

ITEM 1

Application Reference	DC/081474
Location:	Cow And Calf Hotel 2 School Brow Bredbury Stockport SK6 3AT
PROPOSAL:	Retention, conversion and extension of existing pub to form 3 dwellings and the erection of 5 houses and 1 bungalow together with new access and parking.
Type Of Application:	Full Application
Registration Date:	16.07.2021
Expiry Date:	20210910
Case Officer:	Jane Chase
Applicant:	Mr D. Woodman
Agent:	Architectural Solutions Ltd

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

4 or more objections – Area Committee

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

As originally submitted this application sought planning permission for the demolition of the pub and the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. Such development to School Brow would have comprised the erection of 2 pairs of 2 storey semi detached houses (4no. dwellings in total) with forecourt parking together with a terrace of 3 houses, 2 storeys high plus accommodation in the roof and with parking to the rear accessed from Barrack Hill. To Barrack Hill, a pair of 2 storey semi detached houses were proposed with car parking to either side.

Since this original submission, the application has been amended and now comprises the following:-

To School Brow 2 pairs of semi detached houses (4 houses in total) positioned behind a forecourt parking area. The proposed houses each comprising 3 bedrooms would comprise 2 full floors of accommodation of a simple design with a hipped roof and projecting gables to the front and rear elevations. Materials are indicated as being brick brick and tiles with stone cill and head detailing to the windows. Private rear gardens are proposed to each dwelling with pedestrian access from the front to bin and bikes stores at the rear. To the front of these 4 houses is a forecourt parking area accessed

from School Brow accommodating 2 parking spaces for each of the 4 dwellings. This parking area would be enclosed to School Brow by a low brick wall and railings with planted beds positioned behind this wall and around the parking spaces.

The existing pub is now being retained however the 2 storey and single storey extensions to the rear together with the single storey side extension will be demolished and the main roof removed. A 2 storey extension will be erected to the south side of the pub fronting School Brow together with a 2 storey extension to the rear; a new hipped roof will be erected over the resulting building. This will then be converted to 1no. 3 bed and 2no. 4 bed terraced houses. The 3 bed house at the junction of School Brow and Barrack Hill will comprise 2 full floors of accommodation as will the 4 bed houses however they will also have accommodation in the roofspace served by rooflights to the front and rear roof plane. Each house will have a private rear garden accommodating bike and bin stores accessed either from School Brow or Barrack Hill. Materials are indicated as being a mix of brick, render and tiles with stone detailing to the window heads and cills.

To Barrack Hill it is proposed to erect a 2 storey detached house at the end of the gardens to the converted and extended pub building. This house comprising 3 bedrooms would be of a simple design with a 2 storey projecting gable to the front elevation and a pitched roof over. The ground floor would be constructed from brick with a rendered 1st floor and tiled roof. Stone head and cills are proposed to the windows. This house would have an enclosed small front garden and larger private rear garden accommodating bike and bin stores.

A detached bungalow is also proposed to Barrack Hill comprising 3 bedrooms. This would be mainly rendered with a projecting brick gable to the front elevation and pitched roof over. A small garden is proposed to the front and rear with the main amenity space being to the side of this dwelling and accommodating bike and bin stores.

Between the house and bungalow proposed to Barrack Hill it is proposed to create a parking area accommodating 8 parking spaces. These spaces would be for the benefit of the 3 dwellings in the pub conversion together with the 2 storey house and bungalow to Barrack Hill.

The application is accompanied by the following documents:-

Heritage Statement

Daytime Bat Survey and Ecological Scoping Survey

Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment and Method Statement

Noise Impact Assessment

Risk Assessment and Remediation Strategy

Energy Statement

Transport Note

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located at the junction of School Brow and Barrack Hill and currently accommodates the Cow and Calf Public House. The application advises that the pub closed in June 2017. The pub is 2 storeys in height with a simple pitched roof and gable ends to either side. To the east side is a single storey extension also with a pitched roof over whilst to the rear is a pitched roof 2 storey projection, flat roofed single storey projection and an open sided pitched roof canopy. The pub has a small hard surfaced beer garden to the rear within which is a detached prefabricated garage. Beyond this beer garden and pub building to the east is a grassed beer garden which is enclosed to School Brow by a high belt of trees (mainly leylandii). To the rear of the site is a surface level car park accessed from Barrack Hill.

The site occupies an elevated position with School Brow falling to the east towards Romiley. To the north of the site on the opposite side of School Brow (and side on to the application site) is a 2 storey terrace comprising a solicitor's office closest to the application site. Behind this at a lower level are the communal gardens of bungalows on Barrack Hill Close. Beyond the site to the east and at a lower level are 2 storey semi detached houses to School Brow (adjacent to the existing grassed beer garden) and a single storey detached dormer bungalow (1a Barrack Hill) in a backland setting accessed from Barrack Hill. To Barrack Hill is a large 2 to 3 storey care home (Berrycroft Manor) and a variety of smaller scale 2 storey cottages opposite the site. To the south beyond the access to 1a Barrack Hill is a detached bungalow.

The Cow and Calf Hotel (Commercial Inn) has an entry on the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (GM HER 14228.1.0), describing the structure as 2-storeys, built of machine-made brick with a symmetrical façade.

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

NE1.2 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance

EP1.7 Development and Flood Risk

L1.1 Land for Active Recreation

L1.2 Children's Play

MW1.5 Control of Waste from Development

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

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

SD-3 Delivering the Energy Opportunities Plans – New Development

SD-6 Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change

CS2 Housing Provision

CS3 Mix of Housing

CS4 Distribution of Housing

H-1 Design of Residential Development

H-2 Housing Phasing

CS8 Safeguarding and Improving the Environment

SIE-1 Quality Places

SIE-2 Provision of Recreation and Amenity Open Space in New Developments

SIE-3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment

CS9 Transport and Development

T-1 Transport and Development

T-2 Parking in Development

T-3 Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network

Supplementary Planning Guidance

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

Design of Residential Development

Open Space Provision and Commuted Sum Payments

Transport in Residential Areas

National Planning Policy Framework

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

The NPPF representing the governments up-to-date planning policy which should be taken into account in dealing with applications focuses on achieving a lasting housing reform, facilitating the delivery of a greater number of homes, ensuring that we get planning for the right homes built in the right places of the right quality at the same time as protecting our environment. If decision takers choose not to follow the NPPF, then clear and convincing reasons for doing so are needed.

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

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

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

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

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

a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and
c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.”

Para.11 *“Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.*

For decision-taking this means:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Para.61 “To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.”

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

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

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

c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and

accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.”

Para.93 “To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should 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; and 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.”

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

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

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

Para.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.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 “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.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.125 “Area-based character assessments, design guides and codes and masterplans can be used to help ensure that land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places. Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. In these circumstances:

- a) plans should contain policies to optimise the use of land in their area and meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible. This will be tested robustly at examination, and should include the use of minimum density standards for city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport. These standards should seek a significant uplift in the average density of residential development within these areas, unless it can be shown that there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate;*
- b) the use of minimum density standards should also be considered for other parts of the plan area. It may be appropriate to set out a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas, rather than one broad density range; and*
- c) local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards).”*

Para.126 “The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live

and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.”

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

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁴⁹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”*

Para.131 “Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible.”

Para. 132 “Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals. Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.”

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

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance*

on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or

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

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

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

- a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure; and*
- b) can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government’s policy for national technical standards.”*

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

- a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and*
- b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption”.*

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

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;*
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;*
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and*
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an*

agreed emergency plan.”

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

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and

f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.”

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

a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation);

b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and

c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.”

Para.189 “Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.”

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.203 “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

Para.204 “Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.”

Para. 205 “Local planning authorities should require developers 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. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.”

