

ITEM 3

Application Reference	DC/087141
Location:	Land Off Stanley Road Heald Green
PROPOSAL:	The erection of a residential development comprising houses and apartments, together with all associated works including landscaping, public open space and car parking.
Type Of Application:	Full Application
Registration Date:	24.11.2022
Expiry Date:	2023.02.23
Case Officer:	Jane Chase
Applicant:	Clowes Developments (N W) Ltd & Great Places Housing Group
Agent:	Savills

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Departure (Green Belt) – Planning & Highways Committee

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application is best illustrated by the plans attached to this agenda but in brief proposes the residential redevelopment of the site in the form of up to 159 dwellings comprising 81no. apartments (27no. 1 beds and 54no. 2 beds) and 3no. bungalows (2 beds) and 75no. houses (18no. 2beds, 41no. 3 beds and 16no. 4 beds). As originally submitted the application proposed that of these dwellings, 47no. would be offered on the open market with the remaining 112no. being offered as affordable housing. The application has since been amended and now proposes that all 159 dwellings will be delivered as affordable housing.

The single family dwellings will be of a traditional design being brick built with projecting gables, hipped and pitched roofs, either single or 2 storeys high. The apartments are spread throughout the development, mixed in amongst the houses. The southern block to Stanley Road will be of a simple contemporary flat roofed design, being brick built with flat roofed projecting bays. To the north of the site towards the western boundary are a pair of L shaped, 3 storey apartment buildings arranged to enclose communal gardens. These will be of a simple traditional brick design with canopied entrances and tiled hipped roofs. To the north of these beyond the pedestrian/cycle access onto Wilmslow Road will be a small 2 storey apartment building of a simple traditional brick design with canopied entrances and a tiled pitched roof. To the east of this, also to the north of the site is another smaller 2 storey apartment building of a simple traditional brick design with canopied entrances and a tiled pitched roof.

A single point of vehicle access is proposed into the development from Stanley Road with a spine road running through the site in a south – north direction and with a series of cul de sacs leading off. A shared pedestrian/cycle access is proposed to Wilmslow Road from the north of the site. Off site highway works include:

- A shared use footway/cycleway on the northern side of Stanley Road between the site access and a Tiger crossing to be provided at the junction with Wilmslow Road;
- A shared use footway / cycleway on the northern side of Stanley Road between the site access and an informal crossing facility and cycle let-down facility to be provided approximately 50m to the east of the access;
- A new footway on the southern side of Stanley Road between the informal crossing facility and the Wilmslow Road / Stanley Road junction, with tactile paving at the layby accesses;
- A relocated and upgraded westbound bus stop on Stanley Road, proposed closer to the development entrance;
- A shared use footway / cycleway south eastern corner, between the new Tiger crossing on Stanley Road to a Tiger crossing to be provided on Wilmslow Road southern approach to the junction;
- A shared use footway/cycleway west side of Wilmslow Road, between the existing Tiger crossing (close to A555) and the access to the Wagon & Horses public house;
- A segregated cycleway and footway plus part shared route, west side of Wilmslow Road from the pub access up to Bolshaw Road. This link will connect with the cycle improvements associated with the Bloor Homes housing development to the north that are under construction/have recently been completed and
- Cycle let downs at locations to enable safe transition between the carriageway and the off carriageway infrastructure.

Throughout the site a variety of open spaces are proposed including areas of grassland fronting Stanley Road, hard and soft landscaped front gardens, soft landscaped rear gardens to the bungalows and houses, communal gardens to the apartments, a large area of public open space to the west of the site and a similar sized area to the east which will accommodate a Local Area for Play (LAP). Further smaller open spaces are spread around the site and will be landscaped to provide a series of wetland meadows, swales and ponds to support the drainage of the development.

Given the large number of plans submitted with this application, not all have been appended to this report. Rather, a selection has been chosen which, it is considered, will afford Members a sufficient understanding of the development proposed. If however Members wish to view the application in its entirety then they can do so via the Council's website.

The application is supported by the following documents:

Planning Statement
 Design & Access Statement
 Affordable Housing Statement
 Transport Assessment
 Travel Plan
 Road Safety Audit
 Arboricultural Survey
 Condition of Existing Trees and Vegetation Report

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
Bat Survey
Biodiversity Net Gains Assessment & Matrix
Drainage Strategy
Air Quality Assessment
Geo-Environmental Assessment
Noise Impact Assessment
Heritage Statement
Crime Impact Statement
Energy Statement
Statement of Community Involvement

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises some 4.4ha of land situated to the north of Stanley Road, Heald Green. Access is currently from Wilmslow Road to the west and here within the northern half of the site is previously developed land, laid with hardstanding and which is used for airport parking. The southern half of the site is greenfield land, devoid of any development and accommodates trees and scrubland.

The site is bounded to the west by properties on Wilmslow Road including a commercial uses, residential dwellings, a mosque and community centre. Opposite the site on the south side of Stanley Road is the Manchester Airport Stanley Hotel and residential dwellings. To the east is the Seashell Trust school campus. To the west, a swathe of undeveloped land is positioned to the rear of houses and the commercial units forming the South Gate Centre. To the north is a further area of airport parking accessed from Wilmslow Road via that forming part of the application site and beyond this are further office developments and Griffon Lodge (a grade 2 listed building). Here to the north, extending along Wilmslow Road up to Syddall Avenue is the Bloor Homes residential development.

The application site is identified on the UDP Proposals Map as being within the Green Belt and a Landscape Character Area.

POLICY BACKGROUND

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

The Development Plan includes:

Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted 31st May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; &

Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17th March 2011.

Saved Policies of the SUDP Review

LCR1.1 Landscape Character Areas
NE1.2 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance
NE3.1 Protection and Enhancement of Green Chains
EP1.7 Development and Flood Risk
EP1.9 Safeguarding of Aerodromes and Air Navigation Facilities

EP1.10 Aircraft Noise
GBA1.1 Extent of Green Belt
GBA1.2 Control of Development in Green Belt
GBA1.5 Residential Development in Green Belt
L1.1 Land for Active Recreation
L1.2 Children`s Play
MW1.5 Control of Waste from Development

<https://www.stockport.gov.uk/topic/current-planning-policies>

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management Policies

CS1 Overarching Principles: Sustainable Development – Addressing Inequalities and Climate Change
SD-1 Creating Sustainable Communities
SD-3 Delivering the Energies Opportunities Plan
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
H2 Housing Phasing
H3 Affordable Housing
CS8 Safeguarding & 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
SIE5 Aviation Facilities, Telecommunications and Other Broadcast Infrastructure
CS9 Transport & Development
T-1 Transport and Development
T-2 Parking in Developments
T-3 Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network

<https://www.stockport.gov.uk/topic/current-planning-policies>

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.

Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD
Design of Residential Development SPD
Sustainable Transport SPD
Transport in Residential Areas SPD
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
Affordable Housing SPG

<https://www.stockport.gov.uk/topic/current-planning-policies>

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF (2023) sets out the Government’s position on the role of the planning system in both plan-making and decision-taking. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, in economic, social and environmental terms, and it states that there should be “presumption in favour of sustainable development” and sets out what this means for decision taking.

The NPPF (2023) confirms the plan-led approach to the planning system and that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant paragraphs within the NPPF include:-

Para. 1 to 2: Introduction

Para. 7 to 14: Achieving Sustainable Development

Para. 38, 39, 41, 47, 55 to 58: Decision Making

Para. 60, 62 to 65, 69, 74; Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes

Para. 92, 98 Promoting Healthy & Safe Communities

Para. 104, 105, 110 to 113; Promoting Sustainable Transport

Para. 119, 120, 123, 124; Making Effective Use of Land

Para. 126, 130, 131, 134; Achieving Well Designed Places

Para. 137, 138, 147 to 150; Protecting Green Belt Land

Para; 152, 154, 157, 159, 167, 169; Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding & Coastal Change

Para. 174, 179 to 188: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Para. 189, 194, 195, 197, 199 to 202, 205; Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Para. 218, 219; Implementation

[National Planning Policy Framework.](#)

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.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no planning history relating to the application site itself which is directly of relevance to the proposed development. Members however will be aware of the following applications on adjacent sites:

DC060928 - Seashell Trust, Stanley Road, Heald Green. Hybrid application comprising a full planning application for a new school, with associated facilities, infrastructure, parking, access and landscaping and an outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new campus facilities, parking, infrastructure, landscaping and ancillary works; and the erection of up to 325 dwellings, including associated infrastructure, parking, access, landscaping and ancillary works, on the land to the north of the school.

This application was recommended for approval by Officers but refused by Members. An appeal and public inquiry followed and planning permission was granted by the Secretary of State in 2020.

DC078180 – Seashell Trust, Stanley Road, Heald Green. Reserved matters application for phase 1 of the residential development approved by DC060928 comprising 202 dwellings. That application has been approved and development commenced with many of the houses now being occupied.

DC084620 – Seashell Trust, Stanley Road, Heald Green. Reserved matters application for phase 2 of the residential development approved by DC060928. This application remains under consideration.

DC088902 - Land to the east of Wilmslow Road, Heald Green. Full application seeking the erection of 80 dwellings, together with access, parking, landscaping and drainage, and other associated works. This application relates to land immediately to the north of the application and remains under consideration.

DC089817 – Seashell Trust, Stanley Road, Heald Green. Full application for the construction of a temporary access road for a period of 3 years to facilitate the construction of the new college, administration, sports and training building. This application relates to land falling within the site to which this report is advising upon and remains under consideration.

In addition to the above, Members should note that the southern half of the application site previously accommodated an area of woodland which was felled in 2021. Whilst the trees benefitted from no legal protection afforded by a Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area status, the Forestry Commission commenced enforcement proceedings and served a restocking notice on 5th October 2021. This Notice requires the following:

- Before 30th June 2023 the felled area must be restocked with broadleaf species to achieve no less than 1,100 equally spaced stems per hectare. This equates to 1,177 trees at this site.
- The following species are to be planted to achieve the restocking requirements by 30th June 2023: 25% oak, 20% birch, 15% sycamore, 10% willow, 10% hawthorn, 10% wild cherry and 10% common alder.
- For a period of 10 years from planting the trees must be properly protected against damage, adequately weeded and maintained in accordance with good forestry practice, as set out in the latest edition of the United Kingdom Forestry Standard.
- Any trees which fail, die or are otherwise lost during the 10 year period must be replaced by 30th June the following year to provide satisfactory restocking and done so in accordance with the rules and practice of good forestry, as set out in the latest edition of the United Kingdom Forestry Standard.
- If damaged or dislodged, any fences or individual tree guards deployed to maintain the trees must be replaced within the 10 year period, within 31 days of that damage or dislodgement taking place, and done so in accordance with the rules and practice of good forestry, as set out in the latest edition of the United Kingdom Forestry Standard.

An appeal has been lodged against this restocking notice which currently remains undetermined.

Members are advised that legal advice has been sought on the implications of this enforcement action upon the determination and (if approved) implementation of this planning application. In this respect it is advised that the FC restocking notice and undetermined appeal are a material consideration in the determination of this planning application. This however does not prevent the determination of this application even if the appeal is dismissed before a decision is taken on this application.

If the appeal remains undetermined at the time a decision is taken on the planning application, then as the trees were unlawfully felled, the planning application should be determined as if they still existed. It is however for the decision maker to decide how much weight to give to the trees that previously existed (and which legally should still exist).

If the appeal is dismissed and the restocking notice is upheld before the planning application is determined, this also would not prevent determination of the application. In this instance however the Council should be clear in determining the planning application that it has given due regard to the relevant decision. It is for the decision maker to decide how much weight to give to the restocking notice if the appeal is dismissed before the application is determined

If the appeal is dismissed and planning permission is approved for the development sought by this application, it is for the developer to decide whether the restocking notice impacts on their ability to implement this planning permission.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The receipt of the application was advertised by way of a site and press notice. The occupiers of 92 neighbouring properties were also notified directly in writing.

