survey and/or background research to be undertaken/informed by the Mellor Archaeological Trust, who expressed interest in being involved with the investigation and interpretation of this site during a previous application (DC/061367). A letter expressing the Trust's interest has been provided in support of this current application. The opportunity for community involvement during any archaeological works, research and subsequent mitigation would be welcomed as a means of appropriate engagement and dissemination.

Should Stockport Council be minded to grant permission for the development, GMAAS recommend that a programme of archaeological works is secured by a condition, worded as follows :-

*No soft-strip, alteration, demolition or development ground-works shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works. The works are to be undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The WSI shall cover the following :-*

*1. Informed by the updated North West Regional Research Framework, a phased programme and methodology of investigation and recording to include:*



*i – historic buildings survey of the stabling range and workshop to Historic England Level 2-3*

*ii – (informed by (i)), an archaeological watching brief during any soft-strip or demolition works which have potential to reveal concealed historic fabric that can further enhance the record.*

*iii – an archaeological walkover and photographic survey to Historic England Level 1-2 to identify and describe all surviving (and potentially surviving) elements of the bleachworks site within the development boundary*

*iv – (informed by (iii)) further building recording and/or archaeological evaluation trenching in areas of significance that will be impacted upon (subject of a separate WSI)*

*2. A programme for post investigation assessment to include:*

*- analysis of the site investigation records and finds*

*- production of a final report on the significance of the heritage interest represented.*

*3. Deposition of the final report with the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record.*

*4. Dissemination of the results commensurate with their significance.*

*5. Provision for archive deposition of the report and records of the site investigation.*

*6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved WSI.*

*Reason: In accordance with NPPF Section 16, Paragraph 205 - To record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.*

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

### Highway Engineer

This application, which seeks permission for the restoration and conversion of a derelict building situated at a rural site at Mellor to a residential dwelling, together with associated landscaping and the erection of a small barn and feed store, is similar to a scheme which was approved in 2016 under application DC/061367 and, I understand, was commenced. As with that application, the dwelling will be accessed via an existing access track which takes access from Hollywood Lane (which also serves a couple of existing dwellings, as well as agricultural land) and parking and turning facilities will be provided within the site. The scheme, however, differs slightly from the previous scheme, with the main changes being:

- 1) The form of the residential dwelling (including various extensions)
- 2) The site layout, including the layout of the driveway
- 3) A barn / feed store is now proposed
- 4) The former workshop is no longer proposed to be used as a domestic garage

These amendments should not have any material implications on the local highway network or how the site is accessed and, as such, subject to similar conditions being attached to any approval granted as were attached to the previous approval, together with conditions requiring EV charging (taking into account changes in policy since the previous scheme was approved) and use of the barn / feed store, I would consider the proposal acceptable from a highways perspective.

With respect to the former workshop building, as this is no longer proposed to be used as a domestic garage, a separate cycle store will be required. The requirement to provide this can be secured by condition. Finally, although this does not form part of this application, I note that the Planning Statement outlines that the applicant is considering future uses for this building and has outlined that one option would be to use it as a holiday let. As outlined in my comments on the previous application, I would have concern regarding any proposal that resulted in an intensification of use of the access track that serves the site, unless the impact could be mitigated. As such, whilst not for consideration as part of this application, the applicant should bare this in mind when considering future options for the use of this building.

- Recommendation : No objection, subject to the following condition :-

No development shall take place until a detailed drawing outlining a scheme to :-

- 1) Hard surface (in bitmac) the first few metres of the two legs of the access track that serves the site where it meets Hollywood Lane (so as to improve the tie in between the access track and the highway); and
- 2) Provide pedestrian passing places / waiting areas at regular intervals along the access track that serves the site

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved drawing and the passing places are available for use. The passing places shall then be retained at all times thereafter.

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.

No development shall take place until full details outlining how the access drives within the site (including associated parking and turning area) will be surfaced and drained have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the driveways have been constructed in accordance with the approved drawings. The driveways shall then be retained and remain available for use for access, parking and turning at all times thereafter.

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

A charging point for the charging of electric vehicles shall be provided within the site for the approved dwelling. Prior to its provision, details of the charging point shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved dwelling shall not be occupied until the charging point has been provided in accordance with the approved details and is available for use. The charging point shall thereafter be retained (unless it is replaced with an upgraded charging point in which case that should be retained).