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

Planning Practice Guidance

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

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DC/076110 16 Barrack Hill, Bredbury, Stockport, SK6 3AZ. Erection of 4 No. houses on former pub garden. Withdrawn June 2021 to pursue the current application for the wider site.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The occupiers of 17 neighbouring properties have been notified of the receipt of this application. 4 letters have been received objecting to the application as originally submitted on the following grounds:

Highway Matters

- It is impossible to put in another entrance to the site on the Barrack Hill, the traffic is Horrendous. As it is now you cannot get out of St Christopher's Drive at best of times and have to turn left to go down Gorse Brow or round Bredbury Green. The cottages opposite park outside on the pavement so if a wagon is waiting to turn left at the lights and a wagon turns right from the lights into Barrack Hill you cannot get past and have to go on the grass verge causing a danger to pedestrians. Yellow lines are needed down both sides of the road from the lights to at least the junction with St Christopher's Drive.
- Traffic along Barrack Hill is already getting worse and queues stretching from the traffic lights several hundred metres down Barrack Hill especially during rush hour and even lunch time. It is already more difficult for us to drive out of our property safely and in a reasonable time. The proposed development will make the traffic congestion worse with an increase in noise, nuisance and pollution which will have adverse effects on our health and wellbeing and that of us and others who live in this area.
- The traffic lights at the former Cow and Calf are delaying traffic and an extra 18 cars plus any visitors and delivery drivers with 3 drives on the site will only make matters worse.
- Pedestrians especially elderly people, wheelchair users and children will be more at risk along this stretch during construction and after the new development is completed. Already cars park or drive on the grass verges where the former pub is and outside our house churning up the grass and even blocking our drive and on short times whilst making deliveries to other houses opposite. I can only presume that a lot of these cars are visiting the houses opposite the pub which have little or no parking, turning lorries use the grass verge on occasion making very deep tyre marks.
- The extra 9 houses have on-site parking for 18 cars whereas delivery vans and visitors which already use the grass verge to park while delivering to houses opposite will have nowhere to park other than blocking the driveways and putting pedestrians at risk.
- On the plans, plot 5 has a road access next to 1A Barrack Hill. If the diagram is to scale, then this implies removing part of the grass verge; this can only mean more parking or waiting. We have already been delayed leaving our own drive by delivery vans and someone stopping to use a mobile phone or to pick up someone opposite. This is likely to get worse with so many houses in such a small plot.
- The access to plot 5 appears to show an overlap of the road access to the adjacent property. This overlap could only be achieved by removal of a grass verge and would create a wide off-road space which will only encourage further parking / stopping which would disrupt access to the neighbouring property with increased disruption to the traffic flow.
- The boundary of plot 3 to Barrack Hill will restrict the safe passage of pedestrians and wheel chair users. This is a known safety concern. It has been observed that turning lorries and buses often mount the low pavement in this area and pedestrians have to go in single file to reduce the risk of being hit by these vehicles. It appears that Plot 3 will

follow the same boundary as the former Cow and Calf Pub without considering the new safety risks that have evolved since the pub was erected about 200 years ago when Barrack Hill was not the main road and traffic was only a fraction of what it is today.

Amenity Matters

- The proposed bin store is right at the side of the hedge. The neighbouring residents sit there with their disabled son in the summer so will have the smell of the rubbish plus flies etc. This will need to be repositioned to back of the car park away from the houses.
- The site would benefit and look much better with the houses than the bomb site it is at Present, it just needs a little more thought and tweaking here and there as the traffic is chaos as it is now without adding to it anymore.
- Plots 4 and 5 will cause loss of natural daylight and create overlooking/loss of privacy to neighbouring properties due to the elevation of proposed development.
- Plots 6/7/8/9 also will cause loss of privacy and overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- The new houses will have good views of Romiley and the Peak District with this surely will spoil the view of the people opposite who have been accustomed to these views.
- The road access to plot 5 directly borders the front garden of the adjacent property with only a hedge separating the two. This area, which is used as an area for sitting out will be subject to an increase in noise, nuisance and air pollution which will have adverse effects on our health and well-being and that of our neighbours.
- The proposed development will be most over-bearing / out-of-scale in terms of density and appearance with the local area. The over-bearing /out-of-scale development of 9 houses on such a relatively small plot of land will significantly diminish the striking views over Romiley Village and of the distant hills in the Peak District for many residents living on Barrack Hill and also for many residents in the local community who often stop here to admire the stunning views. The Landscape General Arrangement plan shows the high density compared with the adjacent residential area.
- The noise & nuisance generated from the proposed homes cannot be ignored and will have a significant impact on the quality of our lives and well-being.
- The application site is at a higher level than adjacent properties accessed from Barrack Hill as can be seen on the Site Plan and Elevation Section 6. The proposed houses on the former car park will tower over our property and gardens and also those of our neighbours. Each of these houses will have 3 windows on Level 1 with fantastic view over Romiley Village and the distant hills and the new residents would understandably use these as viewing platforms. As a consequence, this will have an adverse impact on our privacy and our quality of life and that of our neighbours. The tree which borders plot 5 is of a deciduous variety and will shed all of its leaves in the winter months thus offering no visual protection.
- There is also doubt that the recently treated Japanese Knotweed on the border to plot 5 could survive and there is no guarantee against this happening in the future.

In respect of the application as amended, at the time of writing this report 2 letters have been received objecting on the following ground.

- The entrances over the pavements should be friendly to wheelchair users. Double yellow lines should be extended over the entrances and waiting restrictions introduced outside neighbouring properties so as to afford access to emergency vehicles if and when the need arises (the objectors son lives with a condition which necessitates access by a wheelchair).
- We are apprehensive that there will be excessive parking on Barrack Hill in the future. Wheelchair access is required to a property adjacent to the application site and this should not be blocked by parking on the grass verge. We have already been blocked in on rare occasions by vans delivering to Barrack Hill.
- Traffic along Barrack Hill is already bad and we getting worse and queues stretching from the traffic lights several hundred metres down Barrack Hill especially during rush hour. The proposed development will make the traffic congestion worse with an increase in noise, nuisance and pollution which will have adverse effects on our health and well-being and that of us and others who live in this area.
- The latest plan is better than previous planned but parking needs restricting so we can safely turn into Barrack Hill.

1 letter has been received commenting that the retention and conversion of the pub building is welcome as is the provision of a bungalow to Barrack Hill.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Conservation Officer – This application has been amended since originally submitted. The amended plans now provides for the retention and conversion of the former historic public house that lies at the junction of School Brow and Barrack Hill. The revised plans propose its conversion and extension to form 3 dwellings in association with erection of 5 houses and 1 bungalow together with new access and parking arrangements.

The former Cow and Calf public house is identified within the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (ref MGM14843 Commercial Inn, School Brow) and therefore for planning purposes it is treated as a non-designated heritage asset in accordance with relevant historic environment/heritage policies within the NPPF and Stockport Core Strategy.

Paras 195-197 of the NPPF state the following:

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.

196. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

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.*

Currently unused, the pub building occupies a very prominent corner site at the intersection of Barrack Hill and School Brow and makes a positive contribution to the street scene in both long and short distance views. The building was constructed in the mid-nineteenth century in a late Georgian style, constructed of local brick in English Garden Wall bond and features a hipped blue slate roof and brick chimneys. Its street facing elevations feature natural stone wedge lintols and cills to windows and a centrally located classical doorcase is set into the School Brow elevation forming the main entrance. The architectural interest of the building stems from its local vernacular interest rather than as an example of high status polite Georgian architecture. Its location on an important road junction also contributes positively to the interest of the local townscape and the setting of the Bredbury and Romiley War Memorial (listed Grade II).

Its retention and conversion to a new use would preserve and enhance the heritage asset, assist in maintaining the sense of local distinctiveness the building contributes to the character of the wider area and represents a sustainable solution to the development of the site that minimises its associated environmental impacts .