2 letters have been received objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:-

- This development will cause significant travel issues as the road size will not take this volume of traffic.
- Where will construction workers park?
- This is a green belt area and should be protected the site has a large proportion of mature trees and hedge rows some of these trees have already been removed without permission but looking at the plans they intend to remove a least 50% of what is currently there not in line with what should happen on a green belt area.
- The proposed houses will be out of keeping with the prevailing layout of plots in the area which feature more generous separation distances. They will negatively affect this key element of the character of this designated low density housing area. The application represents a poor design and overdevelopment of the site.
- The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This high density cramped housing will fill up the only Green Belt space left in the area. As the developers have correctly stated, the site is surrounded on all sides by Cheadle Mosque, Bloor Homes and the Seashell Trust. Bloor Housing has already been granted planning permission to build over 300 new homes of which a substantial number are affordable.
- Instead of allowing further urban development on this, the last remaining open space in the area, it should in fact be protected all the more robustly by Stockport Council. It would serve more of a local need by being converted into a park, or a wildflower meadow or field. This would be much bigger than the proposed "attenuation pond and meadow" whose sole purpose is to tick a box in the planning application.
- There will be approximately 400 extra cars accessing Stanley Road and Wilmslow Road. Apart from inclusion of heat pumps I see little ambition for

decarbonisation. Just because there will be electric charge points for electric vehicles, this does not mean that all the vehicles used will be electric. In fact as the majority of housing will be "affordable", then the majority of electric vehicles may well be unaffordable for residents. Electric cars are expensive to purchase, not to mention the extortionate cost of electricity today which will be needed to run them. Can the developers prove that the extra emissions won't affect my young children's health?

- Will they be building a zebra/pelican crossing on Stanley Road to help children and the elderly residents of Stanley Road cross it safely? Will the Council be reducing the speed limit on the road to reduce the risks of fatal accidents?
- As residents we already feel the road is busy with traffic at excess speeds. With the ongoing Bloor homes development we have seen a rise in traffic in the road and this development is yet to be completed. Worshippers from Cheadle Mosque on Fridays and all during the month of Ramadan struggle to find parking and are causing a nuisance in the area, parking across people's drives and the Bloor Homes site. This situation will be further exacerbated by the Clowes Homes development.
- Surely it is sensible to see the full impact on traffic and services of the Bloor homes development before granting further planning permission for more homes in the adjacent site?
- What about the noise implications? All that traffic will surely drive away the wonderful biodiversity present? The noise produced during construction will also be considerable, and the resulting permanent pressure on the local roads in terms of noise pollution significant.
- There is already an overload on local GP practices in Heald Green, with all of them stretched beyond capacity. We don't need more houses with more patients, rather we need more GP's, dentists and other healthcare providers. I have been unable to access a NHS dentist for 3 years. A more prudent use of the space would be a healthcare centre. This application if granted will add further strains on presently failing infrastructure and facilities. Please put the needs of the population in front of the profits to the developers.

3 letters have been received supporting the proposed development on the following grounds:-

- The proposals will provide much needed affordable and new housing in the area and repurpose the site. I support this application because it makes use of land that is currently underutilised as airport parking.
- I also think that the new development should be approved because the homes look attractive, modern, stylish, and fit into the area's look and feel.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which details the public consultation that was carried out by the applicant ahead of submitting a full application for the development proposed is included in the submission. This is an important element of the planning process and the determination of this application. Early public engagement as well as that with statutory and non statutory consultees is not only encouraged by this Planning Authority but also by the Government through the NPPF (para's 39 to 42).

The Statement advises that:

- *Residents and stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the proposals at all stages of the public consultation via a number of*

different channels, including one-to-one meetings, a consultation website (including a virtual exhibition) and a physical exhibition at a local venue. A Freephone information line, a feedback email address and a dedicated website were also made available throughout the course of the pre application stages, for interested parties to receive further information and to provide their feedback to the project team.

- *This has ensured that the local community has had an opportunity to understand the proposals, discuss them with members of the project team and provide their feedback before the submission of a planning application.*
- *Pre-application consultation one-to-one meetings were offered to neighbouring residents and were held on Wednesday 25 May 2022, and a virtual public exhibition was hosted from Wednesday 25 May until Friday 10 June 2022. A physical public exhibition was held on Wednesday 8 June 2022 at the Sylvia Roberts Guide Hall, Cross Lane, Heald Green SK8 3LW. Members of the project team were available to answer questions on the day.*
- *On 24 May 2022, over 2,000 households and businesses close to the site were sent a two-page newsletter which included a QR code with a direct link to the project website. The newsletter included an invitation to attend the public exhibition on 8 June 2022. Online feedback forms were available as part of the virtual exhibition for attendees to record their views.*
- *Great Places and Clowes Developments have carefully reviewed all the feedback received to date, and the main comments raised by the local community have been addressed within this document and the wider material submitted as part of the planning application. Following submission of the application, Great Places and Clowes Developments will ensure that interested parties and key stakeholders remain informed and updated regarding the proposals.*

The full Statement of Community Involvement is available to view as part of this application on the Council's website.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Planning Policy Officer (Green Belt) – No objection.

Planning Policy Officer (Housing) – No objection.

Strategic Housing – No Objection.

Planning Policy Officer (Open Space) – No objection subject to S106 to secure commuted sum payments in lieu of that not provided on site.

Planning Policy Officer (Energy) – No objection. The proposed design is a 59% reduction on current building regulations Part L 2021 and there will be a CO2 reduction of 80% based on Part L 2006, thus complying with the energy reduction targets of SD-3.

Planning Policy (Education) - The development will not significantly impact the sufficiency of early years, nursery or primary school places in this area and the Council will not seek contributions in this respect. The development will however impact the sufficiency of secondary and SEND school places (23 pupils) and which

are currently oversubscribed and will cause the Council into commissioning new places.

Highway Engineer – No objections in relation to accessibility, traffic generation, off site works, layout or parking.

Transport for Greater Manchester – No objections but offer advice in relation to improving land use and transport integration through the development proposals. TfGM control and manage the traffic signals in Greater Manchester, as such any schemes that alter signalised junctions need to be agreed with TfGM. Additionally, where developments impact on signalised junctions, TfGM have a duty of care to ensure that these impacts are satisfactorily mitigated as part of the planning process.

Tree Officer – No objections subject to the imposition of conditions to ensure no tree/hedge works other than shown on the approved plans, the protection of trees/hedges during construction works (through protective fencing and implementation of construction method statements) and to secure improvements to the tree and hedge planting within the site in terms of the level of planting proposed and inclusion of native species.

Nature Development Officer – No objection subject to conditions and S106 to secure Biodiversity Net Gains and an acceptable form of development in relation to ecology.

LLFA (Drainage) – No objection subject to a condition to secure final technical details.

Conservation Officer – No objections in relation to the impact of the development upon the significance of designated and non designated heritage assets subject to opportunities being taken to maximise areas of openness and soft landscaping particularly along the boundaries of the site. This could however be improved upon by incorporating PV panels and constructing to PassivHaus standards.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service – No objections to the impact of the development upon archaeology. There is no need for further work in this respect by the applicant.

EHO (Noise) – No objection subject to conditions to secure compliance with the mitigation measures outlined in the Noise Impact Assessment and the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

EHO (Lighting) – No objection subject to external lighting details being secured by condition to show levels of illumination around the site (isolux drawings) and any overspill lighting beyond the site boundary. Mitigation measures or installation requirements shall be clearly identified on the external lighting scheme drawings: time controls/light sensors or other control methods.

EHO (Air) – No objection subject to a condition requiring the implementation of mitigation measures outlined in the report.

EHO (Contamination) – No objection however the report states there should be further gas monitoring undertaken however 4 rounds over a 5 week period is not sufficient given the size of the development, sensitive end use and made ground present. This can be addressed through the imposition of conditions.

Manchester Airport – No objections subject to a condition to maintaining the 24h drain down time of the drainage system, and a condition to ensure that we are

consulted of the proposed details of the off-site biodiversity enhancements once the details are known.

Greater Manchester Police – No objections subject to consideration of amendments to the scheme. It is recommended that any planning approval is subject to a condition to secure compliance with the Crime Impact Statement.

Cheshire East – No comments received.

ANALYSIS

By way of introduction, the application site occupies a site of relatively large size that is positioned between Stanley Road and Wilmslow Road within the Green Belt. The applicant's proposals for this site have been the subject of lengthy discussion with Officers over a significant period of time seeking to clarify elements of the proposal and address consultation responses. The application raises a number of key issues for consideration and these are discussed in the report below.

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of this application the saved policies of the UDP Review and the Core Strategy DPD form the development plan. The NPPF and Council's SPD's are material considerations.

The NPPF confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (para 7). 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.

Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local

circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area (para 9).

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

- approving developments that accord with an up to date development plan or
- where the policies which are most important for the determination of the application are out of date, granting planning permission unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of 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 the Framework as a whole.

In this respect, given that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing, the relevant elements of Core Strategy policies CS4 and H2 which seek to deliver housing supply are considered to be out of date. Areas or assets of particular importance are defined as including the Green Belt and designated heritage assets. Noting the location of the site within the Green Belt and the location of the application site within the setting of a designated heritage asset (Griffon Farm, a grade 2 listed building), the NPPF directs that planning permission should be approved unless the application of policies in the Framework relating to these areas/assets of importance direct refusal or unless the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole. This assessment is set out below.

Loss of the Existing Use

The lawful use of the site is for airport parking and it is noted that this occupies the northern half of the application site. Airport parking does not fall within a specific planning use class and thus is considered to be Sui Generis (in a class of its own). There are no policies in the Development Plan that would resist the loss of this existing commercial use and as such, the proposed development is acceptable in this respect.

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.

Core Strategy policy CS3 confirms that a mix of housing, in terms of tenure, price, type and size will be provided to meet the requirements of new forming households, first time buyers, families with children, disabled people and older people. Support will be given to the provision of specialist and supported housing for older people and people with a disability. Developments in accessible suburban locations will be expected to achieve a density of 30dph.

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

that the focus is on making effective use of land within accessible urban locations with the priority for development being previously developed land in urban areas.

The NPPF confirms that 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 60).

Small and medium sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions, giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes (para 69). Where there is an undersupply of housing local planning authorities should identify actions to increase delivery in future years (para 77).

Planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes while safeguarding the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions (para 119). Planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes, promote and support the development of underutilised land especially if this would help meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained (para 120). Planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land taking into account the identified need for different housing types and other forms of development and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it (para 124). 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 (para 125).

In response to that policy position Members are advised that notwithstanding the site's location in the Green Belt (which is discussed below) CS4 of the Core Strategy directs new residential development towards the more accessible parts of the Borough identifying 3 spatial priority areas. 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, at present, 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 residential development of this accessible site therefore accords with policy CS4.

Currently, there is 4.1 years of housing land supply in Stockport, which is well below the NPPF requirement to have 5 years of housing land supply. The proposal for 159 dwellings represents an important addition to the housing land supply within Stockport and therefore significant weight should be given to this positive impact, in line with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

The proposed housing would help to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS2 'Housing Provision', and the housing need identified in the most recent assessment of local housing need (LHN), which at 1,125 dwellings per annum supersedes the targets in CS2.

In terms of housing mix, the scheme proposes 27no. 1 bed dwellings, 75no. 2 bed dwellings, 41no. 3 bed dwellings and 16no. 4 bed dwellings. This range broadly meets the criteria set out in policy CS3. The Stockport Housing Needs Assessment (2019) (HNA) notes that 'there is an ongoing need for all types and sizes of dwelling with strongest need for 3-bedroom and 4 or more-bedroom houses.' Notwithstanding this, the HNA indicates that within this area there is an insufficient supply of across all types of properties as well as an insufficient supply of houses with level access. The density, at just over 36 dwellings per hectare is towards the lower end of what the Council would expect to be delivered. Although the scheme does meet with the expectations set out in Policy CS3 'Mix of Dwellings', making optimal use of the land in terms of housing delivery is an aim outlined in NPPF Section 11.