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

No work shall take place in respect to the provision of cycle parking within the site until details of proposals to provide a long-stay cycle parking facility for the approved dwelling (which shall be in the form of a covered and secure cycle store that will accommodate a minimum of one cycle for the dwelling) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved dwelling shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facility has been provided in accordance with the approved details. The cycle parking facility shall then be retained and shall remain available for use at all times thereafter.

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

The approved barn/feed store shall only be used for the storage of livestock, equipment and animal feed associated with the management of land in which it is situated.

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.

#### Arboricultural Officer

There is no Conservation area protection within this site or affected by this development.

There are no legally protected trees within this site or affected by this development.

The proposed demolition and construction including associated infrastructure of the site predominantly sits within the informal grounds and hard standing areas of the site and will not have an impact on trees on site or neighbouring the site.

The main concern for the development is the potential accidental damage during the demolition stages of the build as well as the foundations stages of the rebuild on the site and the ever increasing rural aspect of the site and surrounding areas through tree loss. There is some indicative tree planting shown on the site layout plans, so there is limited evidence on how they propose to enhance the ever increasing urban setting but some consideration needs to be given to the increase of screening of the site from the properties and vice versa, while also considering the biodiversity and environmental aspect of trees within the urban setting.

The proposed development will potentially not impact on the trees through the demolition stages on site with a number of trees and shrubs being within proximity of the demolition/new build and without the tree survey details on their health condition, structural condition and impact from developments further comments cannot be made on the impact this may have. Due to the ever increasing urban aspect of Mellor a compensatory/enhancement planting scheme needs to be further developed in accordance with the Councils policy for tree cover in any proposed landscape scheme submitted to off-set the impact on the biodiversity of the site and enhancing the local environment with increased level of tree cover for the site as the current laurel planting proposal is not significant enough.

The tree planting will impact on biodiversity, aesthetics and general screening of the site. The development will need to supply protective fencing and advisory notices to prevent any damage, accidental spillage or compaction on the trees and their root systems.

In addition to the protective fencing some consideration should be given to the proposed tree planting as part of the scheme as whilst the plan shows a good level of proposed tree planting throughout the site that will enhance the local area the details of the tree size and species need to be reviewed as some species need to be assessed and all the sizes need to be the larger size as noted in the landscape plan.

In principle the proposed construction will not have an impact on the trees on site and within neighbouring properties, therefore it is acceptable in its current format with the submission of a method statement for soft demolition, a landscaping schemes submitted to discharge the conditions and consideration of the above is given in these schemes, root protection plans for fencing at the side and rear of the site.

The root protection plan will need to be conditioned and approved prior to works commencing on site.

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

- No existing tree within the site shall be cut down, topped, lopped, uprooted, willfully damaged or willfully 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.
- 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.
- 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.

### Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Thank you for supplying the updated Bat & Bird Survey (Dunelm Ecology, October 2021) for the above site. I have the following comments to make: -

- The survey updates work undertaken in 2014 and 2018 for the barns.
- While the current work was undertaken in September, towards the later part of the survey season, I concur that given the effort over a number of seasons this does not invalidate the Report's conclusions.
- The work in 2021 reconfirms the presence of roosting bats (common Pipistrelle) and identifies a second species (Brandt's/whiskered) utilising roosts at the site.
- I concur that the application can be implemented via a Natural England Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL).
- The Report outlines the broad methodology that will be utilised under the BMCL class licence. It is my opinion, that this appropriate and proportionate to the status of the bat roosts.
- As the scheme will be implemented under a Bat Mitigation Class Licence a full reasoned statement is not required by Natural England to issue the licence, but that this does not obviate the LPA's responsibilities to have *regard* to the derogation tests. It is therefore considered that the building is a confirmed bat roost under the definition of the Habitats Regulations (2019).
- It is strongly advised that the Local Planning Authority report the presence of a bat roost in their recommendations to Committee or delegated report.
- I would recommend that a British Standard model condition is applied to the proposal should it receive permission: -

*"The following works including any conversion/repair works including repointing, dismantling stone walls, removal of slate roof coverings or treat/removal of internal roof joists, which support roosting common pipistrelle and Brandt's/whiskered bats shall not in any circumstances commence unless the Local Planning Authority has been provided with either:*

*A licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of the Conservation for Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, authorising the specified development to go ahead;*

*Or*

*A statement in writing from the relevant licensing body to the effect that it does not consider that the development will require a licence."*

- It is recommended in the Report that a sensitive external lighting scheme is provided and this should be secured via a condition on any permission if granted to be submitted and implemented prior to the reoccupation of the building/first use. In line with the NPPF (July 2021 para 185 c)) we recommend that applicants follow the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance (01/21 obtrusive lighting and 08/18 wildlife sensitive lighting). This

should include all elements of the proposal such as highways lighting, pedestrian/cycleway access and external domestic/security lighting as appropriate.