I concur with the submitted heritage assessment which concludes that while the core of the original building will be retained, a new two-storey extension will be attached to the eastern side and the low rear outrigger raised, in matching style, to conform to the height of the main block. The new extension is however treated differently, while replicating the modest proportions and overall form of the original building, its lower height and rendered elevations ensure it is clearly distinguished as an addition. The differing design approach to these separate new elements is therefore entirely appropriate. While the interior will inevitably undergo change as a result of the conversion, this is not considered harmful as the significance of the undesignated building resides principally in its external qualities and streetscene presence. The proposed site layout and the scale, density and detailed design of the associated new development, comprising 5 houses and 1 bungalow together with new access and parking arrangements, will have no detrimental impact upon the setting of the heritage asset or listed War Memorial.

It is recommended that the following conditions are applied to the former pub building and associated extensions in order to ensure due care and attention is given to the selection of external materials and aspects of detailed design, such as windows/doors, and the removal of selected permitted development rights in order that the quality of its external appearance can be maintained in the future:

- Notwithstanding the information shown on the submitted drawings, no external construction to the former Cow and Calf public house shall take place until a detailed schedule of all of the proposed materials of external construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and samples have been made available on site. Samples of brick and slate shall comprise at least 1 square metre in area and a sample panel of brickwork including mortar jointing shall be made available. Existing natural roof materials capable of reuse shall be reused in the development. All other roof covering shall be new natural materials to match the existing buildings. The schedule shall also include details of design, materials and finish of verges and eaves. Development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the agreed schedule and samples.

- Notwithstanding the information shown on the submitted drawings no installation of windows and doors to the former Cow and Calf public house shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All windows and doors to elevations facing School Brow and Barrack Hill shall be of timber construction with a painted exterior finish. Details shall include elevations drawn at a scale of 1:20, and vertical and horizontal sections drawn at a scale of 1:5. All windows and doors shall accord with the approved details and shall be fitted with an exterior reveal of not less than 90mm.

- All rooflights hereby approved shall be conservation type, top hung fitted flush with the plane of the roof covering, coloured black and fitted with a central vertical glazing bar.

- In respect of Plots 1-3 (the former Cow and Calf public house as extended), notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development falling within classes A-H of Part 1 of Schedule 2, classes A - C of Part 2 of Schedule 2, Class C of Part 11 of Schedule 2, and Classes A-B of Part 14 of that Order shall be carried out.

The reason for these conditions is in order to preserve or enhance the special architectural, artistic, historic or archaeological significance of the heritage asset, in accordance with Development Management Policy SIE-3 (Protecting, safeguarding and enhancing the environment) of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS) – The current application is supported by a revised Heritage Assessment (HA) compiled by Garry Miller Heritage Consultancy (May 2022) to support proposals for retention, conversion and extension of the former pub and the erection of further houses within the application site. The structure of the HA follows its previous iteration, drawing on cartographic and limited documentary sources to provide a brief historical background for the site, a descriptive account of the exterior facades and scale of the extant building, a summary

of the building's heritage significance, a review of national and local policies against which the proposal is assessed, and an appreciation of the impact that the revised proposals will have on the building and its site.

In summary the HA judges that the significance of the building “derives from its historical role rather than the merits of its fabric”, and states that the new proposal “has already gained the approval of their [Stockport Council's] Conservation officer”. The revised proposals for retention rather than demolition are welcomed, but GMAAS still believe that there is knowledge to be gained regarding the development of the building by recording the remaining fabric prior to the proposed alterations.

The HA still mentions that the interior of the building was not accessed or appraised as part of the assessment, on the understanding that it was stripped out several years ago, concluding that “there is unlikely to be anything of historic interest surviving” (Section 5.3). As GMAAS have stated in previous responses, a stripped building often presents opportunities to reveal detail on the construction, phasing and previously concealed fabric. This could be of particular relevance in discovering the function and phasing relationship of the narrow outrigger with elongated second-storey window to the rear of the main public house structure. The new proposals seek to change the Barrack Hill elevation (including the outrigger) quite considerably, and although the outrigger has already seemingly been changed with part of it being reduced to a single storey, the new proposals will lead to changes that will render the historic arrangement entirely illegible.

The historic buildings survey should be undertaken by an appropriately qualified specialist, to the equivalent of a Historic England Level 2 to 3 record (where appropriate). This will include measured floor plans and phased plans of the buildings, detailed photographs of elevations, rooms, and features of architectural/archaeological interest, description of the historic fabric, history, and comparative analysis, and an assessment of significance of the buildings and their components. The historic building survey will provide a point-in-time record of the structural layout of the building and will inform the necessity for a watching brief during any further soft-strip or demolition works that may expose concealed historic fabric within or on the exterior of the buildings. A report of all works will be prepared and submitted for incorporation with the GM HER, containing historical research to contextualise the wider social context of the undesignated heritage asset (this should include analysis of local trade directories to understand the origins and occupations of residents of the buildings, and perhaps of those on the west side of Barrack Hill as indicated on historic 19th century mapping). GMAAS recommend that the archaeological works are secured by a condition, worded as follows:

No soft-strip, alteration, demolition or development 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 to Historic England Level 2 to 3 (where appropriate)
 - ii - informed by the above, 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 – historical research within the report to contextualise the survey
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.

Nature Development Officer – The site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise. Many buildings and trees have the potential to support roosting bats. All species of bats and their roosts, are protected under Section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. The latter implements the Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora. Bats are included in Schedule 2 of the Regulations as ‘European Protected Species of animals’ (EPS).

Under the Regulations it is an offence to:

- 1) Deliberately capture or kill a wild EPS
- 2) Deliberately disturb a wild EPS in such a way that significantly affects:
 - a) the ability of a significant group to survive, breed, rear or nurture young.
 - b) the local distribution of that species.
- 3) Damage or destroy a breeding place or resting site of such an animal

A bat survey and ecological scoping survey has been carried out and submitted with the application. The survey was carried out in June 2021 by a suitably experienced

ecologist (Rachel Hacking Ecology Ltd, June 2021). An external and internal inspection of the pub building and assessment of the garage was carried out to search for signs of bats and assess the likelihood of a bat roost being present. No evidence of a bat roost was discovered during the survey. The main building was found to offer very limited potential bat roosting potential features, with tiles intact and soffits/lead flashing tight fitting and no obvious gaps observed. The garage was found to be well-sealed. No potential roosting features were observed in the trees on site. The site is considered to offer negligible potential to support a bat roost.

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

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

Japanese knotweed was recorded on site within the hedgerow. This species is listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it an offence to plant or otherwise cause to spread this invasive species in the wild.

Recommendations:

No evidence of roosting bats was recorded during the survey and the site is considered to offer negligible bat roosting potential. As such the proposed works are considered to be of low risk to roosting bats. Bats can be highly cryptic in their roosting behaviour however and can sometimes roost in seemingly unlikely places and regularly switch roost sites. As a precautionary measure it is therefore recommended that an informative is attached to any planning consent granted so that the applicant is aware of the potential for roosting bats to be present. It should also state that the granting of planning permission does not negate the need to abide by the legislation in place to protect biodiversity. If at any time during works, evidence of roosting bats (or any other protected species) is discovered on site, works must cease and a suitably experienced ecologist contacted for advice.

To protect breeding birds, no building roof/demolition/tree or vegetation clearance works should take place during the bird nesting season (which is generally between 1st March and 31st August inclusive), unless it can be demonstrated that nesting birds are not present and/or suitable mitigation measures are in place. A pre-works survey should be carried out by an ecologist immediately prior to any such works in the bird nesting season. The pre-works survey should be carried out by a suitable experienced person no more than 48 hours in advance of works commencing. This can be secured by condition.

Japanese knotweed was recorded on site. A method statement for the control and treatment of this invasive species will need to be submitted to and agreed by the council prior to any works commencing. This will need to include details of suitable control measures to prevent its spread along with a treatment plan and subsequent

monitoring. This can be secured via a pre-commencement condition.