With regard to affordable housing provision, the NPPF at para 65 confirms that where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the total number of homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups.

Stockport, as a borough, has a net affordable need of 549 dwellings per annum, as identified in the HNA, with the net shortfall of affordable housing identified for the township of 'Gatley, Heald Green and Cheadle Hulme (North)' is 175 dwellings. In both cases, there is a persistent shortfall of delivery against need. Core Strategy Policy H-3 requires 50% affordable housing on sites located on greenfield, Green Belt sites and 30% on brownfield sites in this area.

The application proposes that all 159 dwellings will be affordable and will comprise 82no. shared ownership units, 30no. social rented and 47no. affordable rented units. The difference between affordable rent and social rent is that affordable rent will be slightly higher than social rent as it allows the landlord to charge up to 80% of market rent levels within the local area. Notwithstanding this, the rents will still be low and along with the social rented and shared ownership housing will fall within the definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF.

In terms of tenure split, policy H-3 requires that affordable provision should be 50% shared ownership, based on the Council's model, which is set in its affordable housing note, and 50% social rent. However, the Housing Needs Assessment has identified a greater need for shared ownership properties in this area and recommends that 25.5% should be affordable/social rented, while 74.5% should be for shared ownership. In the context of 100% affordable housing delivery, the proposed mix of 51.5% shared ownership, 29.6% affordable rent and 18.9% social rent units is considered acceptable.

The range of housing types proposed broadly meets the criteria set out in Core Strategy Policy CS3 (Mix of Housing). The Stockport Housing Needs Assessment (2019) (HNA) notes that 'there is an ongoing need for all types and sizes of dwelling with strongest need for 3-bedroom and 4 or more-bedroom houses.' Notwithstanding this, the HNA indicates that within this area there is an insufficient supply of across all types of properties as well as an insufficient supply of houses with level access (which this application will deliver in the form of 21no. 1 bed and 58no. 2 bed dwellings).

For the above reasons, the proposed development in terms of housing delivery and affordable housing accords with para's 60, 65, 69, 77, 119, 120, 124 and 125 of the NPPF together with Core Strategy policies C2, CS3, CS4 and H3. It is also of note that as well as complying with para 65 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy H3 the

proposed development significantly exceeds policy requirement. In proposing 100% affordable housing, given the need and shortfall of provision which exists in the borough and locally, this weighs heavily in favour of the proposed development in terms of the overall planning balance.

Green Belt

The proposed development is located within the Greater Manchester Green Belt as designated by 'saved' Stockport UDP Review policy GBA1.1 'Extent of Green Belt' and shown on the policies map (proposals map) of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (UDP).

Saved UDP Review policy GBA1.2 'Control of Development in Green Belt' sets out a presumption against the development of new buildings in the Green Belt unless it is for one of a number of specified purposes. GBA1.2 also sets out that development falling within these categories will be permitted only where it will not act to make adjoining Green Belt areas less defensible against encroachment. This application, as is correctly recognised in the Planning Statement submitted in support of this application, is not for a form of development falling within any of the specified purposes.

Saved UDP Review policy GBA1.5 'Residential Development in the Green Belt' sets out that, within the Green Belt, residential development will be restricted to three specified categories. Again, the form of development proposed by this application does not fall within any of the specified categories.

Members are advised however that whilst GBA1.2 is considered up-to-date in broad terms it is not absolutely consistent with national policy on Green Belt set out in Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In seeking to provide more detailed local considerations GBA1.5 is also not consistent with the NPPF. The more recently adopted provisions of Chapter 13 as set out below are therefore considered to provide a more suitable framework for the determination of this application.

NPPF Chapter 13, paragraph 149 sets out that a Local Planning Authority should consider the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt to be inappropriate other than for a number of stated exceptions. Most relevant to this application is exception g) which allows for the:

"limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- *not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- *not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority."*

The more northerly part of the application site, currently in use as airport car-parking, is considered to be previously developed land. As the scheme is for 100% affordable housing and, both the local area and the wider borough have a not insignificant shortfall of affordable housing provision, this part of the proposal therefore has the potential to be considered not inappropriate, subject to satisfying the test of causing less than substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The more southerly part of the site, however, is not previously

developed land and consequently the proposed development is inappropriate in the Green Belt as it does not fall within any of the excepted forms of development as set out in para 149 of the NPPF.

Para 147 of the NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Following on from this para 148 confirms that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

In response to this policy position, the applicant sets out a case for the proposed development within their Planning Statement. This case is substantial and lengthy however can be summarised as follows:

Whilst accepting that the aim of Green Belt is to prevent sprawl by keeping land permanently open, due to the pattern of historic and committed development in the area, this area of the Green Belt has been significantly degraded since its original adoption. Being surrounded by extensive development on all sides, the site is an "island site", which displays none of the usual characteristics of a Green Belt location. When assessed against the criteria set out at Paragraph 138 of the NPPF, it is clear that the site does not serve any of the purposes for including land within the Green Belt. As a result it can be concluded that the development of the site would not undermine the overall purposes of the Green Belt. It follows that the proposal would not result in harm as a result of urban sprawl nor would there be any significant impact on openness.

Notwithstanding the above, Paragraph 149 of the NPPF provides for a range of circumstances where the development of new buildings in the Green Belt should not be classified as being inappropriate. Of those exceptions, subsection g) states that:

"limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority."*

Given the above conclusion that the development of the site would not result in substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, it follows that the proposals to develop the northern portion of the site for the purposes of providing affordable housing should not be regarded as 'inappropriate'. Therefore, if the northern portion of the site were to be developed for affordable housing, then this would meet the exception criteria within Paragraph 149(g) and would therefore be acceptable in principle.

Notwithstanding the above, it is accepted that the development of the southern portion of the site is defined as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It

follows that, if planning permission is to be granted for the development, then 'very special circumstances' must exist to justify it.

In relation to assessing the impact of a proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt, the NPPG identifies a number of matters which may need to be taken into account. These include, but are not limited to:

- openness (both spatial and visual):*
- the duration of the development, and its remediability; and*
- the degree of activity likely to be generated.*

Although part of the site is previously developed it is free from buildings and therefore the proposed development would result in the permanent loss of openness by virtue of the new buildings. Whilst there will clearly be harm to openness, the degree of such is considered to be low for the following reasons:-

- The site serves none of the purposes for including land within the Green Belt.*
- Due to its low-lying topography, the site is not visible from any prevalent local views;*
- The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment concludes that the visual impact of the proposals will be modest (and in some instances, of visual benefit given the existing use as a surface car park);*
- The context of the site demonstrates that any encroachment upon the countryside has already occurred;*
- The landscape-led nature of the proposals, which include the retention and improvement of existing green infrastructure wherever possible (including significant tree-lined boundaries to the south, east and west).*

Taking into account the above, the starting point for the consideration of the proposal is that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm arising from the proposal. Substantial weight is given to the impacts upon openness, albeit at the 'low' end of the spectrum. As has been established, 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the identified harm by inappropriateness and to openness (as well as any other harm caused by the proposals) is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

In considering 'very special circumstances' the following should be noted:

- The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. That is a very significant shortfall in provision – especially when considering that the Council is severely constrained by Greenbelt to its southern and eastern borders and that considerable time and effort has been made to identifying and assessing the suitability of brownfield land for development.*
- The Council produced an Action Plan in August 2020 containing specific advice as to the methods by which the Council can increase housing delivery, critically it does not seek to allocate new sites to meet the ongoing need for new housing in the Borough. As a result, there is little to no prospect that the Council will be able to address the shortfall in housing supply and delivery in the foreseeable future.*

- *The acute shortage of housing will therefore require Green Belt land and sites such as this should be considered. The proposal will deliver 159 new homes which will make a significant contribution and should be afforded significant weight.*
- *This proposal commits to delivering a total of 159 (i.e. 100%) of the proposed dwellings as affordable homes, to be delivered on site by a Registered Provider of affordable housing. The type, tenure and location of the affordable homes has been developed in consultation with the Council to ensure that the provision is best able to address Stockport's needs identified in the HNA.*
- *Given the alarming degree to which the Borough is under-delivering on affordable housing, the provision of such a large amount of affordable housing in an area of growing need should be afforded very substantial weight in the decision-making process.*
- *The development of affordable housing on previously developed land in the Green Belt should not be regarded as 'inappropriate'. Whilst this site is only partially located on previously developed land and therefore does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 149(g), the efficient and beneficial reuse of that land is capable of being considered when assessing whether 'very special circumstances' exist to justify the proposal.*
- *Paragraph 118(c) of the NPPF provides that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of reusing suitable brownfield land to provide homes and to meet other needs. This is also implicit in paragraph 138 which advises that, where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, first consideration should be given to land which has been previously developed.*
- *Given the extent to which the Council is underdelivering against its identified housing need, which cannot be addressed on existing allocated sites, the context demands that the Council must support the delivery of housing on unallocated brownfield land in order to address the existing shortfall. Previous efforts by the Council to identify brownfield land within existing settlements to deliver new housing have concluded that sufficient land does not exist to address the shortfall. Those contextual circumstances support the conclusion in the Core Strategy that the release of Green Belt land is necessary to accommodate housing requirements.*
- *As per the approach set out in the NPPF, it logically follows that the Council should prioritise the protection of its "higher value" Green Belt land, by prioritising the development of existing brownfield sites in the Green Belt. Accordingly, the context demonstrates that the reuse of brownfield land to provide new housing which meets the Borough's requirements should be afforded significant weight in favour of the proposal.*
- *The proposed development will result in a series of economic, social and environmental benefits which, when considered collectively, contribute to the 'very special circumstances' which justify the proposal. These benefits should be afforded significant weight in favour of the proposed development.*

Members are advised that it is agreed that the proposed development does not fall within any of the excepted forms of development set out in saved UDP Review policies GBA1.2 or GBA1.5, The NPPF however offers the more up to date policy position and therefore greater weight is afforded to the provisions of that Framework.

The NPPF confirms that the Government places great importance on Green Belt and that the fundamental aim of policy is to keep land permanently open. The NPPF however does allow for certain excepted forms of development in the Green Belt notably that presented under para 149g which allows for the redevelopment of previously land which would not cause substantial harm to openness and would contribute to meeting an identified need for affordable housing within the area of the local planning authority. Any other development not falling within any of the excepted forms of development can only be approved if very special circumstances are demonstrated.

The more northerly part of the site, currently in use as airport car-parking, is previously developed. As the scheme is for 100% affordable housing and both the local area and the wider borough have a not insignificant shortfall of affordable housing provision, this part of the proposal has the potential to be considered not inappropriate, subject to satisfying the test of causing less than substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The more southerly part of the site, however, is not previously developed and consequently development as is proposed should be considered inappropriate and can only be approved where VSC are demonstrated.

Considering both in turn, Members are advised accordingly:

Even though the northern part of the site is previously developed, the absence of existing buildings means that the proposed development would result in the permanent loss of openness. Given that there are currently no buildings on the site there would clearly be a significant volumetric increase in built form and, therefore, a significant spatial impact. In terms of visual impact, however, the northern part of the site is largely obscured from public view and therefore the impact of the proposals here will be modest. Noting the context of this part of the site with development to the west, north and east as well as that further to the south beyond Stanley Road, there is already significant encroachment into the countryside. This latter point however should not be taken to mean that the Green Belt designation is somehow no longer applicable.

In overall terms, particularly because of the existing development in the wider area which has already compromised both openness and the extent to which the land meets the purposes of its inclusion within the Green Belt, it is apparent that whilst substantial weight should be given to potential harm by reason of inappropriateness, the actual degree of harm caused by the proposal is likely to be minimal.