- The Report also highlights that the building has been used by breeding birds and that all bird species are protected whilst nesting (W&CA). Breeding activity was in the past recorded for Barn owl (Schedule 1, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981), which receives additional protection during the breeding and nesting season. A condition should be used to indicate that works during the breeding season (March – August inclusive) should only be carried out where it can be clearly demonstrated by a suitably qualified person that no nesting activity is present.
- It should be noted that in order to receive a BMCL updated surveys may be required by Natural England.
- Other landscaping should include biodiversity enhancement measures as guided by the NPPF (July 2021, paragraph 174d and 179 b)). This detail can be secured via condition.

I am satisfied that the updated survey is adequate and that the application can proceed to determination in respect of biodiversity subject to the recommendations and application of conditions as outlined above.

#### Environment Team (Land Contamination)

The proposed development site is on an area of land identified a potentially contaminated due to chemical manufacturing, as such the developer will need to undertake a site investigation to ensure the site is suitable for its intended sensitive end use.

I recommend the following conditions :-

#### Condition CTM1

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

#### Reason

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

#### Condition CTM2

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

#### Reason

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

#### Condition CTM3

The development shall not be occupied until the approved remediation scheme required to be submitted by Condition XXX has been carried out. Within 6 months of completion of remediation measures, a validation report assessing the effectiveness of the remediation carried shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall specify any further remediation measures necessary and indicate how and when these measures will be undertaken.

#### Reason

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

#### Drainage Engineer

#### **Comments of 26/11/2021 :-**

There appears to be limited information regarding drainage for the site. On the Landscape Plan, there appears to be potential to have SuDS incorporated, such as ponds and grassed areas for infiltration. However, we require the applicant to provide a clear drainage strategy, which details how they intend to successfully drain the surface water. I have attached our Developer Guidance, which explains what we expect from a drainage strategy.

## Further comments of 25/05/2022, following submission of additional information :-

- The drainage strategy that has been proposed is on the basis that infiltration within the site is feasible. In order to confirm this assumption, we require site investigations and infiltration testing to be undertaken in accordance with the standards.
- The foul package treatment plant has the intention of discharging the foul water into the filter bed, along with the surface water. We have a concern that this could be a complication. Therefore, we require the applicant to adequately prove that the foul package treatment plant complies with the binding rules (see attached).
- Our records show that there is a nearby watercourse to the site, however the strategy does not appear to discuss the potential viability of draining into the watercourse.

### Public Rights of Way Officer

I have no particular issues with the plans for the site, as the PRoW will not be directly affected. However, access along footpath 29 Marple from Hollywood Road may occasionally be affected by construction traffic. This should be minimised and all efforts made to ensure safety.

### ANALYSIS

#### Policy Principle – Green Belt

The site is allocated within the Green Belt, as defined on the UDP Proposals Map. The NPPF addresses the national approach to Green Belt policy under the heading entitled 'Protecting Green Belt Land' and takes as its fundamental starting point the importance of maintaining 'openness' on a 'permanent basis'. Paragraph 137 of the NPPF confirms that *'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'*.

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, except in a number of limited circumstances, including within Paragraph 149 (c) :-

***The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.***

Paragraph 150 of the NPPF states that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Such forms of development include, within Paragraph 150 (d) :-

***The re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.***

Saved UDP policy GBA1.2 states that forms of development other than new buildings, including changes in the use of land, will not be permitted unless they maintain openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and that proposals for the re-use of buildings will be assessed against the



provisions of saved UDP policy GBA1.6. Additionally, saved UDP policy GBA1.5 specifies, amongst other categories, that within the Green Belt new residential development will be restricted to the re-use of buildings, as provided for by saved UDP policy GBA1.6.