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

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

Biodiversity enhancements are expected within the development in line with national and local planning policy. Suitable measures include the provision of an integrated bat and/or bird box at a minimum rate of one per each new dwelling (i.e. minimum total 9 within the site – each new house does not necessarily need to have a bat/box, it may be it is more appropriate to have some houses with no bat/bird box and some with more than one (e.g. if swift bricks are used, two or more should be placed adjacent to each other). Details of the proposed type, number and location of the bat and/or bird boxes should be submitted to the LPA for review. This should be secured via a pre-commencement of construction condition since it is difficult to retrofit integrated boxes.

Further enhancements for biodiversity would be expected within a sensitive landscape planting scheme for the site: comprising wildlife-friendly species (preferably locally native). Tree planting should be maximised across the site (it is noted that three new trees are proposed but an increase on this would be welcomed). Furthermore, native species hedgerows should be used to demark site and plot boundaries (rather than using fencing).

Where the use of close-boarded fencing is unavoidable, gaps should be provided at the base (130mm x 130mm, at least one gap per fence elevation) to provide access and maintain habitat connectivity for species such as hedgehog (a UKBAP species and Species of Principle Importance under the NERC Act 2006). Further information can be found: <https://www.hedgehogstreet.org/help-hedgehogs/link-your-garden/>

Any proposed lighting should be sensitively designed so as to minimise impacts on wildlife associated with light disturbance (following the principles outlined in Bat Conservation Trust guidance: <https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2018/09/new-guidance-on-bats-and-lighting>)

Tree Officer – There are no legally protected trees within this site or affected by this development. The proposed development is unlikely to have a negative impact on trees located on site however there is some potential for impact in relation to encroachment and/or potential damage from machinery working in close proximity of the trees within the site.

The landscaping plan should be reviewed to show more tree planting within the site or along the highway verge to Barrack Hill. Notwithstanding the details submitted, this could be secured by condition. Conditions should also be imposed to secure protective fencing within the site to the retained trees during construction and to protect the trees from the impacts of construction traffic, delivery vehicles and any site compounds.

The following conditions are required if the scheme is approved with Tree 3 amended from that drafted below to secure additional tree planting beyond that already shown on the landscaping proposals:

Condition Tree 1

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 Tree 2

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 Tree 3

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.

Highway Engineer – The Transport Statement submitted in support of the application outlines that, based on a TRICS assessment, if the existing pub was to reopen it would be expected to generate no trips during the AM peak and 22 trips around the PM peak. It also outlines that 9 dwellings would be expected to generate 5 trips during both the AM and PM peaks and, as such, the proposal would result in an increase in vehicle movements to / from the site during the AM peak (+5) but a decrease during the PM peak (-17). The statement therefore concludes that the development would not have a material impact on the surround highway network.

Whilst the TRICS reports referred to in the statement are missing from the statement, after interrogating the TRICS database myself, I would agree with this conclusion and note that, whilst there will be an increase in vehicle movements to / from the site during the AM peak, during the PM peak and in total throughout the day, there will be a material decrease. As such, providing that the site's access, parking and servicing

arrangements are satisfactory, I would conclude that the development should not have an adverse impact on the public highway.

Following extensive discussions with the applicant, the scheme has been amended and now includes:

- 1) Proposals to convert and extend the former pub to form 3 dwellings
- 2) Amendment to the site's access arrangements on Barrack Hill, with Plots 1-5 now served by a single access located further away from the School Brow junction
- 3) Amendments to the proposed parking arrangements, with Plots 1-5 now served by a single 8-space car park, providing 1 space for each dwelling and 3 visitor spaces, including 1 space suitable for disabled people (160% provision)
- 4) Wooden cycle sheds and bin stores for each dwelling
- 5) EV charging points for each dwelling

The applicant has also demonstrated (with details included in the Transport Note) that both accesses will benefit from an acceptable level of visibility (having regard to recorded vehicle speeds) and cars and small delivery vehicles (3.5T vans) would be able to turn into, within and out of each of the parking areas.

After reviewing the revised drawings and information, I would conclude that they have addressed the issues I previously raised and, as such, I raise no objection to the application, subject to the following conditions:

No development shall take place until a method statement detailing how the development will be constructed (including any demolition and site clearance) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include details on phasing, access arrangements, turning / manoeuvring facilities, deliveries, vehicle routing, traffic management, signage, hoardings, scaffolding, where materials will be loaded, unloaded and stored, parking arrangements and mud prevention measures. Development of the site shall not proceed except in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To ensure that the approved development is constructed in a safe way and in a manner that will minimise disruption during construction, in accordance with Policy T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD. The details are required prior to the commencement of any development as details of how the development is to be constructed need to be approved prior to the commencement of construction activities.

No work shall take place in respect to the construction of the access on School Brow that will serve Plots 6-9 until a detailed drawing of the access, which shall include:

- 1) Details of proposals to provide 1m by 1m pedestrian visibility splays at either side of the access
- 2) Details of proposals to provide vehicular visibility splays of 2.4m by 50.4m to the north-west and 2.4m by 45.3m to the south-east

3) Details of proposals to provide a dropped kerb footway crossing has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling within Plots 6-9 shall not be occupied / the approved access shall not be brought into use until the access has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing and is available for use. No structure, object, plant or tree exceeding 600mm in height shall subsequently be erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 600mm within the pedestrian visibility splays. No structure, object, plant or tree exceeding 1000mm in height shall subsequently be erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 1000mm within the vehicular visibility splays.

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 work shall take place in respect to the construction of the access on Barrack Hill that will serve Plots 1-5 until a detailed drawing of the access, which shall include:

- 1) Details of proposals to provide 1.5m by 1.5m pedestrian visibility splays at either side of the access
- 2) Details of proposals to provide vehicular visibility splays of 2.4m by 56.2m to the north and 2.4m by 43.0m to the south
- 3) Details of proposals to provide a dropped kerb footway and verge crossing has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

No dwelling within Plots 1-5 shall not be occupied / the approved access shall not be brought into use until the access has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing and is available for use. No structure, object, plant or tree exceeding 600mm in height shall subsequently be erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 600mm within the pedestrian visibility splays. No structure, object, plant or tree exceeding 1000mm in height shall subsequently be erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 1000mm within the vehicular visibility splays.

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.

A detailed drawing outlining a scheme to:

- 1) Reconstruct the existing footway that abuts the site
- 2) Permanently close the redundant site accesses, remove the redundant footway / verge crossings at these accesses and form new sections of footway / verge where they were located
- 3) Widen the footway (including bus boarding platform) on School Brow that abuts the site to a minimum width of 2m (with localised widening, where required to allow a bus shelter to be provided)
- 4) Reinstated / re-turf the existing highway verges on School Brow that abut the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall not be occupied until the specified works have been carried out in accordance with the approved drawing.

Reason: In order to ensure that there are safe and high quality pedestrian facilities adjacent to the site and ensure that development can be accessed in a safe manner 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, supported by paragraph 5.30, 'Post development footway reinstatement', of the SMBC Sustainable Transport SPD.

Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no gate or other means of obstruction shall be erected across the vehicular accesses that will serve the approved development at any time.

Reason: In order to ensure that vehicles can enter and exit the site unhindered so that they are not required to stop of the highway and therefore be a threat to highway safety and / or affect the free-flow of traffic in terms of 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.

The approved pedestrian gates / any gates to be erected across the pedestrian accesses shall be constructed so that they only open into the site and not out into the public highway.

Reason: In order to ensure that any gates do not impinge on the adjacent footway when open in terms of 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 work shall take place in respect to the construction of access drives and car parking facilities to be provided for the approved development until a detailed drawing of the access drives and car parking facilities has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:

- 1) How the access drives and car parking facilities will be surfaced, drained, and illuminated
- 2) How the parking spaces will be delineated / signed

No dwelling within Plots 1-5 shall not be occupied until the access drive and car parking facilities that will serve those plots have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing and are available for use. No dwelling within Plots 6-9 shall not be occupied until the access drive and car parking facilities that will serve those plots have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing and are available for use. The access drives and car parking facilities shall thereafter be retained and shall remain available for use for occupiers and visitors to the approved dwellings. The access drives and car parking facilities shall be illuminated at all times during the hours of darkness that the access drive and car park is in use (either permanently or using motion-controlled lighting).