On the basis of the above Members are advised that the redevelopment of the previously developed land for 100% affordable housing within the northern section of the site accords with para 149g of the NPPF and therefore is appropriate in the Green Belt.

The land within the southern section of the site is undeveloped and clearly the proposal will cause significant harm to openness both in visual and spatial terms. The applicant presents a comprehensive case in terms of demonstrating VSC to outweigh this harm. In response to this Members are advised that it is without

doubt that the Council is in a position of housing undersupply. Despite years of attempting to address this through the redevelopment of previously developed land, levels persistently remain below that required by the NPPF. The proposal will make a much needed and not insignificant contribution to this identified need. The very substantial weight attributed to the provision of affordable housing where a need is clearly identified is of particular note and is not disputed.

In considering proposals, para 138 of the NPPF is clear in advising that VSC will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In considering what 'any other harm' may arise Members will need to consider the economic, social and environmental impacts of the proposed development. These are considered in the remainder of this report, however, it is considered that the cumulative weight of the VSC presented by the applicant and the benefits of the proposals in all other respects, outweigh the harm that will be caused to the Green Belt through the redevelopment of this southern section of the site.

For the above reasons, Members are advised that notwithstanding the conflict with saved UDP Review policies GBA1.2 and GBA1.5, the proposal accords with the Governments approach to development within the Green Belt set out within para's 147 to 149 of the NPPF.

Impact on the Character & Amenities of the Locality

Saved UDP Review policy LCR1.1 confirms that development in the countryside will be strictly controlled and will not be permitted unless it protects or enhances the quality and character of the rural area. Where it is acceptable in principle, development should be sensitively sited, designed and constructed of materials appropriate to the area and should be accommodated without adverse impact on the landscape quality of the area. Development proposals should (where appropriate) protect or improve existing recreational land, not impede and where possible improve public access, protect or enhance the natural environment, conserve or enhance buildings that contribute to the history or character of the area and improve the appearance of the countryside notably by removing or screening unsightly existing development.

Core Strategy policy H1 confirms that development should be of a high quality, respond to the character of the area within which they are located and provide for good standards of amenity. This is reinforced in Core Strategy policy CS8 which welcomes development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to a sustainable, attractive, safe and accessible built and natural environment. Policy SIE-1 of the Core Strategy also confirms that development which is designed to the highest contemporary standard, paying high regard to the built/and or natural environment within which it is sited, will be given positive consideration. Specific regard should be paid to the use of materials appropriate to the location and the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings (particularly with regard to height, density and massing of buildings). Satisfactory levels of privacy and amenity for future, existing and neighbouring users and residents should be provided, maintained or enhanced.

The NPPF confirms at para 119 that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes while safeguarding the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. 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 and the importance of securing well designed and attractive places (para 124).

Chapter 12 of the NPPF confirms that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities (para 126).

Planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible (para 130).

Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, significant weight should be given to development that reflects local design policies and government guidance on design and supplementary planning documents (para 134).

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

The application is supported by a Design & Access Statement which together with a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment consider the proposals in the context of the surrounding locality.

The application site is located in the Heald Green Fringe Landscape Character Area. This LCA is generally flat landform, with field patterns and vegetation cover but is more affected by "urban fringe" uses. The area is split into three compartments by urban development. The application site is located in the larger central area which contains a number of institutional uses and is bisected by the new road. In this LCA it is acknowledged that the pressure for urban and semi-urban development is likely to be considerable and care will be needed to protect the remaining open and agricultural character of the area. Tree planting should be encouraged, particularly in and around the institutional grounds and along the major road lines.

The character of the locality surrounding the application is mixed. To Stanley Road there is a verdant feel afforded by the large number of trees that line the road. To the north side of the road there is a relative absence of development other than the adjacent Seashell Trust school until the junction with Wilmslow Road. To the south side of Stanley Road are 2 storey detached houses in a variety of architectural styles, of a generous size and set back from the road frontage behind maturely landscaped front gardens. At the junction with Wilmslow Road is the Manchester Airport Stanley hotel, a substantial detached

building rising up to 4 storeys in height and set within landscaped grounds. Opposite this on the west side of Wilmslow Road is the Waggon and Horse PH, a Lakeland kitchen supply shop and an open air car wash.

To the west of the site is development on Wilmslow Road comprising the newly constructed replacement mosque building. 2 storeys high this building is of a striking architectural style befitting and reflecting its religious use. Beyond that are small, 2 storey terraced houses behind which is an area of woodland abutting the western boundary of the application site. Further northwards is Southgate, a 2 to 3 storey office/commercial development positioned adjacent to the existing access into the application site. Beyond this access is a swathe of open air car storage/parking (unconnected with that on the application site) which along with further parking behind it, and immediately to the north of the application site is accessed from Wilmslow Road using the same access as that serving the application site.

Beyond this car parking is residential development adjacent to Griffin Farm, a grade 2 listed building. Further residential development, also recently granted permission as part of the redevelopment proposals for the Seashell Trust school, is present north of Griffin Farm extending up to Syddall Avenue. This housing is of a traditional design, 2 storeys in height.

To the east of the site, the site is largely bounded by the Seashell Trust school site which is currently undergoing redevelopment having recently been granted planning permission for new school buildings with associated facilities, parking and access. Beyond this is existing housing comprising large detached dwellings with accommodation at first floor level within the roofspace.

Within the site itself, whilst the existing parking to the northern section is not visually prominent, it does nothing to enhance let alone protect the visual amenities of the locality. This part of the site is not well maintained with the surface being potholed and unmade in many places. There is little apparent order to the parking on site with cars stored in large groups often 13 wide and 12 deep, extending into every space possible.

In response to this the layout of the proposed development is influenced not just by the size and shape of the application site but also by the need to accord with the Council's guidelines for residential development as set out in the SPD and the need of the development to reflect the pattern of development in the area. Of influence also is the need to provide for open space within the development and to deliver a landscape strategy consistent with the character of the locality. Clearly also the development needs to be afforded suitable access for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Development on the northern, previously developed section of the site will be largely screened from public view on account of it being surrounded by development to the west, north and east. That on the undeveloped land within the southern section of the site will however be more visually prominent from Stanley Road. It is important that the development as a whole responds to the character of the locality, however, that to Stanley Road needs particular attention noting its likely presence in the streetscene.

The main entrance into the development will be from Stanley Road via a new carriageway built off that existing. This will run in a northerly direction and off it will be a series of spur roads and smaller cul de sacs. The existing access onto

Wilmslow Road will be repurposed to provide pedestrian and cycle access to and from the development.

To Stanley Road, will be a large 3 storey apartment building together with 2 storey detached and semi detached houses, all positioned back from this frontage behind the existing tree provision. The remainder of the site comprises largely 2 storey semi detached houses save for a single detached bungalow and a pair of semi detached bungalows. To northern extent of the site are also 2no. 3 storey apartment blocks, a short terrace of 2 storey apartments and a 2 storey semi detached apartment building.

All the proposed houses benefit from front and rear gardens; some front gardens also accommodate forecourt parking but others are soft landscaped with parking to the side of the dwelling. The apartments fronting Stanley Road have communal gardens forward of them, behind the existing line of trees to this frontage and communal parking to the rear. The larger of the apartment blocks to the north of the site is arranged around a communal garden with landscaped gardens in front and parking located in 3 areas to the front and sides of the buildings. The smaller apartments to the north of the site both have landscaped gardens in front and communal gardens to the rear with parking arranged in communal areas. Houses, bungalows and the smaller apartment blocks to the north of the site are of a traditional design with pitched roofs, gable ends, projecting bays and porches. The larger apartment block to the south of the site is of a more contemporary design with a flat roof, projecting bays and floor to ceiling windows.

The layout of the development is considered to be acceptable and reflective of the development in the locality particularly that recently allowed on appeal and now occupied or under construction to the north of the application site as well as development within the wider Heald Green area. Whilst the development will be visible in the streetscene to Stanley Road, here the existing tree line will be retained save for that required to create the access into the site. The development will be positioned well behind the existing tree line, 6.3m to 22.8m from the boundary of the application site with Stanley Road (which follows this tree line). Separating the development from Stanley Road will be the communal gardens of the apartments, the side gardens of houses to either side of main spine road and the spur road and front gardens to the remaining houses. This is considered to be an appropriate response to the Stanley Road frontage. Within the site the positioning of development will afford a spacious quality on account of the gaps between pairs of houses, the curvature of roads, the generous siting between dwellings and areas of open space performing a variety of functions throughout the development. Where forecourt parking is proposed to the front of dwellings this is broken up by soft landscaping.

In terms of scale and design, the development is largely 2 storey in height save for the apartment building fronting Stanley Road and the larger of the apartments to the north of the site. In amongst this are a limited number of bungalows also positioned to the northern section of the site. Taking into account the largely traditional character proposed, this scale of development of considered appropriate having regard to the character of the locality, particularly that recently allowed on appeal and now occupied or under construction to the north of the application site as well as development within the wider Heald Green area. The more contemporary design of the apartments, particularly those to Stanley Road is noted however it is considered this will successfully integrate the development into the locality marrying the variety of architectural styles already prevailing.

Details of materials are not proposed within the application however these can be secured by condition.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the removal of the extensive and unsightly parking to the northern part of the site and the redevelopment in the manner proposed will deliver a development of a size, siting and design that responds to, protects and enhances the character of the locality. The proposal is therefore compliant with saved UDP Review policy LCR1.1, Core Strategy policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 together with para's 119, 124, 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

The consideration of residential amenity extends not just to existing occupiers adjacent to the site but also to the future occupiers of the proposed development. In terms of existing adjacent occupiers, this mainly includes those in the houses on the south side of Stanley Road. Those in the houses immediately to the north of the Seashell Trust school are separated from the application site by a belt of trees and those on Wilmslow Road in the terraced houses benefit from a parcel of wooded land between them and the application site.

In considering the issue of amenity, regard is paid to the guidance set out within the Council's SPD 'Design of Residential Development'. This document sets out standards for the siting of development relative to other dwellings whether existing or proposed as well as to the provision of amenity space whether private or communal.

In terms of surrounding development, the 3 storey apartment building fronting Stanley Road will be positioned over 44m from the front elevations of dwellings on the opposite side of the road. This is significantly in excess of the 24m required by the SPD. On this basis the proposed development will cause no loss of amenity to these existing occupiers by way of overlooking or loss of privacy. Noting this distance and the siting of the development to the north of these existing dwellings, it is considered that there will be no harm in relation to visual intrusion or loss of light either. Notwithstanding the presence of 3rd party land between the application site and terraced houses on Wilmslow Road, the siting of the 2 storey houses to the west of the site, 80m from the rear elevations of these houses will ensure that no loss of amenity arises (noting also that this significantly exceeds the 25m separation required by the SPD). The rear elevation of the bungalows to the north of the site will be positioned between 44m and 46m from the side elevation of existing houses to the east. This significantly exceeds the 12m required by the SPD and will ensure that the amenities of these neighbouring occupiers is safeguarded.

The layout of the development generally either fully accords with the separation distances set out in the SPD or exceeds them. The only pinch point where the standard is not achieved is in relation to the 3 storey apartment building to the north of the site which is positioned adjacent to the west boundary. The 2 buildings forming this part of the development are positioned so to form a courtyard communal garden. Here the southern elevation of the northern most block is positioned 23.5m from the north elevation of the southern most block. For a 3 storey development the separation afforded between habitable room windows should be 28m to accord with the SPD. Future occupiers will however clearly take a view as to the acceptability of this relationship when deciding whether to buy in to the development or not. From a planning perspective and noting that this minor infringement is to the proposed development rather than to existing neighbouring occupiers, it is not considered that there would be an

unacceptable loss of amenity arising in relation to overlooking, visual intrusion or loss of light.