Saved UDP policy GBA1.6 confirms that the change of use or conversion of buildings of permanent and substantial construction will be permitted, provided that a number of criteria are satisfied, as outlined below :-

***(i) Would be used for economic or other purposes other than wholly residential ones;***

Whilst saved UDP policy is broadly consistent with the NPPF, criteria (i) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6, which precludes conversion of buildings to wholly residential uses, is in direct conflict with Paragraph 150 (d) of the NPPF, which makes no distinction between types of uses.

In this context, Paragraph 219 of the NPPF requires weight to be afforded to Local Plan policy, according to its degree of consistency with the NPPF. On this basis, the discrepancy relating to criteria (i) of the saved UDP policy GBA1.6 is outdated following the introduction of the NPPF and accordingly should not be apportioned any weight.

In view of the above, in Green Belt policy terms, it is therefore left to be considered whether or not the conversion satisfies the remaining criteria (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6. Each of these will be assessed in turn :-

***(ii) Would maintain openness and would not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt;***

Information submitted in support of the application confirms that the volume of the existing building is 892 cubic metres and the volume of the resulting building would be 1207 cubic metres, representing a 35% increase on the volume of the existing building. This is considered acceptable when assessed against the 'about one third' volume increase guideline considered appropriate by saved UDP policy GBA1.5. As such, the proposed extension would not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the existing building, in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 149 (c) of the NPPF. On this basis, the proposal is considered to maintain openness and would not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Should planning permission be granted for the proposed development, it would be reasonable to impose a condition to withdraw householder permitted development rights, in the interests of safeguarding the openness of the Green Belt.

***(iii) Would safeguard or improve the appearance of the rural environment;***

The sympathetic conversion and extension of the existing vacant and redundant buildings which comprise a non-designated heritage asset and would otherwise continue to deteriorate, is supported by the Council Conservation Officer and would secure a viable long-term future for the non-designated heritage asset. As such, it is considered that the sympathetic conversion and extension of the building would safeguard and improve the appearance of the rural environment, in particular the Ludworth Moor Landscape Character Area within which the site is located.

***All buildings should be structurally sound, well related to their surroundings and capable of :-***

***(iv) Accommodating the new use without the need for major rebuilding or extension;***

Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing building is vacant and redundant, the Structural Report Letter submitted in support of the application confirms that the building is structural sound for conversion. In addition and as stated above, the proposed extensions are not considered to be major. As such, the proposal satisfies the requirements of saved UDP policy GBA1.6 (iv), along with the requirements of Paragraph 150 (c) of the NPPF.

***(v) Being provided with an adequate curtilage without adverse impact on the Green Belt; and***

The proposed dwellinghouse would be served by a tightly defined and appropriately sized curtilage which would not extend outside the previously developed area of the site and would not result in adverse impact on the Green Belt.

***(vi) Being satisfactorily accessed and serviced without adverse impact on the Green Belt.***

The Highway Engineer considers the access, parking and servicing facilities acceptable subject to conditional control. The existing access would be retained and improved within the previously developed area of the site and, as such, would not have an adverse impact on the Green Belt.

***In the case of buildings, which may be used by bats, barn owls or other protected species, satisfactory investigation must be carried out into the possible presence of such species and, where appropriate, measures must be implemented to ensure that legal obligations are met and that any damage to habitats is minimised.***

On the basis of the ecological information submitted in support of the application, in the absence of objections from Greater Manchester Ecology Unit and subject to appropriate mitigation measures which would be secured by condition, any harm to protected species would be minimised.

In addition to the above, Members are advised that planning permission has previously been granted for the restoration and conversion of the buildings at the site to form a dwellinghouse, albeit without the proposed extensions sought as part of the current scheme, as part of planning application DC061367 in July 2016. All relevant pre-commencement conditions were discharged and a lawful commencement of this development has been implemented. As such, this planning permission is extant in perpetuity and comprises a genuine fall-back position, capable of implementation.

In view of the above and in summary of Green Belt considerations, it is clear that the proposal complies with the requirements of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6. It is recognised that the proposal does not comply with the requirement of criteria (i) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6, being for a wholly residential use. However, due to the fact that this criteria is in direct conflict and inconsistent with the advice contained within Paragraph 150 (d) of the NPPF which was introduced after adoption of the UDP, it is considered to be outdated and should not be apportioned any weight, in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 219 of the NPPF. On this basis, the proposal represents a Green Belt exception for the

purposes of Paragraph 150 (d) of the NPPF, does not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is considered to be fully justified as a departure from the development plan.