Reason: To ensure that the site will benefit from safe and practical access arrangements, adequate parking 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.

Charging points for the charging of electric vehicles shall be provided for each of the approved dwellings. Prior to their provision, details of the charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each dwelling within the development shall not be occupied until the charging point for that dwelling has been provided in accordance with the approved details and is available for use. The charging points shall thereafter be retained (unless they are 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 112, 174 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Each dwelling within the development shall not be occupied until a cycle store has been provided for that dwelling in accordance with the details indicated on drawing 09 Rev J 'Revised Site Plan' and the cycle store is available for use. The cycle stores 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.

Details of a scheme to provide a bus shelter at the bus stop on School Brow in front of / abutting the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the location and design of the shelter and details of all amendments / works required to the footway / boarding platform to allow it to be provided. No part of the development shall be occupied until the bus shelter has been provided in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is accessible by public transport and occupiers and visitors to the development are encouraged to use public transport in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', 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

A drawing illustrating a scheme to provide an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing (dropped kerbs with tactile paving) at the junction of Barrack Hill and St. Christopher's Drive shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

development shall not be occupied until the pedestrian crossings have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing and are available for use.

Reason: To ensure that the development has safe and good quality pedestrian access arrangements in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places', 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

All ground floor doors and windows on the sides of the former public house to be converted to Plots 2 and 3 that front and abut the highway shall be constructed to open into the building only and not out into the highway.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not adversely affect use of the adjacent highway, notably by pedestrians, in accordance with Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD

Each dwelling within the development shall not be occupied until a bin store has been provided for that dwelling in accordance with the details indicated on drawing 09 Rev J 'Revised Site Plan' and the bin store is available for use. The bin stores shall then be retained and shall remain available for use at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have adequate bin storage facilities, having regard to Policies SIE-1 'Quality Places' and T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network' of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD.

Environmental Health Officer (Noise) – No objections subject to the imposition of a condition to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which shall include consideration of noise mitigation, dust management and a pile foundation method statement during construction.

Environmental Health Officer (Contamination) – Remedial measures are proposed all garden and landscaped areas. As such I would recommend the imposition of a condition requiring validation evidence to be submitted.

Environmental Health Officer (Air) – no objections subject to the imposition of a condition to secure the submission and approval of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP). The CEMP shall address the environmental impact in respect of air quality and noise on existing residents during the demolition and construction phase (noise mitigation, dust management and pile foundation method statement). There shall be no burning of materials on site during construction and the CEMP shall be implemented throughout the demolition and construction phase of the development.

Planning Policy Officer (Energy) – The energy statement submitted is compliant with current Core Strategy Policy SD3 on requirements for showing evidence of consideration of low / zero carbon technologies for their technical feasibility and financial viability.

The energy statement was however drafted some time before changes to the Building Regulations which occurred on 15 June 2022. The changes to 'Part L' of the building regulations focus on greater fabric performance, lower energy demand, and a move away from fossil fuels (gas and oil boilers) to electric heating systems. The changes should cut carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from new homes by around 31% and non-domestic new builds by 27%. The Building Regulations have set new minimum standards for fabric efficiency and energy efficiency, and it is the responsibility of the developer to comply with relevant building regulations standards. New SAP calculations may be required as a result of the new requirements. Developers should contact their architect or a building control body for more advice.

The statement suggests that solar photovoltaics are a feasible technology for use on the roof of this development, however no firm commitment has been made to deliver this technology as part of the development, due to concerns over cost and viability. I suggest that the use of a modest array of solar photovoltaics is explored further by the developer, to offset electricity used in the development, as the cost of panels has become increasingly affordable in recent years. This will help to offset electricity used by future occupiers of the development and thus further reduce CO2 emissions and energy bills.

United Utilities - In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. We request the imposition of drainage conditions to any subsequent approval to reflect the above approach.

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 development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- 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:
 - 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
 - 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.

In this respect, given that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing, the relevant elements of Core Strategy policies CS4 and H2 which seek to deliver housing supply are considered to be out of date. That being

the case, and noting that there are no areas or assets of particular importance (given that the heritage asset is non designated) the tilted balance as referred to in para 11 of the NPPF directs that permission should be approved unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The main issues for consideration are as follows:-

- The loss of the existing use
- The principle of housing delivery
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on residential amenity
- Highway and parking impacts
- Other matters such as ecology, trees, energy efficient design, contamination and drainage.

Loss of Existing Use

Paragraph 92 of the NPPF supports the retention of community facilities, which should be retained for community use. It states:

“To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

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.”

In response to the NPPF it should be noted that the existing public house ceased operation in June 2017. The site owner advises that the reason the brewery sold the Cow & Calf was due to the fact it was financially unviable to continue to trade as a public house.

Within a 1 mile radius of the site are however the following pubs (or drinking establishments):-

Duke of York, Stockport Road, Romiley, SK6 3AN – 0.3 miles – public house serving food

Friendship Inn, 77 Stockport Road, Romiley, SK6 3AA – 0.3 miles – public house serving food

Spread Eagle, Hatherlow, Romiley, SK6 3DR – 0.3 miles – public house serving food

VIP Wine Bar & Grill, Higher Bents Lane, Bredbury, SK6 2JW – 0.4 miles – bar and grill serving food

Grapevine Wine Bar – 10 The Precinct, Romiley, SK6 4EA – 0.5 miles – wine bar serving food

The Crafty Vendor – 1 The Precinct, Romiley, SK6 4EA – 0.5 miles – bar serving food

Platform One, 6 Stockport Road, Romiley, SK6 4BN – 0.5 miles – public house serving food
Romiley Arms, Stockport Road, Romiley, SK6 4BN – 0.5 miles – public house serving food
Jakes Ale House, 27 Compstall Road, Romiley, SK6 4BT – 0.6 miles – pop up ale house
The Queens, Higher Bents Lane, Bredbury, SK6 2JN – 0.7 miles – public house serving food
Stock Dove, 94 Compstall Road, Romiley, SK6 4DE – 0.8 miles – public house serving food

It can therefore be demonstrated that notwithstanding the loss of this pub through the residential redevelopment of the site, that there would be a sufficient number and choice of similar establishments sufficient to enable the community to meet their day to day needs. For this reason the proposal is considered to accord with para 92 of the NPPF.

Housing Delivery

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

Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy directs new residential development towards the more accessible parts of the Borough identifying 3 spatial priority areas (Central Housing Area; Neighbourhood Priority Areas and the catchment areas of District/Large Local Centres; and other accessible locations).

Policy H-2 confirms that when there is less than a 5 year deliverable supply of housing (as is currently the case) the required accessibility scores will be lowered to allow the deliverable supply to be topped up by other sites in accessible locations. This position has been regularly assessed to ensure that the score reflects the ability to 'top up' supply to a 5 year position. However, the scale of shortfall is such that in order to genuinely reflect the current position in that regard the score has been reduced to zero. The reduction of this score to zero means that for the purposes of housing delivery, all sites within the Borough will be considered as being accessible.

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

In response to this it should be noted that the Council is in a continued position of housing undersupply and only has a 3.2 year supply vs the 5 year supply plus 20% as required by the NPPF. Having regard to this continued undersupply and to help reduce pressure for development in the Green Belt, it is important that the development potential of sites in the urban area are explored to their maximum potential subject to there being no adverse impact on the locality and amenity.

The application site is considered to be in an accessible location having regard to services and public transport and noting the close proximity to the designated local shopping centre on Higher Bents Lane. As such the proposal accords with the third spatial priority to the delivery of housing set out in policy CS4. Proposing 9 dwellings the application will make a modest yet welcome contribution toward addressing the position of housing undersupply in the Borough.