With regard to amenity space the SPD notes that whatever the size or location of a dwelling there will always be a requirement for some form of private amenity space ranging from balconies, roof gardens and communal private space associated with flats to back and front garden space associated with conventional family housing. Private amenity space should be usable, accessible, reasonably free from overlooking, allow for adequate daylight and sunlight, and have regard to the size of the dwelling and the character of the area. Unusable spaces such as narrow strips of ground adjacent to roads and parking, steeply sloping areas or those in excessive shade should be avoided. For apartments, 18m² of amenity space is required for each 1 bed dwelling and 35m² for each 2 bed dwelling. The apartments fronting Stanley Road therefore require 1356m² of amenity space. That proposed between the building and Stanley Road comprises circa 1100m² of space and thus is slightly short of that required by the SPD. The apartments to the north of the site arranged around a courtyard garden would require 840m² of amenity space. That proposed in the courtyard garden comprises circa 667m² of space and again is slightly below the level suggested appropriate in the SPD. It should however be noted that it is proposed to provide a LAP on the site as part of a wider landscaped area. Whilst the LAP is intended to meet the play needs arising from the proposed development rather than to ensure compliance with amenity space standards, the wider space around it will still afford a level of amenity for the occupiers of these apartments. It should also be noted that there is a further larger area of open space to the west of the site which will be within easy access of not only the apartments fronting Stanley Road but also those to the north of the site arranged around the courtyard garden. Comprising circa 2000m² of amenity space, it is considered that this will compensate for any under provision in respect of these apartments. On this basis it is considered that the future occupiers of these apartments would have access to a sufficient level of communal gardens and amenity space to ensure meaningful use and an acceptable level of amenity.

The 2 smaller apartment buildings to the north of the site would have circa 320m² and 336m² of amenity space each both significantly exceeding the 72m² and 108m² required by the SPD. This will ensure the occupiers of these apartments an excellent level of amenity.

For houses, 75m² is required for 2 to 3 bed dwellings and 100m² for 4 beds or more. Proposed rear gardens will range in size from 70m² to 334m² and a very limited number of dwellings will have marginally less than that suggested as appropriate by the SPD. In contrast to this, a large number of dwellings will have significantly more amenity space than that encouraged in the SPD. Members are advised that when considering the development as a whole, residents will enjoy a level of amenity ranging from acceptable to excellent in terms of rear garden sizes. Rear gardens are considered to be of a size that could accommodate future extensions to dwellings carried out under permitted development without impacting on the amenities of occupiers. On this basis it is not considered necessary to remove householder permitted development rights.

The application is supported by a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) which considers the impact of externally generated noise upon the amenities of the future occupiers. The NIA advises that given the construction of the development, the only measures required to ensure an acceptable level of amenity is double glazing and the use of standard trickle vents. Members are advised that the NIA is considered to be a robust assessment and that subject to

the imposition of a condition to secure the measures proposed, the future occupiers will be afforded an acceptable level of amenity. Noting the scale of the proposed development and likely duration of construction works, it is considered necessary to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers from the likely noise and dust impacts arising. This can be secured by a condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a construction environmental management plan.

On the basis of the above Members are advised that the proposed development will deliver an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers and safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal therefore accords with policies H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 of the Core Strategy together with para's 119, 124, 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

Children's Play and Formal Recreation

Core Strategy policy SIE-2 "Provision of Recreation and Amenity Open Space in New Developments" sets out that "Development will be expected to take a positive role in providing recreation and amenity open space to meet the needs of its users/occupants." This expectation is linked to achievement of the Fields in Trust (formerly National Playing Fields Association) 'Six Acre Standard.' As confirmed in saved UDP Review policy L1.1 "Land for Active Recreation", the standard sets out that for each 1,000 residents there should be 2.4 hectares of recreation and amenity open space comprising of 1.7 hectares for outdoor sport and recreation space (including parks) and 0.7ha for children's play with about 0.25 ha of this, equipped playgrounds. This equates, through SIE-2, into a need to provide 17 sqm of formal recreation space and 7 sqm of children's play space per head of population. The need for development proposals to make provision for children's play is also confirmed in saved UDP Review policy L1.2 "Children's Play".

Policy SIE2 confirms that where appropriate in new developments, landscaped amenity areas should be provided which are necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. In those parts of the Borough with deficiency in recreation and amenity open space large new residential developments should include provision for such on or readily accessible to the site. As much as possible of the open space should be provided within or adjacent to the new development and play provision should be based on the hierarchy set out within the policy. However, provision of some or all of the open space off site or through contributions to improve and/or expand an existing facility or create a new one will be permitted/required where the Council is satisfied that there is no practical alternative or that it would be better to do so. Any off site provision should be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed and should be in a location where it would be of direct benefit to the occupiers of the proposed development. Off site contributions will be secured by S106 agreement.

The NPPF at para 92 confirms that planning policies and decisions should achieve healthy places which enable and support healthy lifestyles through the provision of green infrastructure and sports facilities. 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. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate. (para 98).

The Council's SPD "Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments" provides further explanation as to the basis of this policy position as well as that relating to the application of these policies.

In terms of children's play, the 2017 Open Space Study records quantitative shortfalls across the Borough for a number of typologies of open space including within the area of the application site. In relation to formal provision, the 2019 Stockport Playing Pitch Strategy notes a range of capacity and quality issues across a number of sports in the area.

Applying the above policy position in relation to children's play, the expected population of the development (following the rates set out in Core Strategy paragraph 3.335) would be 523 which is large enough to warrant provision of a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). The application however proposes to deliver a smaller single local area for play (LAP) within the site. A single LAP is not adequate to meet the needs of the proposed development; some properties would be significantly over the maximum walking distance of 100m to/from the nearest LAP (and the maximum 60m straight line distance) and a single LAP, following the detailed requirements set out in table 3 ("Play Facilities") of the Core Strategy, is only adequate to meet the needs of a population of approximately 50 people.

Noting the provision of a single LAP there is a significant shortfall of provision equivalent to the needs of a population of 473 people. This significant shortfall runs counter to the requirements of SIE-2, however, paragraph 3.313 of that policy allows that some or all of the required recreational open space might be provided off site or through contributions to improve and/or expand an existing facility or create a new one where the Council is satisfied that there is no practical alternative or that it would be better to do so. In such cases, following the approach and costs set out in the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD, the contribution would be £281,435.00.

The application site falls within the catchment area of East Avenue NEAP (neighbourhood equipped area of play). The applicant has agreed to make this contribution of £281,435.00 towards children's play. In accordance with the policy requirements and SPD, these funds could be invested at this existing NEAP so as to expand its provision to cater for the residents of this development thus ensuring a direct relationship with the proposed development. The thresholds in place within the SPD for taking commuted sums for children's play facilities ensure the direct relationship test of Regulation 122 (CIL Regulations 2010) is passed.

In relation to formal recreation, Core Strategy policy SIE-2 sets out that, where an occupancy level of 100 people or more is expected, new residential development should provide for formal recreation on the basis of 1.7ha per 1,000 population. The needs of this proposed development's anticipated population of 528 equates to provision of 8,976 square metres of such space. Whilst ideally those needs would be met either on or in close proximity to the site, it is a pragmatic approach to manage formal sport and recreation spaces on a more strategic, borough-wide basis; this also recognises that people are often prepared to travel to make use of such facilities. As such, and given the limited space available within the site, a contribution towards off-site provision (and maintenance) is a reasonable and acceptable means of meeting this element of SIE-2's requirements.

Following the population rates set out in Core Strategy paragraph 3.335 and the mechanisms and costs set out in the SPD, the contribution for off-site provision of outdoor sport and recreation space to meet the needs of the total anticipated population of 528 people would be £471,223.

The applicant has agreed to make a contribution of £471,223 towards formal recreation. In accordance with the policy requirements and SPD, this commuted sum will be allocated to the Council's Formal Sport Priority List. The list is compiled from evidence in the authority's Playing Pitch Strategy and Local Football Facility Plan, and any such project is approved by Cabinet Member. As such it is judged that the chosen recipient of the formal sport contribution will address identified deficiencies in the evidence base, thereby meeting Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010.

In conclusion, the provision of a single LAP on site and the payment of £752,658 secured by way of a S106 agreement ensures that the development accords with the provisions of saved UDP Review policies L1.1 and L1.2, Core Strategy policy SIE2, the Council's SPD 'Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments' and para's 92 and 98 of the NPPF.

Education

Para 95 of the NPPF confirms that it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement and to development that will widen the choice in education. Whilst there is no corresponding policy within the development plan, the Council's draft Education Contributions SPD is currently out to consultation.

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) adds further context to the NPPF. In September 2019, the PPG updated its guidance on planning obligations towards education. It sets out that contributions needed for education should be based on known pupil yields from housing developments. It also sets out that existing or planned/committed school capacity should be considered to identify where additional capacity is required.

In November 2019, the DfE published its guidance 'Securing Developer Contributions for Education'. This document acknowledges that while there is government funding available, developers will still be expected to provide contributions to ensure adequate provision of education infrastructure. The guidance recommends that developer contributions should be sought for a range of school places, where need arises. This includes places for early years, primary, secondary and those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

Outlined in the School Investment Strategy, a fundamental requirement for any local authority wanting to assure sufficiency is that its schools hold surplus school places. Surplus places need to be held by schools to absorb margins of error in pupil forecasting and inward migration. Stockport aims to achieve and hold between 6-8% surplus places. This means 6-8% of the total school capacity distributed as evenly as possible across the Borough.

In relation to early years education the site is located in the Gatley, Heald Green Health Visiting area. This currently holds a minimum of 19% of surplus places across early years and childcare providers in that area. As such, there will be no direct impact on early years and childcare places in this area and the Council will not seek contributions.

In relation to primary education the application site is located in the Kingsway Primary Planning Area which holds an adequate 6% surplus places which they are expected to maintain over the next 5 years. The site will fall in to Outwood Primary School catchment area which is a 1FE primary school. Outwood Primary School holds a portion of the surplus places and the development will only displace a small number of pupils that would normally obtain a place at this school and who would be expected to obtain a place at other local schools. As such, the development will not significantly impact sufficiency in this area and the Council will not seek contributions in this respect.

In relation to secondary education the application site is located in the West Planning Area which currently has no surplus of secondary school mainstream places and is projected to face significant capacity issues over the next 5 years. All schools in the planning area are popular and oversubscribed. The planning area has one resourced base (that being specialist support for children with special educational needs and disabilities to enable them to access mainstream education by using specialist interventions). This however is full and there are no special schools (those being separate entities dedicated to children with special educational needs and disabilities that meet different needs and have different areas of expertise). Kingsway School would be the catchment school associated with this development and is a 9-form entry secondary school with attached resourced base. The development will directly impact school place sufficiency in this area causing the Council to commission new places.

Special Education provision within Stockport currently has a shortage of places available with at present too great a reliance on special and independent special school places. The Board acknowledges that this is an existing concern, however the 1.13 children requiring such education that the proposed development is expected to yield will exacerbate the shortfall.

To alleviate forecast pressures, the following contributions would be required:

Secondary pupils = 15.55
Estimated Secondary Costs (expansion) £388,672

16-18 pupils 6.32
Estimated Secondary Costs (expansion) £158,019

SEND pupils 1.13
Estimated SEND Specialist School Costs £86,453

Estimated Total Pupils 23
Estimated Total Costs = £633,143

In response to this Members are advised that whilst the NPPF & NPPG confirm that local planning authorities should take a proactive approach to meeting the requirement for additional school places, there is currently no local policy to secure this. The Council's approach to securing such contributions has been based primarily on those documents and is reliant upon schemes being viable enough to secure all other policy requirements in the first instance.

The application has been the subject of viability issues in terms of the delivery of policy compliant affordable housing since submission and it is only recently as a result of further discussions that this has been resolved through the securing of funding for 100% of the dwellings as affordable housing from Homes England.