### Policy Principle – Residential

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

The NPPF puts additional emphasis upon the government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing, rather than simply having land allocated for housing development. Stockport is currently in a position of housing under-supply, with 3.2 years of supply against the minimum requirement of 5 years + 20%, as set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF. In situations of housing under-supply, Core Strategy DPD policy CS4 allows Core Strategy DPD policy H-2 to come into effect, bringing housing developments on sites which meet the Councils reduced accessibility criteria. Having regard to the continued position of housing under-supply within the Borough, the current minimum accessibility score is set at 'zero'.

In addition to the above, Members are advised that planning permission has previously been granted for the restoration and conversion of the buildings at the site to form a dwellinghouse, albeit without the proposed extensions sought as part of the current scheme, as part of planning application DC061367 in July 2016. All relevant pre-commencement conditions were discharged and a lawful commencement of this development has been implemented. As such, this planning permission is extant in perpetuity and comprises a genuine fall-back position, capable of implementation.

In view of the above factors, the principle of residential development at the site is considered acceptable at the current time of housing under-supply within the Borough. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with Core Strategy DPD policies CS2, CS4 and H-2.

### Impact on Heritage Assets

The former Holly Head Bleachworks is included in the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record and therefore, under the NPPF, represents a non-designated heritage asset. The detailed comments received to the application from the Council Conservation Officer and Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS) are contained within the Consultee Responses section above.

Whilst much of the original Bleachworks complex has been lost over time, the conversion of the two remaining structures (the stable block and workshop) to residential use is welcomed by the Conservation Officer, as it would provide a means by which the surviving historic fabric of the building can be preserved into the future.

The Conservation Officer acknowledges the previously granted planning application (Reference : DC061367) for the restoration and conversion of buildings at the site to form a dwellinghouse at the site, however notes that this permission did not involve any extensions to the existing buildings. The current scheme would incorporate

additions and amendments to the previous planning permission, including a contemporary two storey extension to the South Western elevation, a two storey extension to the North Western elevation, a balcony to the North Eastern elevation and a number of alterations to the original fabric of the building.

Amendments have been made to the scheme since its original submission, in order to address concerns raised by the Conservation Officer. The amended scheme would ensure that the existing structure would be sympathetically repaired and the design of the proposed extensions accommodated without causing harm to the heritage significance of the surviving structure. On this basis, the amended scheme is supported by the Conservation Officer, as it would represent a means of preserving the heritage asset and its significance for the future, ensuring that it would have a long-term viable use. Appropriate matters of detail in relation to materials of external construction, external windows and doors, rainwater goods/soil and vent pipes, external plant and equipment and boundary treatment, would be secured by way of suitably worded planning conditions. In addition and as recommended by GMAAS, a condition will be imposed to require the submission, approval and implementation of a programme of archaeological works and recording during development.

In view of the above, on the basis of the submitted amended scheme, in the absence of objections from the Conservation Officer and GMAAS and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered to represent a sympathetic conversion and extension of the existing building and the proposed residential use would provide a long term viable future for the heritage asset. As such, the proposal complies with Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3 and the advice contained within the NPPF.

#### Impact on Landscape Character and Amenity

The application site is located within the Ludworth Moor Landscape Character Area. Saved UDP policies LCR1.1 and LCR1.1A and Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3 seek to ensure that the landscape and character of the countryside is preserved and enhanced and to strictly control development in the countryside to ensure that the landscape quality of the area is not adversely affected.

The proposal would comprise the restoration, conversion and extension of existing vacant and redundant buildings at the site which are likely to continue to deteriorate further in the absence of securing a viable re-use. As such, it is clear that the proposed residential use and sympathetic conversion and extension of the building would preserve and enhance the character of the Ludworth Moor Landscape Character Area, in accordance with saved UDP policies LCR1.1 and LCR1.1A and Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3.

In view of the location of the site and the level of private amenity space provided, satisfactory levels of amenity would be provided for future occupants of the proposed development, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies H-1 and SIE-1 and the Design of Residential Development SPD.