The proposal is therefore compliant with policies CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy.

Core Strategy policy CS3 confirms that developments in accessible suburban locations may be expected to provide the full range of houses from terraced properties to large detached and should contain fewer flats. Within District Centres housing densities of 70 dwellings per hectare (dph) is commonplace. Moving away from these central locations densities should gradually decrease first around to 50 dph then to around 40dph as the proportion of housing increases. Development in accessible urban locations should achieve a density of 30 dph.

The NPPF at para 124 confirms that planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land taking into account several factors including the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens) and the importance of securing well designed and attractive places. Para 125 confirms that where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing need it is especially important that policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. In these circumstances:

- Plans should contain policies to optimise the use of land in their area and meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible
- The use of minimum density standards should also be considered and it may be appropriate to set out a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas
- Local planning authorities should refuse planning applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land.

The density of the proposed development equates to 41 dwellings per hectare which is appropriate having regard to its location close to a designated centre and being in an accessible urban location. The consideration of density is however not simply the application of a numerical figure and regard also has to be paid to the impact of the development upon the character of the area, amenities of existing and future

occupiers together conditions of highway safety. Subject to a satisfactory assessment in this respect, the proposal would accord with policy CS3.

Given the minor nature of the application (proposing less than 10 dwellings) there is no requirement within either the Core Strategy or NPPF for the provision of affordable housing.

Impact on the Character of the Area

Core Strategy policy H1 confirms that the design of new development should be to a high standard, respond to the townscape and landscape character of the local area, reinforcing or creating local identity in terms of layout, scale and appearance. Policy CS8 welcomes development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to a sustainable, attractive, safe and accessible built and natural environment. This position is supported by policy SIE-1 which advises that specific regard should be paid to the use of materials appropriate to the location and the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings (particularly with regard to height, density and massing of buildings).

Policy SIE3 seeks to protect the natural environment. Proposals affecting trees and other vegetation which makes a positive contribution should be retained unless there is justification for its loss to enable the development to take place.

The NPPF sets out the Government's most up to date position on planning policy and confirms that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development, respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials whilst not preventing or discouraging innovative design and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

The application site is not within a Conservation Area nor is the building listed (statutorily or locally). The site however does have an entry on the Historic Environment Record (GM HER 14228.1.0), describing the structure as 2-storeys, built of machine-made brick with a symmetrical façade. For the purposes of this planning application the site therefore accommodates an undesignated heritage asset.

Core Strategy policy CS8 confirms that the Council recognises the unique place the historic environment holds in Stockport's cultural heritage and the multiple ways in which it supports and contributes to the economy, society and daily life. The historic environment is a non-renewable resource and its fragile and finite nature will be a

particularly important consideration; conserving and managing this resource for future generations is a key component of the wider principle of sustainable development which forms an overarching principle of the LDF.

Development will be expected to make a positive contribution to the protection and/or enhancement of the borough's heritage assets. Buildings, sites, monuments, places and areas positively identified as having a degree of historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological significance (including canals and other transport infrastructure of historic value) will be safeguarded for the future.

Core Strategy policy SIE3 confirms that development which preserves or enhances the special architectural, artistic, historic or archaeological significance of heritage assets will be welcomed. Heritage assets include buildings, sites, places, areas or landscapes positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Loss or harm to the significance of a heritage asset, through alteration, destruction or development within its setting, will require clear and convincing justification.

The NPPF offers the most up to date policy position confirming at para 189 that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

In determining applications, para 197 confirms that 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.

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset (para 203).

Local planning authorities should require developers 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 accessible⁶⁹. However, the ability to

record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted (para 205).

The character of the area is generally derived from single storey and 2 storey housing ranging in its age, style and building materials. An exception to this is the large 2 to 3 storey care home on the opposite side of Barrack Hill to the application site. Existing development is however fairly traditional with brick, render and tiles evident along with hipped and pitched roof forms. Front entrances are often afforded protection through the provision of canopied or enclosed porches and projecting bays are common place. Houses are positioned behind landscaped front gardens with those on Barrack Hill being much shallower than those to School Brow. The application site occupies an elevated position above properties to the east on School Brow however is more or less level with those elsewhere (excluding 1a Barrack Hill which is positioned at a lower level relative to the eastern boundary of the site).

The impact of development upon the character of the locality is assessed in terms of the size, siting and design of that proposed. In this respect, submitted with the application (and appended to this report) is a site layout, sections and street scenes which show that proposed in the context of development to the east on School Brow, to the south on Barrack Hill and in relation to 1a Barrack Hill.

The streetscenes indicate that the proposed development whilst following the gradient of School Brow will be no higher than 4 and 6 School Brow to the east. 2no.pairs of semi detached houses together with the extended and converted pub are proposed in a form rising in height towards the junction with Barrack Hill. Where the development comprises 3 floors of accommodation, the second floor is contained within the roofspace served by rooflights only. This is an appropriate response to this frontage noting the character of development on Barrack Hill and the presence of 3 storey development on the opposite side of Barrack Hill in the form of the care home. To Barrack Hill itself a detached 2 storey dwelling is proposed together with a detached bungalow. The siting of this development with the detached house being positioned adjacent to the extended and converted pub building and the bungalow being adjacent to 1 Barrack Hill, which also comprises a bungalow, is considered an appropriate response to this streetscene.

The retention and conversion of the existing pub building is welcome and follows the advice of the Council's Conservation Officer and GMAAS to retain this non designated heritage asset. The proposed extensions are of an acceptable form and scale and will ensure that the importance of the original, retained building is not diminished. The traditional design of the remainder of the development also reflects that of the wider locality in terms of its form and architectural approach. Contrary to the comments of GMAAS however it should be noted that the proposed outrigger to the retained pub will be 2 storeys in height and not single storey. Subject to the imposition of conditions to secure details of the precise materials proposed, together

with those recommended by the Conservation Officer and GMAAS, it is not considered that the development will cause harm to the character of the area.

In terms of the siting of the development, the new build element to School Brow will be positioned behind an area of forecourt parking. The enclosure of this with a low wall and railings should ensure its successful integration into this streetscene. The new dwellings to Barrack Hill are positioned close to the boundary of the site behind small front gardens. Noting the presence of several properties opposite the site here which also have small front gardens, the siting of the development is considered consistent with the prevailing character in this respect.

The entrance to the car parking area on Barrack Hill has been kept to the minimum width required to facilitate safe access into and out of the site as has the turning area within the car park itself. Hedging is proposed around this car park to either side of it and along the rear boundary together with a new tree at its entrance. This, it is considered, will assist in enhancing the setting of this parking area and ensuring that it causes no harm to the streetscene.

There are no trees within the application site however adjacent to it are 2 groups of trees and 1 tree. The groups, which are positioned in the garden of 1a Barrack Hill, comprise 2 birch and 2 ash trees which will be retained. The single tree which is positioned on the highway verge adjacent to the access into 1a Barrack Hill is an ash which will be felled to accommodate the proposed development. The tree report submitted with this application notes that this tree to be felled is a self seeded specimen which shows signs of being affected by ash dieback.

A condition can be imposed to ensure that the 2 groups of trees in the adjacent garden are not adversely impacted by construction works, this will be in the form of protective fencing to ensure that no machinery or materials are stored in the root area of these groups. Once the development is constructed it will only be the proposed garden areas that are positioned adjacent to these trees and as such, no adverse impact is expected in that respect.