Notwithstanding that, the application is able to make the required contributions to children's play, formal recreation and highways improvements, matters which unlike that relating to education, are supported by fully adopted policies and SPDs. It is not expected that Homes England funding would secure additional contributions over and above the requirements of the Core Strategy. Noting also the significant contribution that the proposed development would deliver to affordable housing which weighs heavily in favour of the application it is considered unreasonable (and also unnecessary in terms of the wider planning balance) to require further contributions in respect of education.

Crime Impact

Policy H1 confirms that good standards of safety and security should be afforded to occupants of new housing. Development that is designed to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to a safe built environment will be given positive consideration (Core Strategy policy CS8). Specific account should be had of ensuring the safety and security of users whilst not causing harm to the wider environment, the character of the building and accessibility (Core Strategy policy SIE1). This is reinforced in the NPPF at para's 92, 97 and 130 where it confirms that decisions should aim to achieve safe places so that crime and disorder do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.

Submitted with the application is a Crime Impact Statement which confirms that subject to the following being addressed, the proposed development is considered acceptable:-

- *The removal of the access to Wilmslow Road which could provide opportunities for offenders to exploit.*
- *The enclosure of areas of landscaped open space to deter access by motorcycles and to protect the parking spaces and boundaries of adjacent dwellings.*
- *The enclosure of the amenity space and parking to the apartment buildings.*
- *The securing of boundaries to private space, the securing of surveillance to rear parking on corner plots and the definition/segregation of front gardens and driveways.*
- *The use of robust access controls to apartment buildings and a secure system for the delivery of post.*

As Members will read in the report below in relation to highway considerations, the retention of the access to Wilmslow Road is essential to maintain access to adjacent sites until such a time as they too are redeveloped and also to provide for pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the wider locality. It is not suggested by GMP that the removal of this access is essential to make the development acceptable from a crime prevention perspective nor is this considered to be the case by Officers.

The landscaping of the site has been designed to create as far as possible an open plan approach. This is desirable not just in visual terms but also having regard to the accessibility of these spaces to all users. To that end it is not proposed that the areas of open space should be enclosed. Houses adjacent to these areas will however be enclosed by 2.1m high brick walls and it is considered that this will be sufficient to ensure that the occupiers are safeguarded, as far as reasonably possible from crime.

The car parking and amenity space to the apartments fronting Stanley Road will be enclosed by existing and proposed 1.8m high fencing/railings and gates. This is sufficient to safeguard the occupiers of the apartments to an acceptable level without having to enclose this part of the site any further.

The amenity space to the northernmost apartments will be enclosed by 1.8m existing fencing and proposed 1.8m high brick walls. That to the apartments adjacent to the western boundary is not enclosed by fencing but is open to the adjacent pathways. Whilst there is no physical deterrent in this location, the amenity space is overlooked on 3 sides by the development positioned around it. As such it will have the feel of private space and along with the overlooking of it, especially at ground level, is not considered unacceptable from a crime perspective.

Where gardens of houses have a boundary to public space they will be enclosed by a 1.8m high brick wall. Front gardens and forecourt parking will be demarcated by low level landscaping. This is considered sufficient to ensure a satisfactory form of development.

The inclusion of access controls and secure postal delivery systems goes beyond that which it is reasonable to control through the planning process. An informative can however advise the applicant to consider the inclusion of these measures.

On the basis of the above, Members are advised that the layout is such that will deliver a development that is safe and one which assists in deterring crime. A condition can be imposed to ensure compliance with the CIS so far as it relates to the approved plans. The proposal therefore accords with policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 together with para's 92, 97 and 130 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity, Trees and Landscaping

Saved UDP Review policy NE1.2 confirms that the habitats and biodiversity of sites of biological importance will be protected and enhanced where possible. Development should seek to ensure the continuing viability of the habitat or wildlife interest of the site through the nature, scale, layout and density of development, measures which remove or minimise damage to habitat and disturbance to wildlife and appropriate provision for the future maintenance of the site.

The Core Strategy at policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 requires development to be landscaped to a high standard, paying high regard to the natural environment, within which it is cited. Incorporating Green Infrastructure into development schemes also contributes to addressing key issues such as climate change. Policy SIE3 confirms that the Borough's landscapes and biodiversity combine to create a unique and distinctive local character of importance to residents and visitors alike. Planning applications should identify mitigation measures that keep disturbance to a minimum and provide alternative habitats to sustain at least the current level of population as well as setting out a long term management for the site. Development proposals affecting trees which make a positive contribution to amenity should make provision for their retention unless there is justification for their removal to enable development to take place.

The NPPF at para 131 acknowledges that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning decisions should ensure opportunities are taken to incorporate trees in development, that appropriate measures are in

place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible.

Planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity, by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity (para 174). When determining planning applications if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

The site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise as listed in Stockport's current Local Plan (e.g. Site of Biological Importance, Local Nature Reserve, Green Chain). It has however been identified as an opportunity area within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) pilot study for Greater Manchester for tree planting. This is not necessarily a barrier to development and does not confer protection or prevention of land uses but shows that such areas have been prioritised for restoring and linking up habitats. The site is located within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Lindow Common SSSI (3.9km to the south). However, the type of development proposed is not included within the relevant IRZ categories and therefore requires no further consideration.

The site currently comprises hard-standing, access roads/tracks and recently felled woodland with trees around the periphery. An old (defunct) hawthorn hedgerow runs along the perimeter of the site with occasional oak trees. As referenced earlier in this report the application site is subject to a Forestry Commission restocking notice which is the subject of an undetermined appeal.

The restocking notice and undetermined appeal is a material consideration in the consideration of this planning application however it does not prevent determination. Given that the appeal remains undetermined and the trees were unlawfully removed, the application must be considered as if they still existed. It is on this basis that the proposed landscaping/biodiversity strategy has been designed by the applicant and assessed by Officers.

The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report which, following comments made by the Council and further surveys being undertaken, was updated in September 2023. The following habitats were recorded on-site: semi-natural broadleaved woodland, recently felled woodland, scattered trees, dense scrub, standing water, a pond, tall ruderal (species that first dominate disturbed ground) and hardstanding.

Given that the proposed development would result in the loss of local BAP/Priority habitats (woodland and pond) it is important the application demonstrates how the mitigation hierarchy has been followed (i.e. avoidance and then minimisation of ecological impacts, with mitigation as a last resort). The Delta Simons (November 2022) Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment report provides evidence relating to this and measures to improve BNG outcome. This includes the retention of trees from the former woodland areas and the provision of native species rich hedgerows around the periphery of the site which, despite the loss of woodland on the site, will help retain some connectivity between the site and surrounding habitats. Native and ornamental hedgerows within the site itself are extensive and will provide some additional habitat connectivity within the site. The landscape proposals also include tree planting, planting of new attenuation features with wetland grass mixes, shade tolerant meadow and grass mixes and native scrub planting.

The current landscaping plans show the inclusion of native hedgerows around the periphery of site as well as some internal native hedgerows which is welcomed. The landscaping plan also shows hedging to demarcate individual plot boundaries which is very much welcome. Whilst these hedgerows include some native species, they also include others that are not native such as escallonia, cherry laurel and non-native beech. This mix of planting should include a greater proportion of native species which can be secured through the imposition of a suitably worded condition.

As shown on the proposed site layout, the main spine road stops just short of the northern boundary of the site; there is then a small gap to the boundary. The landscaping plan shows a hedge being planted along this northern boundary however a break in this hedge line is proposed where the spine road meets the boundary. As proposed whilst there will be a high quality environment secured either side of the spine road, that at the head of it will simply comprise a 1.8m high close boarded fence. This will be somewhat poor compared to that either side and being visible for some distance when approaching from the south needs to be improved. Details of the extension of this hedge across the end of the spine road can be secured by condition so as to ensure a high quality landscaped environment to this part of the site reflecting that within the wider site.

Notwithstanding the above, measurable gains for biodiversity are expected within development in accordance with national and local planning policy. BNG enhancements on the site have been maximised through the proposed landscaping scheme but notwithstanding this, there is an overall loss of BNG on site compared to what previously existed prior to the felling of the woodland and to what current exists. A strategy has therefore been submitted with the application to adequately offset the shortfall in biodiversity units. In this respect and following discussion with Officers, Bruntwood Park has been chosen to deliver some of the BNG offsetting for the development. In accordance with the GMCA Guidance for BNG in Greater Manchester (February 2021), it has been agreed that the applicant will pay £400,000 (plus a 10% management fee) to the Council to secure these off site enhancements; this will be secured by S106 agreement. A condition will also be imposed to ensure the proper ongoing management for both the onsite and offsite elements.

In relation to protected species, Members are advised as follows:

All species of bats and their roosts are also protected under UK (Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)) and European legislation (The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations, 2019). The 2021 survey identified 4 trees with moderate bat roost potential and 2 with low potential. Emergence surveys were undertaken in June and July 2022. No emergences or re-entries were observed during these surveys but moderate activity was recorded across the site which is likely to be an important foraging and commuting link within the wider landscape.

All trees with bat roost potential within the site were subject to an updated survey in 2023. No bats were observed emerging / re-entering these trees and therefore no further survey effort is required. Sensitive felling techniques should however be employed and the precautionary method of supervised section felling by a licensed ecologist. This can be secured by a condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Bat enhancement measures should also be included within the proposed development through the imposition of a condition to secure bat boxes

throughout the site. Given the scale of development proposed, 75 bat boxes should be provided.

Great Crested Newts are afforded the same legal protection as bats. A single pond (which periodically dries up) and an area of standing water were recorded within the site boundary during the survey. An eDNA test was undertaken in 2021 with negative results indicating that GCN were absent from this pond at that time. The shelf-life for eDNA test results had expired and therefore the LPA requested that the developer either undertook an update survey (with the potential for further surveys / mitigation) or they apply for Natural England's District Level Licensing (DLL) scheme for GCN. The applicant has opted to secure a DDL which has been agreed with and confirmed as being acceptable by Natural England. This will require the developer to pay Natural England for off site compensation ponds instead of carrying out detailed surveys and applying for a mitigation licence. Natural England then measure the impact of the proposed development on GCN, assess the cost of dealing with the impact through new or improved ponds for GCN. Members are advised that this satisfactorily addresses any impact that may arise in this respect. Reasonable avoidance measures should however be adopted during construction works to minimise potential risk of harm/injury to amphibians (e.g. draining down the pond and site clearance). This can be secured by a condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a CEMP.

Badgers are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act, 1992. This makes it an offence to kill or injure a badger or to damage, destroy or obstruct access to a sett. It is also an offence to disturb a badger while it is in a sett. There are records for badger in the wider area and although no evidence of badger activity was recorded on-site during the 2021 survey or in the updated surveys in 2023. It should be noted, however, that badgers are a highly mobile species and may move into the site at any time. It was also noted that there are areas of dense scrub which could not be fully inspected during the surveys. Protection of badgers during construction works will be secured by condition through the CEMP.

The nests of all wild birds are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended). Trees and other vegetation on-site have the potential to support nesting birds. No building demolition or vegetation clearance works should take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of buildings/vegetation for active birds' nests immediately (no more than 48 hours) before vegetation clearance works commence and has provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. This can be secured by condition. Bird enhancement measures should also be included within the proposed development through the imposition of a condition to secure nesting boxes throughout the site. Given the scale of development proposed, 75 boxes should be provided.