The site is adjoined to all sides by open fields/agricultural land and is well separated from the nearest residential properties to the North East, South East, South West and North West. As such, the proposed residential use and associated development could be accommodated on the site without causing harm to the amenity of surrounding residential properties, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies H-1 and SIE-1 and the Design of Residential Development SPD.

## Highways Considerations

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

The Highway Engineer acknowledges the previous planning permission for the formation of 1 no. dwellinghouse at the site in 2016 (Reference : DC061367). The Highway Engineer notes that, as with the previous planning permission, the proposed dwellinghouse would be accessed via an existing access track which takes access from Hollywood Road and parking facilities would be provided within the site. Differences between the previous planning permission and the current scheme comprise the form of the proposed dwellinghouse, the site layout including the layout of the driveway, the proposal for a barn/feed store and the former workshop no longer being proposed as a domestic garage.

In raising no objections to the proposal, the Highway Engineer considers that the scheme would not result in any material implications on the local highway network or how the site is accessed and, on this basis, the proposal is considered acceptable from a highways perspective.

Conditions are recommended by the Highway Engineer to secure matters of detail in relation to the surfacing of the access track; the provision of pedestrian passing places/waiting areas on the access track; surfacing/drainage of the access drives; electric vehicle and cycle parking facilities; and to ensure that the barn/feed store is only used for the storage of livestock, equipment and animal feed.

In view of the above, in the absence of objections from the Highway Engineer and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered acceptable from a traffic generation, parking, accessibility and highway safety perspective. As such, the proposal complies with Core Strategy DPD policies SD-6, SIE-1, SIE-3, CS9, T-1, T-2 and T-3, the Sustainable Transport SPD and the Transport and Highways in Residential Areas SPD.

## Impact on Trees

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

The Arboricultural Officer notes that existing trees on the site are not afforded protection by way of either Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area status. As such, consideration must be taken of the fact that existing trees on the site could effectively be removed or worked to without the requirement for consent.

The Arboricultural Officer considers that the proposed development would not have an impact on existing trees within the site. In order to address concerns raised by the Arboricultural Officer in relation to potential impacts on trees during construction, conditions are recommended to ensure that any existing tree is not worked to and to require the provision of protective fencing to existing trees during construction. A further condition is recommended to require the provision of additional landscaping/planting, to enhance the site from a biodiversity and visual amenity perspective.

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

#### Impact on Protected Species and Ecology

A Bat and Bird Survey has been submitted in support of the application. The detailed comments received to the application from Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. GMEU are satisfied that adequate ecological information has been submitted in support of the application in order to inform determination.

The submitted Survey confirms that the existing building has been used by breeding birds and breeding activity was recorded in the past for Barn Owl, both of which are protected species. As such, a condition is recommended to ensure that any proposed works during the breeding season are carried out only where it can be clearly demonstrated by a suitably qualified person that no nesting activity is present.

The submitted Survey confirms the presence of roosting bats (common Pipistrelle) and identifies a second species (Brandt's/whiskered) utilising roosts at the site. As such, the proposed development would impact on a building which is known to support roosting bats, with the potential to kill or injure bats and damage their roost without appropriate mitigation and compensation measures. When determining planning applications, legal cases demonstrate that the Local Planning Authority has a requirement to have regard to the 3 Habitats Regulation derogation tests :-

- Imperative reasons of Over-riding Public Importance (IROPI);
- No satisfactory alternative solution;
- Maintenance of the favourable conservation status (FCS) of the species.

In assessment of each of the tests, Members are advised of the following :-

1. It is considered that the proposed development would be for a reason of over-riding public importance. The proposed residential use of the building would secure a viable, long-term future for the heritage asset, which is currently redundant and in a poor state of repair.
2. It is considered that there is no satisfactory alternative solution to the proposed development. In the absence of the proposed conversion, it is likely that the buildings would remain unused and fall into further disrepair, with potential loss of the bat roosts.
3. GMEU confirm that the development would be implemented via a Natural England Bat Mitigation Class License (BMCL), outlining the broad methodology that will be used which, in the opinion of GMEU, is appropriate and proportionate to the status of the bat roosts. This would be secured by the imposition of a condition to ensure that the development is not commenced until an appropriate license has been issued by Natural England or confirmation has been received from the licensing body that such a license is not required.

Further conditions are recommended by GMEU to secure the provision of biodiversity enhancements within the proposed planting and landscaping scheme and to ensure that any external lighting is sensitively designed in order to minimise impacts on wildlife.