The comments of the Tree Officer regarding the landscaping of the site are noted. Whilst only 1 tree is being removed, a poor quality ash tree, as part of the proposed development it is understood that other trees have been removed from the site prior to the submission of this application. Whilst this removal did not require the consent of the Local Planning Authority (as none of the trees were legally protected nor considered worthy of such protection) it is considered appropriate that compensation for the loss beyond that proposed by this application be secured. The provision of 8 trees as shown on the landscaping proposals are welcome however it is considered that further provision should be secured within garden areas and along the verge to Barrack Hill. As such and notwithstanding the landscaping proposals submitted with this application, an enhanced landscaping scheme should be secured by condition. Subject to this and having regard to the wider proposals in relation to hard and soft landscaping, it is considered that the proposed development will be acceptable in

terms of its landscaping. A condition should also be imposed to ensure replacement planting if any of that proposed dies, becomes diseased or is removed within 5 years of the development being carried out.

On the basis of the above it is considered that the proposal is compliant with policies H1, CS8, SiE1 and SIE3 together with advice contained in the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Core Strategy policy H1 confirms that good standards of amenity and privacy should be provided for the occupants of new and existing housing; this is reinforced by policy SIE1. The NPPF confirms that development should create places that promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The layout of the development and its impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers has also been considered in the context of advice contained within the Council's Supplementary Design Guidelines 'Design of Residential Development'.

To the east of the site on School Brow are residential properties which, on account of the gradient of this road, are at a slightly lower level than the application site. The pairs of semi detached houses proposed here would be positioned 1m off the boundary with the neighbouring house outside of the application site (4 School Brow). The rear elevation of the proposed house adjacent to this boundary would roughly align with that of the part single, part 2 storey outrigger to the neighbouring house. Noting the separation of 6m to 8.4m between the proposed development and the outrigger of this neighbouring house together with the 2 storey nature of that proposed, it is not considered that there will be an adverse impact on the amenities of this neighbouring house.

To the rear, east of the site and accessed from Barrack Hill is a dormer bungalow (1a Barrack Hill). As is evidenced by the plans appended to this report, this neighbouring property is positioned at an angle to the application site and as such directly faces the rear of the existing houses on Barrack Hill rather than that proposed on the application site. This property is also at a lower level than the application site. The rear elevation of the houses proposed to School Brow would be over 19m from the rear corner of this adjacent house. Given that the proposed houses would be sited at an angle relative to this neighbouring property and therefore will not directly face it, an unacceptable impact in relation to the amenities afforded from this neighbouring house is not anticipated.

There are no residential occupiers opposite the site on School Brow other than the bungalows at the end of Barrack Hill Close. Noting that these bungalows are positioned at a lower level than School Brow and enclosed by a hedge that screens views of them, the siting of the development (which in any event at over 30m distant exceeds the guidance in the SPD) will cause no harm to the amenities of these neighbouring occupiers.

On Barrack Hill facing the application site is the adjacent 3 storey care home. Windows in the side elevation of the converted pub will face this development. The interface distance between the proposed windows and those in care home opposite at 20m to 22m is slightly less than that required by the SPD (21m for 2 storey development, 24m for 3 storey (noting that the care home opposite is 3 storey)). It is however noted that this interface is across a street where the privacy of front facing rooms is already compromised by their position adjacent to the public realm. It is also noted that the SPD confirms that rigid compliance with the suggested interface distances will not be applied and that regard should be paid to the character of the area within which the development is proposed. Noting that the siting of the windows, close to the back edge of the footpath reflects those in the existing pub, it is not considered that the amenities of these neighbouring occupiers will be adversely affected to a degree that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.

The siting of the development to Barrack Hill at 17.4m to 19.8m when measured from the front elevation of the proposed house and bungalow to that opposite, falls short of the 21m suggested as appropriate by the Council's SPD. Like that in relation to the care home, this interface is across a street where the privacy of front facing rooms is already compromised by their position adjacent to the public realm. The SPD confirms that rigid compliance with the suggested interface distances will not be applied and that regard should be paid to the character of the area within which the development is proposed. Noting that the siting of that proposed, close to the back edge of the footpath reflects the tighter knit character of that opposite the application site, it is not considered that the amenities of these neighbouring occupiers opposite the site will be adversely affected to a degree that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.

On Barrack Hill, to the other side of the drive to 1a Barrack Hill is a bungalow, 1 Barrack Hill; the detached garage to this bungalow is positioned to the side, adjacent to the access to 1a Barrack Hill. The proposed bungalow at plot 5 would be positioned forward of this neighbouring bungalow however being over 19m away, it is not considered that there will be a loss of amenity to the occupiers of this neighbouring property. Whilst the orientation of windows to this proposed bungalow are to the side and towards 1 Barrack Hill, a sufficient level of screening will be afforded by the enclosure of the garden to this property to ensure that there is not an unacceptable degree of overlooking towards the front and side of 1 Barrack Hill. The single storey nature of the development proposed to this plot should also ensure that the development does not appear visually obtrusive when viewed from the front garden of 1 Barrack Hill.

1a Barrack Hill to the rear (east) of the site is, as explained above, positioned at a lower level than the application site. Being single storey, the bungalow to plot 5 should not however result in a visually obtrusive nor overbearing form of development when viewed from this neighbouring dormer bungalow. Furthermore, the rear elevation of the bungalow to plot 5 is largely free of any windows other than

those to the bathrooms (which will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed). This together with the enclosure of the garden to this plot will ensure that there is no overlooking of 1a Barrack Hill.

The consideration of amenity applies to the future occupiers of the site as well as those existing adjacent. Having regard to the above it is not considered that the siting of the development in proximity to the existing neighbouring occupiers will impact on the amenities of the future occupiers of the development.

The Council's SPD sets out amenity space requirements for new development, for 3 bed houses there should be 75m² of private amenity space and 100m² for 4 bed dwellings. The 4no. 3 bed houses to School Brow would each have rear gardens between 57m² and 60m². The 3 bed house in the pub conversion would have circa 48m² and the 2no. 4 bed houses here would have from 89m² to in excess of 100m² each. The 3 bed house and 3 bed bungalow to Barrack Hill would have from 88m² to in excess of 100m². Clearly there are some instances here where the proposed gardens would fail to meet the requirements of the SPD and others where it exceeds that. Notwithstanding the instances of shortfall, all the dwellings would have provision that allows for meaningful use such that the quality of the proposed development and amenities afforded to these future occupiers would not be adversely affected. Members will also be aware that having regard to the continued position of housing undersupply in the Borough there is a need to maximise the use of land within the urban and suburban areas to not only meet demand but to also reduce the pressure for development on Green Belt land. This need is identified in the NPPF at para's 124 and 125 as set out previously in this report. It is considered that the proposed development maximises the use of the site in an appropriate manner without jeopardising the amenities of the future occupiers or the quality of the development proposed.

For the above reasons the proposal is considered compliant with policies H1 and SIE1 together with advice contained in the NPPF.

Parking and Highway Safety

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

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

The application site is considered to be in an accessible location having regard to its proximity to the designated local shopping centre on Higher Bents and the accessibility score set out in policy H2 of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore compliant with policy CS9.

Having regard to the former and lawful use of the site as a pub, it is considered that traffic levels associated with the proposed development will not be materially different to those which historically have taken place and could take place should the pub reopen. The development will benefit from access points and car parking that are safe and practical to use being of an acceptable width and layout and benefitting from an appropriate level of visibility.

The Council's parking standards require a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling. Plots 6-9 on School Brow will have 2 spaces per dwelling (200% provision and in full accordance with the maximum parking standard of 2 spaces per dwelling) and plots 1-5 will be served by an 8-space car park, which equates to 160% provision. This level of parking is considered appropriate for this location having regard to known levels of car ownership (see below). The Highway Engineer also advises that the parking areas will be suitable to small delivery vehicles to enter, park and exit in forward gear. Conditions can be imposed as requested to secure details of cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points.

On the basis of the above and subject to the imposition of conditions as requested by the Highway Engineer, it can be concluded that the proposed development will not give rise to conditions harmful to highway safety and thus is compliant with policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 together with advice contained in the NPPF.