Hedgehog populations are declining rapidly in the UK and are identified as a UKBAP Species and Species of Principle Importance under the NERC Act 2006. Hedgehog are also protected from capture and killing under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 6. Habitats on site have the potential to support hedgehog. It should be demonstrated that hedgehog highways have been satisfactorily designed into the landscaping layout. Gates to rear garden areas should be of a design which will allow the movement of hedgehogs through the site i.e. a gap at the base and/or between rails (noting hedgehog gaps are recommended at 13cm width/height. Additional gaps should also be located

within the walls proposed to circle the rear gardens of dwellings. Gaps should also be provided at the base of fences and walls (130mm x 130mm) to maintain habitat connectivity. Access on and off-site should also be considered in this regard so that wildlife such as hedgehogs can freely come and go from the site. A minimum of 8 hedgehog houses and 8 invertebrate houses should be included within development given the size/scale of the proposals. This can all be secured by condition.

Reptiles (grass snake, adder, common lizard and slow worm) are protected from killing and injury under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. All native species of reptiles in the UK are considered rare and most threatened under the NERC Act 2006 meaning they must be considered within the planning decision. The PEA states that “the site lacks the overall structural mosaic of habitats that reptiles require”. However, there is a mosaic of habitats on-site potentially providing shelter, foraging, hibernation and basking e.g. woodland, open ground, walls and common deadwood. It is noted though that there is a lack of local records and absence of any reptiles found during extensive GCN translocation works adjacent to and close to the site. The likelihood of reptiles being on the site is therefore considered low and precautionary working measures should be put in place during construction works to further reduce likelihood of impacts to reptiles. This can be secured through the CEMP.

An informative should be attached to any future planning consent to 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.

Certain invasive plant species are listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it an offence to plant or otherwise cause to grow this invasive species in the wild. Invasive plant species Himalayan balsam and Japanese knotweed were recorded on site during the 2022 bat surveys. These Schedule 9 plants were identified again with the update surveys in 2023. A condition should therefore be imposed to secure the submission and approval of an invasive non-native species protocol prior to the commencement of the development. This should detail the containment, control and removal of Himalayan balsam and Japanese Knotweed on site. The measures should then be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Any proposed lighting should be sensitively designed so as to minimise impacts on wildlife associated with light disturbance. A condition should therefore be imposed to secure the submission and approval of a lighting plan with locations, light contours and dark corridors.

In terms of trees and landscaping, the application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Survey, Condition of Existing Trees and Vegetation Report, a Tree Removal and Protection Plan, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, proposed landscaping plans and a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan.

The Arboricultural Survey notes that a total of 15 individual trees and 15 tree groups were identified and assessed as part of the Tree Survey. No trees on or immediately adjacent to the site are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or within a Conservation Area (CA). A single hedgerow was surveyed. It was

found to be species-poor and defunct. It was not assessed to be 'Important' under the Hedgerow Regulations (1997) criteria.

The Tree Protection and Removal Plan confirms that other than the removal of a small section to allow the construction of the new junction, the trees fronting Stanley Road and Wilmslow Road will be retained and protected for the duration of construction works. 3 trees in the vicinity of the LAP and main swale to the east of the site will also be retained as will a large number of trees extending along the western boundary of the site from the location of the proposed open space up to the existing access onto Wilmslow Road to the north west of the site. 2 further trees are to be retained in the north east corner of the site along with a group of trees on the eastern boundary. All other remaining trees will be felled to accommodate the proposed development. This is best appreciated by reference to the Tree Protection and Removal Plan which is appended to this agenda.

The Arboricultural Survey notes that those trees identified for retention will need to be adequately protected during any construction works. Measures to protect trees should follow the best practice principles set out in BS 5837: Trees in Relation to Design, Development and Construction (2012). Prior to any construction or development work proceeding, the Root Protection Area (RPA) of individual trees to be retained should be marked out. Marking out should be completed by a competent person with arboricultural expertise. All trees that could be impacted should be protected by barriers or ground protection around the calculated RPA, and as indicated on the Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) produced in association with this Assessment.

To compensate for the tree loss proposed, the application is supported by detailed landscaping plans which show the planting of 156 new trees (extra heavy standard or semi mature) within the site together with the creation of hedging through the planting of 2100 specimens in the form of hornbeam and beech. In addition to this the landscaping scheme proposes a significantly high level of shrubs, herbaceous plants and grasses.

The currently existing trees that are proposed for removal are not of sufficient amenity value to warrant legal protection by way of a TPO and as such could be removed in any event without the consent of this Planning Authority. As such there is no objection to their removal. The application however proposes a significant level of tree, hedge and ground cover planting including a large proportion of native species that will ensure that the development in terms of its landscaping is of an extremely high quality. A condition can be imposed to ensure that no felling other than that shown on the approved plans is carried out. This is particularly important from the perspective of the trees fronting Stanley Road which, whilst not worthy of legal protection through a TPO, do contribute to the verdant character of the streetscene and locality. A condition will also be imposed to ensure that the trees that are to be retained are properly protected from the impacts of construction works. The landscaping plans will be secured by condition as will the Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan.

As outlined earlier in this report, the Forestry Commission restocking notice and undetermined appeal are a material consideration. This however does not prevent the determination of this application even if the appeal is dismissed before a decision is taken on this application. It is for the decision maker to decide how much weight to give to the trees that previously existed (and which at the time of writing this report legally should still exist). In this respect, Members are advised that the loss of this woodland is clearly regrettable given the likely habitat that it afforded however it is noted that the trees were not considered of sufficient amenity value to be afforded

protection by way of a Tree Preservation Order. Even if the woodland was still in situ today, the proposed development delivers Biodiversity Net Gains to not only compensate for its loss but also to achieve that ordinarily required of the proposed development. This together with the comprehensive landscaping proposals of the site which include a significant number of new trees along with hedging and ground cover is considered to carry significant weight in the determination of this application. On this basis it is not considered that the loss of this woodland results in harm sufficient to justify the refusal of planning permission on biodiversity or arboricultural grounds.

Having regard to the above, Members are advised that subject to the imposition of conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement, the proposed development will cause no harm to protected species, will deliver the required net gains to biodiversity, causes no unacceptable impact in relation to trees and will deliver a high quality landscape setting. The proposal therefore accords with saved UDP policy NE1.2, Core Strategy policies H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 together with para's 131 and 174 of the NPPF.

Heritage

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. Loss or harm to the significance of an asset through alterations, destruction or development within its setting will require clear and convincing justification.

The NPPF acknowledges that heritage 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 189). In determining planning applications, the local planning authority should require the applicant to describe the significance of any assets affected (para 194). Local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets (para 197).

Submitted with this application is a Heritage Statement which identifies that there are a number of heritage assets within the surrounding area including the former Griffin Farmhouse (grade II listed building) to the north of the site and Stanley Hall (grade II listed building) to the south east. Although not included on the Council's record of locally listed buildings, there are 3 buildings near the site which are considered to be non designated heritage assets. These are 361-363 Wilmslow Road (circa 65m to the west of the site), Outwood House (circa 60m to the north) and Gill Bent Farm (circa 400m to the east).

The Heritage Statement considers the impact of the proposed development upon the setting of these assets and advises as follows:

- *Stanley Hall (grade II listed building) is over 400m to the south east of the site, has no known historic or functional associations with the site and, due to the intervening distance, development and landscape, has no visual relationship with the site. The proposed development will not be experienced from the grounds of the hall or in views of the hall. It will not affect those elements of setting which contribute to the significance of the asset. For these reasons, it is concluded that the significance and setting of the listed building will be preserved.*

- *Gill Bent Farm (non-designated heritage asset) is situated to the north of Stanley Hall and is less enclosed with views out across undeveloped fields to the north and west. There is potential for glimpsed views of the proposed development, particularly during winter months. However due to the intervening distance (400m), landscape and development (the Seashell Trust Campus) any visibility will be limited and experienced alongside the existing urban context to the west of the asset. There is no known historic or functional relationship between the asset and the site. The fields to the north and east of the farm with which the farmhouse and barn do have a historic functional relationship will be unaffected by the proposed development. The ability to appreciate the local architectural and historic interest of the farmhouse and barn and their group value in views from Stanley Road and within the former farmyard will be unaffected by the proposed development. It is therefore concluded that the significance of the non-designated heritage asset will be sustained as a result of the proposed development.*
- *Outwood House (non-designated heritage asset) is a former farmhouse with a known historic functional relationship with the site and a degree of intervisibility, albeit it limited, with the site. The Inspector, in his report on the appeal lodged by the Seashell Trust, described the 'significant and insensitive alterations' undertaken to the building. Although he found a functional link between the non-designated heritage asset and land proposed for development and concluded that there would be a degree of harm, he attributed very limited weight to that harm.*

The former farmhouse is principally experienced and appreciated from the west, primarily in direct views from Griffin Farm Drive and from Wilmslow Road. The site is situated to the south and the northern part of the site as found today is not an element of setting that contributes. The upper floors and roofs of the proposed development and landscape mitigation will be visible in views looking south from the asset and in the periphery of views of the principal elevation from Wilmslow Road. This will be viewed within the existing context of suburban development along Wilmslow Road and Southgate Business Park and is a visual improvement in comparison to the current hardstanding and overflow car parking which currently characterises this part of the site. The development of the southern part of the Site will result in the loss of an area of grassland which previously had a historic functional relationship with Outwood House but makes a limited contribution to the significance of the asset. The proposed development will also result in the loss of some trees within the site, a reduction in the open character to the south of the asset and will bring a suburban character closer to the former farmhouse. Having considered the altered condition of Outwood House and its setting and the existing character of the site, as well as the proposed mitigation measures, it is concluded that the effect of the above changes on the significance of the asset will be negligible.

- *Due to the intervening distance and development and no known historic functional association between the site and Former Griffin Farmhouse (grade II listed building), it is not considered that the proposed development would affect the significance of the listed building. Despite the relative close proximity, the proposed development will not be experienced in combination with 361-363 Wilmslow Road (non-designated heritage asset) in views which contribute to the significance of the asset. There are no known functional or historic associations with the site or any*

other aspects of setting which will be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, it is concluded that the significance of the asset will be sustained by the proposed development.

Members are advised that the Heritage Statement gives a good overview of the built heritage environment, with an overview of the historic development of the site and an appraisal of the potential impacts of the development on the significance of identified designated and non-designated Heritage Assets and their settings. The Heritage Assessment identifies that harm to the heritage assets by virtue of development in their setting will be limited to its impact on the setting of Griffin Farm (both existing and historically associated open space) and views into and out of the development in the context of Griffin Farm. The landscaping plans submitted with the application show details of hedge and tree planting along the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the site together with the soft landscaping of adjacent garden areas. These measures will maximise areas of openness and soft landscaping such that the boundary treatments to the north, west and south appear as soft boundaries, which would be typical of the rural origins of the area.

With regard to any below ground assessment, it is understood that the southern third of the site has remained as undeveloped farmland from at least the mid-19th century. This might suggest that any unknown remains pre-dating the late post-medieval period might have survived beneath the current ground surface. Historically the area contained field boundaries and pasture but could be considered as having the potential to yield evidence for early periods (Prehistoric, Roman, Medieval). It is noted that in around 1981 a mid-4th century Roman coin was found close to the site on the opposite side of Wilmslow Road which may relate to a possible Roman road from Cheadle to Alderley Edge. However, tree clearance activity has left the southern portion of the site de-vegetated and heavily rutted, activity that has likely heavily impacted on, or negated any potential archaeological survival. On this basis there is little or no reason to seek archaeological investigations on the site.

Having regard to the above it can be concluded that the proposed development will preserve the setting of nearby heritage assets. The proposal therefore accords with Core Strategy policy SIE3 together with para's 189, 194 and 197 of the NPPF.

Energy & Sustainable Design

Core Strategy policy CS1 seeks to ensure that all development meets a recognised sustainable design and construction standard where viable to do so. All development will be expected to demonstrate how it will contribute towards reducing the Borough's carbon footprint by achieving carbon management standards. Policy SD1 confirms that the Council will look favourably upon development that seeks to achieve a high rating under schemes such as BREEAM.