In summary, on the basis of the submitted information, in the absence of objections from GMEU and subject to conditional control, it is considered that any potential harm resulting from the proposed development to protected species, biodiversity and the ecological interest of the site could be appropriately mitigated. As such, the proposal complies with Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3.

### Flood Risk and Drainage

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is deemed to have the lowest risk of flooding. Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-3 states that all development will be expected to comply with the approach set out in national policy, with areas of hard-standing or other surfaces, should be of a permeable construction or drain to an alternative form of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Core Strategy DPD policy SD-6 requires a 50% reduction in existing surface water runoff and incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage the run-off water from the site through the incorporation of permeable surfaces and SuDS.

A Surface Water Drainage Scheme has been submitted in support of the application and the detailed comments received to the application from the Council Drainage Engineer are contained within the Consultee Responses section above. Members will note that the proposed surface water drainage scheme is currently subject to discussions between the applicant and Drainage Engineer at the time of report preparation and Members will be update verbally in relation to these ongoing discussions. Nevertheless, it is noted that appropriate surface water drainage for the proposed development could be secured by the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition. This would require the submission, approval, implementation, management and maintenance of a detailed surface water drainage system for the development, which should incorporate a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS), based on the hierarchy of drainage options identified by National Planning Practice Guidance and taking into account ground conditions. Subject to compliance with such a condition, it is considered that the proposed development could be drained in a sustainable and appropriate manner without the risk of flooding elsewhere, in accordance with saved UDP policy EP1.7 and Core Strategy DPD policies SD-6 and SIE-3.

### Land Contamination

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

The Environmental Health Officer notes that the site is located on an area of land identified as potentially contaminated due to chemical manufacturing, therefore a site investigation is required to ensure that the site is suitable for the proposed residential use. This would be secured by way of suitably worded conditions, which would be applied as a phased approach, to require the submission, approval and implementation of an investigation, risk assessment, remediation scheme and remedial action, where necessary, into contamination at the site. Subject to compliance with such conditions, it is considered that the proposed development would not be at risk from land contamination, in accordance with Core Strategy DPD policies CS8 and SIE-3.

### Energy Efficiency

As the proposed development would not exceed 10 residential units, the proposed development does not trigger the Council's carbon reduction targets, as defined by Core Strategy DPD policy SD-3. The submission of an Energy Statement, to confirm that energy efficient measures would be incorporated within the fabric of the development and to assess the potential use of low and zero carbon technologies within the development would be secured by way of suitably worded planning condition.

### Developer Contributions

With regard to affordable housing, notwithstanding the requirements of Core Strategy DPD policy H-3 and the Provision of Affordable Housing SPG, the NPPF states that the provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments (10 residential units or more). As such, on the basis of the proposal for 1 no. dwellinghouse, there is no requirement for affordable housing provision within the development.

In accordance with saved UDP policy L1.2, Core Strategy DPD policy SIE-2, the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD and the NPPG, there is a requirement to ensure the provision and maintenance of formal recreation facilities within the Borough to meet the needs of the residents of the development. On the basis of the population capacity of the proposed development (1 no. 4 bedroomed/5 person dwelling = 5), this would require a commuted sum payment of £4,505, which would be secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement.

### SUMMARY

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

Members are advised that planning permission has previously been granted for the restoration and conversion of the buildings at the site to form a dwellinghouse, albeit without the proposed extensions sought within the current scheme, as part of planning application DC061367 in July 2016. All relevant pre-commencement conditions were discharged and a lawful commencement of this development has been implemented. As such, this planning permission is extant in perpetuity and comprises a genuine fall-back position, capable of implementation.

The existing building to which the proposed residential conversion and extension would relate comprises a non-designated heritage asset. The building is vacant and redundant and is likely to deteriorate further in the absence of securing a viable re-use. The proposed sympathetic residential conversion and associated extensions is supported the Conservation Officer, who considers that the proposal would provide a long-term viable future for the heritage asset, which should be afforded significant weight by Members in considering the proposal. Weight should also be afforded to the provision of much needed residential development at the site during the current period of housing under-supply within the Borough.

In the absence of objections from relevant consultees and subject to conditional control, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to the issues of impact on the character of the Ludworth Moor Landscape Character Area; impact on residential amenity; traffic generation, parking and highway safety; impact on trees; impact on



protected species and ecology; flood risk and drainage; land contamination; and energy efficiency.