The only objections to this application (as amended) from neighbouring occupiers relate to the need for access to be maintained to and from neighbouring properties and across the highway adjoining the site having regard to their specific needs. In this respect it is noted that the objector is concerned that overspill parking on Barrack Hill could prevent access to his property by ambulance. It also appears that he requires assurance that the new access points would be constructed such that they could be used by him and others in a wheelchair.

Dealing with overspill parking first, it is noted that the only parking restriction on Barrack Hill in the vicinity of the site are double yellow lines in front of 1 Barrack Hill which extend into St Christopher's Drive; these are required to ensure that parking does not occur in close proximity to this junction and thus harm highway safety. As such kerbside parking can occur outside of the application site on Barrack Hill.

Notwithstanding this Members are advised that the level of car ownership in the area is known to be 132% and therefore the proposed level of parking (ranging from 160% to 200%) should meet the demand of the occupiers, plus the occasional visitor without any overspill car parking. Having regard to this it is considered unlikely that parking will take place on Barrack Hill as a result of the development to

the extent that would restrict access to private property and without further evidence, I would question whether parking restrictions would be justified.

In relation to the construction of the access points, Members are advised that dropped kerb footway crossings will be provided such that access from the pavement, across the entrances to the parking on School Brow and Barrack Hill and back onto the pavement will be level (through the provision of dropped kerbs) and accessible by those using wheelchairs as well as other users. Conditions are also requested by the Highway Engineer to secure the closure of the cobbled and kerbed access on School Brow and the provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing (dropped kerbs with tactile paving) at the junction of Barrack Hill and St. Christopher's Drive, both of which would improve access in the area for wheelchair users and others.

Other Matters

Policies L1.1, L1.2 and SIE2 seek to ensure that applications for residential development contribute towards children's play and formal recreation noting that there is a shortfall of such facilities within the Borough. For a small scale development such as that proposed, compliance is expected by way of a commuted sum payment calculated in accordance with the formula set out in the accompanying SPD. As per the requirements of the above policy position, the sum in relation to children's play will be invested at either the Goyt Valley Play Area (NEAP) and Bredbury Recreation Ground (NEAP) both of which fall within the required distance of the site and relating to formal recreation will be allocated for the Formal Sport Priority List and invested any site across the Borough. Compliance with this policy position will be secured by way of a S106 agreement in the event that planning permission is approved.

Policy SD3 requires development to demonstrate how it will assist in reducing carbon emissions through its construction and occupation through the submission and approval of an energy statement. Members may however be aware that new Building Regulations came into force on 15th June 2022 which include changes to 'Part L' of the Regulations focussing on greater fabric performance, lower energy demand, and a move away from fossil fuels (gas and oil boilers) to electric heating systems. The changes should cut carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from new homes by around 31% and non-domestic new builds by 27%. In existing buildings, regulations will typically apply to new build extensions or the installation of new materials or technology.

These new Building Regulation standards are now higher than that required by the current Core Strategy Policy SD-3. Notwithstanding this, developments are still expected to evidence as part of the planning application through a short statement how they intend to meet or exceed the requirements of Part L of Building Regulations introduced in June 2022.

The energy statement submitted with this application whilst being compliant with policy SD3 predates the introduction of the updated Building Regulations. As such it

is appropriate to impose a condition requiring this statement to be revisited and update to demonstrate compliance with the Building Regulations. This, as suggested by the Planning Policy Officer could consider the use of solar photovoltaics to offset electricity used in the development and further reduce CO2 emissions and energy bills. On this basis the proposal is compliant with policy SD3.

The application site is not identified on the UDP Proposals Map as being in an area liable to flood and the Environment Agency identify the site as being within Flood Zone 1. Having regard to the size of the site and scale of the proposed development there is no requirement for the application to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. Policy SD6 however requires all development to be designed in such a way as to avoid, mitigate or reduce the impacts of climate change. In this respect development is required to incorporate sustainable drainage systems so as to manage run off water from the site. Given the small scale of the proposed development, a drainage strategy is not required at this stage however this will be secured by condition in the event that planning permission is approved. This will address the comments of United Utilities.

Policy SIE3 of the Core Strategy together with advice in the NPPF seeks to ensure that development does not result in unacceptable levels of pollution and that future occupiers or users are not subjected to such. Submitted with the application is a Noise Impact Assessment and Risk Assessment and Remediation Strategy both of which have been considered by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Subject to the imposition of conditions to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and the remediation of all garden and landscaped areas, the development is considered compliant with policy SIE3.

Policies NE1.2 and SIE3 together with advice in the NPPF seeks to ensure that development does not cause harm to protected species or their habitats and that gains to biodiversity are secured. Submitted with the application is a bat survey and ecological scoping survey which has been considered by the Council's ecologist.

No evidence of roosting bats was recorded during the survey and the site is considered to offer negligible bat roosting potential. As such the proposed works are considered to be of low risk to roosting bats. Notwithstanding this an informative can be imposed reminding the applicant of the potential for roosting bats to be present. This will also advise that if at any time during works, evidence of roosting bats (or any other protected species) is discovered on site, works must cease and a suitably experienced ecologist contacted for advice.

Conditions as suggested in relation to site clearance during bird nesting season and knotweed together with that to secure a repeat ecological survey if development has not commenced by June 2023 can be imposed. Biodiversity enhancements including bat/bird boxes and the inclusion of native species in the landscaping of the site will also be secured by condition. The request that hedges be used in place of

fencing to demark site and plot boundaries is noted. Whilst this is desirable from an ecological perspective, it does raise issues in respect of other matters. For example, there is a need to provide and maintain sightlines to vehicle access points to ensure that adequate visibility is afforded, the use of hedging here would require regular maintenance to keep it to the required height whereas there is no such requirement with a permanent means of enclosure. Residents of developments also expected a degree of privacy and security from the outset and this could not be secured through the provision of hedging. It is however noted that a comprehensive scheme of landscaping is proposed throughout the site and that this includes the retention of the hedge to 1a Barrack Hill. Whilst further hedge planting would clearly be welcome, the landscaping proposed is certainly not unacceptable. Hedgehog gaps in close boarded fencing will be secured by condition as will details of external lighting.

Having regard to the above the proposal is considered compliant with policies NE1.2 and SIE3 together with advice in the NPPF.

Conclusions

There are no objections to the loss of the existing use and the delivery of residential development on this site will assist in addressing the continued shortfall of housing in the Borough in accordance with policies CS2, CS4 and H-2 of the Core Strategy.

The proposal is considered to be of an acceptable size, siting and design such that it will not adversely affect the character of the area or the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers; the retention and conversion of the non designated heritage asset is also welcome. Furthermore, the future occupiers of the development will be afforded an acceptable level of amenity. In this respect the proposal is considered compliant with policies H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 together with advice contained within the NPPF.

The development gives rise to no concerns with regard to traffic generation, includes an access that is safe and practical to use and benefits from parking in accordance with the Council's maximum standards. The proposal therefore accords with policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 together with advice contained within Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal is acceptable in relation to the impact on the trees, will cause no harm to protected species and will deliver gains to biodiversity. In this respect the development accords with policies NE1.2, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 and advice contained within Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

There will be no harm to the amenities of neighbouring or future occupiers on account of pollution given the imposition of conditions and thus the proposals are compliant with policy SIE3.

Issues relating to the drainage of the site and energy efficiency can be dealt with in an appropriate manner compliant with policies SD3 and SD6.

A S106 agreement to secure a commuted sum payment in relation children's and formal recreation will ensure compliance with policies L1.1, L1.2 and SIE2.

There are no other material considerations that would weigh against the proposed development.

Members are reminded of the tilted balance in favour of residential development as set out at para 11 of the NPPF. In this respect it is considered that there are no adverse impacts arising from the grant of planning permission that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. As such in accordance with para 11 of the NPPF it is recommended that the permission should be approved for the reasons set out in this report.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Subject to Conditions and S106