The application site is located within the Green Belt and it is considered that the proposed residential conversion and associated extensions could be undertaken without causing any adverse harm to the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the requirements of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6. It is recognised that the proposal does not comply with the requirement of criteria (i) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6, being for a wholly residential use. However, due to the fact that this criteria is in direct conflict and inconsistent with Paragraph 150 (d) of the NPPF, it is considered to be outdated and should not be apportioned any weight, in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 219 of the NPPF. On this basis, the proposal represents a Green Belt exception for the purposes of Paragraph 150 (d) of the NPPF, does not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is considered to be fully justified as a departure to the development plan.

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

Given the conflict with criteria (i) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6, the proposal remains a Departure from the Development Plan. Accordingly, should Members of Marple Area Committee be minded to grant planning permission, the application will be required to be referred to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee for determination as a Departure from the Development Plan.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant.

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

Should the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee agree the recommendation and resolve to grant planning permission, the decision should be deferred and delegated to the Head of Planning, pending the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the relevant contribution towards open space.

### **MARPLE AREA COMMITTEE – 22<sup>ND</sup> JUNE 2022**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and highlighted the pertinent issues of the proposal.

Members sought clarification with regard to construction access to the site, noting the condition and nature of Hollywood Road and issues experienced by nearby properties. The Planning Officer highlighted the recommended conditions of the Highway Engineer but advised Members that a Construction Method Statement condition could be imposed to minimise issues during construction should Members feel that this would be required and necessary. Members sought clarification regarding flooding mitigation measures in view of recent flooding issues in the area. The Planning Officer confirmed that the surface water drainage strategy for the scheme was subject to ongoing discussions with the Council Drainage Team, however it was advised appropriate surface water drainage could be secured by

condition. Members sought clarification as to existing planting that had been undertaken on the site in relation to an existing public right of way and in terms of non-native species within the proposed planting scheme. The Planning Officer confirmed that the Local Planning Authority could not control existing planting that had been undertaken in and around the site to date. However, a condition was recommended to require the submission and approval of a landscaping and planting scheme which would be subject to consultation with the Council Arboricultural and Nature Development Officer, who would seek appropriate native species planting within the development. Members sought clarification with regard to the conflict with saved UDP policy GBA1.6. The Planning Officer confirmed that saved UDP policy GBA1.6 (i) allowed for the conversion of buildings within the Green Belt, provided that they would be used for economic or other purposes that wholly residential. However, the Planning Officer confirmed that this is in directly conflict and inconsistent with Paragraph 150 (d) of the NPPF, which did not prevent conversions to wholly residential uses. As such, in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 219 of the NPPF, the Planning Officer advised that criteria (i) of saved UDP policy GBA1.6 was outdated and should not be apportioned any weight and the proposal was considered to be fully justified as a departure.

There were no requests to speak in objection to the application.

The Agent spoke in support of the application. It was noted that the applicant was local to the area and sought to deliver a high quality development as their forever home. The scheme had been subject to extensive discussions with the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer and it was felt that the development could deliver an award winning scheme. The applicant was fully committed to delivering a planting scheme to contribute to ecology and biodiversity.

Members sought clarification from the Agent with regard to potential access issues during construction and associated impacts from heavy vehicles of the road and nearby properties. The Agent confirmed that it would be in the applicants interests to deal with neighbours in the correct way. Whilst there was inevitably be some impact, the applicant would seek to mitigate with appropriate sized vehicles and construction works at reasonable times. Members sought clarification as to proposed flood mitigation measures. The Agent confirmed that the landscaping scheme had been designed to ensure the provision of flood routes through the site and take surface water to existing locations on the site and to comprise sustainable drainage. Members considered it important to keep neighbouring properties informed during development.

Members debated the proposal. The balance between native and non-native trees was considered to be acceptable. A condition was considered to be necessary to require the submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement in order to mitigate impacts during development. Members considered that the quality of the development was considered to be of an incredibly high standard and the re-use of the building rather than demolition and rebuild was considered to be positive.

Following the debate, Members resolved to refer the application to the Planning and Highways Regulation Committee with a recommendation to grant, subject to the imposition of an appropriate Construction Method Statement condition.