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. Notwithstanding this Members will be aware that changes to Part L of the Building Regulations in June 2022 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%. In existing buildings, regulations will typically apply to new build extensions or the installation of new materials or technology.

These standards for energy efficiency are now higher than that required by policy SD-3.

The NPPF at para 152 confirms that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. It should help shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, encourage the reuse of renewable resources and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.

Submitted with the application is an Energy & Sustainability Statement. This confirms the following:-

- *An overall reduction in carbon emissions of 56% can be achieved against a Part L 2021 baseline. This significantly exceeds the 40% reduction required by CS policy SD-3.*
- *This reduction in carbon emissions can be achieved by measures including a fabric specification exceeding the minimum requirements of Part L 2021. Air-Source Heat Pumps to provide heating and domestic hot water and enhanced heating controls including room thermostats and programmers.*
- *The proposals follow a best-practice fabric-first approach, which ensure carbon emission savings throughout the lifespan of the development.*

Members are advised that the UK has set into law a target to bring all its greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050. In March 2019, Stockport Council declared a climate emergency, and agreed that Stockport should become carbon neutral by 2038, in advance of the UK 2050 target. The Stockport CAN strategy was developed to underpin this agreement and was approved by full council in October 2020. The strategy sets out to ensure that Stockport achieves carbon neutrality by 2038, in order to support global efforts to prevent global warming going above 1.5°C. The Environmental Law Foundation has suggested that climate emergency declarations should be regarded as material considerations in the determination of planning matters.

Meeting our 2038 carbon neutrality target will require new development to achieve net zero carbon in advance of then, and we should not be building homes, workplaces, community uses or schools which will require retrofitting in the near future. It is important to note that most microgeneration technologies (e.g. solar panels), and other climate change mitigation / adaptation measures are significantly easier to install at the time of building rather than retrofitting later.

The Energy Statement submitted with the application makes a commitment to a “fabric first” approach, coupled with sustainable technology, to help ensure that this development contributes to the Stockport carbon neutrality target for 2038 and goes some way to reduce the need for costly and disruptive retrofit. The Statement sets out that the proposed design is a 59% reduction on current Building Regulations Part L 2021; and that there will be a CO2 reduction of 80% based on Part L 2006, thus complying with the energy reduction targets of SD-3. In particular it is noted that air source heat pumps are proposed to be included to ensure that no difficult retro-fitting of this type of low carbon technology is required at a later date; this approach is welcomed.

On the basis of the above, Members are advised that the proposed development in terms of energy efficiency and the reduction of carbon emissions accords with Core Strategy policies CS1, SD1 and SD3 along with para 152 of the NPPF.

Highway Matters

Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy DPD requires development to be sited in locations accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. This policy also confirms that the Council will support development that reduces the need to travel by car, a position which is followed through in policy T1. Parking (including accessible spaces and cycle parking) should be provided in accordance with the maximum standards (policy T2) and 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 (policy T3).

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. 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 105).

In assessing specific applications for development, it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be or have been taken up, given the type of development and its location; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; 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 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 110).

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 111).

Applications for development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas and second, so far as possible, to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use. The needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility should be addressed in relation to all modes of transport and development should create places that are safe, secure and attractive, which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards. The efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles should be secured and developments should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations (para 112).

All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed (para 113).

The Council offers guidance in the form of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to inform development. In addition, whilst not with the status of an SPD, guidance is also issued in relation to electric vehicle charging noting that both the Core Strategy and NPPF support measures to promote sustainable modes of travel, to reduce the impacts of climate change and improve air quality.

The submission includes general site layout drawings, a transport assessment (TA), Road Safety Audit and other relevant drawings and documents. The determinant factors from a highway perspective for a residential development are site accessibility; access arrangements and necessary mitigation/interventions; traffic generation, assignment and consequent impact on highway operation and safety; internal site layout and parking provision. The development of the proposals pre and post submission have taken place having regard to the advice of Officers and that of TfGM.

The ability for residents to undertake trips by modes of travel other than the private car and the close proximity of services and amenities helps determine the accessibility of a development site's location. A judgement on sustainability is informed by the likelihood that residents would make those alternative travel choices, this being critically informed by the frequencies of public transport services and the quality of walking and cycling routes. A site simply being close to services and amenities will not necessarily encourage choice, particular if the connection route is difficult to travel, a road is difficult to cross or travel modes are unacceptably put at risk of conflicting when mixing.

In terms of pedestrian accessibility and walking trips and with measurement taken from the centre of the development site, there are some facilities within an 800m walking distance which is considered as a walkable neighbourhood. These include a primary school, place of religious worship, a convenience store, a day nursery and a public house. Within a 1000m distance and defined as an acceptable distance for commuting/school trip journeys is a health centre and another convenience store. At 1100m distance is another primary school and a dental practice and within a 2000m distance is a fitness centre, a post office, a supermarket, a high school and another primary school.

Cycling as a mode of travel has the potential to substitute for short car trips and particularly those under 5km. The existence of all the amenities and services mentioned above plus many more and major public transport infrastructure within a 5km distance and 10 to 20 minute cycle time offers cycling as a viable option and alternative to a private car journey.

The frequency and proximity of public transport services have a significant bearing on whether these modes of transport would be chosen by future residents as a realistic alternative to a private car journeys. The general guide for the walking distance between a proposed development site and a bus stop is that it should be no more than 400 metres and it is acknowledged that people will accept longer walks to reach bus services that are fast and direct, or more frequent and to stops serving a wider range of destinations. People commuting in particular will take account of the total journey travel time, which includes the bus travel time as well as the walk at either end. There are bus stops located within 50m of the proposed site access on Stanley Rd and 100m on Wilmslow Road, offering two hourly services between Handforth Dean and Manchester and Stockport Town Centre, Heald Green and Cheadle Hulme. These services, although not frequent, afford some potential for linked trips and travel further afield.

In terms of rail travel, the nearest station is 1600m from the site, that being a 20 minute walk or 5 minute cycle ride. The station offers connection to the south and Manchester with scope for further travel in north west and beyond. Cheadle Hulme station at 4km away is not a realistic option for rail travel, which does limit opportunity and likely destinations.

Discussions with the applicant have highlighted that there are clear and evident barriers to the likelihood that sustainable travel choices will be made and these are infrastructure deficiencies within the immediate and surrounding area. In particular, Stanley Road and its junction with Wilmslow Road and the Wilmslow Road connections to the north and south lack dedicated facilities for cyclists, have far from ideal pedestrian facilities for crossing highway links and junctions and have far from ideal bus stop facilities. The applicant has acknowledged this and has included within the application the provision of a package of off-site highway infrastructure works to enhance and improve facilities and make safer the environment for vulnerable highway users. The off-site scheme also includes the replacement of the existing Stanley Road / Wilmslow Road signalised junction with a roundabout scheme, the reasoning and detail of which is commented on further within this report.

There is some refinement required to the scheme of off site works currently submitted, with some adjustment to shared footway cycleway widths, the need for provision of a pedestrian refuge crossing on the north side of the roundabout and the provision of a right turn facility for the CMA site. These are all matters that can be resolved under detailed design noting that the overall scheme, which appears to be contained entirely within highway land, could be delivered under planning conditional control and a S278 Highways Agreement. Liaison with Cheshire East and a Highways Agreement with TfGM will also be required and this can be progressed in the event that planning permission is granted.

A secondary pedestrian cycle link is proposed between the northern end of the development and Wilmslow Road. This link, which will be access controlled, will provide a convenient alternative connection to services and amenities for pedestrian and cycle traffic and will clearly benefit the site. It will also afford an emergency link for the purpose of the development site. This link is presently the means of access to land to the north of the application site that is utilised for car storage/airport parking and there is an element of uncertainty associated with delivery of this link given that the adjacent site may still need access to Wilmslow Road if it is not redeveloped as per the current application on that site (DC088902 refers).

After discussion with the applicant, a scheme of improvement to the link is under consideration, to show how vehicle movement and interaction with pedestrian and cycle traffic could be managed in a safe manner. This will be secured by condition and does not impact on the current consideration of this application,

The link is also the subject of another application for its use as a temporary construction access route for the Seashell site (DC089817 refers). With a realistic scenario that the link would not be likely to be completed and available for use until works commences on the northern element of the development site and its use by the Seashell site has ceased, it seems reasonable that a delivery phasing / implementation programme and detailed design become matters that can be addressed under conditional control.

Based on the above interventions being delivered and having regard of the existing infrastructure and facilities close to the site and interventions already under construction, it is considered that the proposal delivers meaningful and substantive interventions which would make the site suitably accessible. Residents would be

able to enjoy a number of local services, amenities and public transport opportunities travelling on foot or by cycle and this should contribute towards reducing reliance on private car journeys for such trips. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the site is considered suitable for development in transport terms with the interventions proposed it is in line with the necessary policy requirements at a local and national level.

The principle site entrance on Stanley Road would be formed as a priority junction with a ghost island right turn facility. The submitted layout is acceptable in principle, the entrance is sufficiently distant from the Wilmslow Road junction and adequate visibility is achievable to and for emerging vehicles. The entrance would be of a safe and practical design, can accommodate all typical vehicles and modelling work undertaken demonstrate it is capable of operation without unacceptably impacting Stanley Road or causing prolonged or excessive driver delay. The access would be constructed under the terms of a Highways S278 Agreement and detailed design matters are capable of conditional control.

For pedestrian and cycle purposes the junction will tie in with a shared use footway cycleway to be provided on the north side of Stanley Road, running from the Wilmslow Road junction to a new refuge crossing to be provided on the east side of the junction. The shared use facility will follow round the site entry radii before cyclists will be required to utilise carriageway space within the new development. Whilst preference would be a cycle track that is segregated from pedestrians it is not reasonably practical to deliver such along this corridor due to the need to retain trees. Any additional widening to the highway beyond that which has been already identified to deliver the site entrance and the new shared facility would severely affect the landscaping belt across the site frontage. As such, the judgement is that a shared scheme for a short distance along an existing link that does not carry high levels of pedestrian and cycle traffic is an acceptable design and it is noted that this scheme will tie in with facilities elsewhere where segregation is more critical and is provided.

As commented earlier a secondary link for the purpose of pedestrian and cycle traffic and emergency purposes is also identified and would be provided at the northern end of the site giving alternative connection to Wilmslow Road.

The proposed accesses into the development are of an acceptable layout and will be safe and practical to use. The development will also ensure that there is a choice of access depending on modes of travel.

In terms of traffic generation and impact on the operation and safety of the highway, baseline traffic data was collected to enable an assessment of the vehicular impact of development traffic on the nearby highway network. The TA includes survey data for Stanley Road from October 12th to October 18th, 2021, a neutral and acceptable period for undertaking counts. A peak period survey was also undertaken at the Stanley Road / Wilmslow junction on June 22nd, 2022.

During scoping of the TA the agreed study area is the proposed site access on Stanley Road and the Stanley Road / Wilmslow Road junction. Assessment is undertaken for the morning and evening peak hours on the highway network, the base year 2022, an opening year of 2024 and future year 2027, including for committed development traffic, the proposed development traffic and the identified improvement scheme for the Stanley Road / Wilmslow Road junction. Future year traffic flows have been derived using acceptable growth factors.

In order to predict traffic that will be generated by the new development, trip rates have been obtained from the TRICS database and the data set used for the nearby Bloor homes development on Wilmslow Road. The two trip rate data sets are very similar so for robustness the Seashell Trust trip rate was adopted for the analysis in the TA. In the future year scenario the development of 159 dwellings is predicted to generate 25 arrivals and 66 departures during the AM peak 0800-0900 and 58 arrivals and 37 departures during the PM peak 1700-1800. These figures are not disputed and Officers are accepting of them.

Traffic generated by the development is distributed and assigned on the network having regard to method of travel to work census data and traffic survey data. Whilst it is noted that the census data available is dated and the A555 link has been completed and opened since the 2011 census, it is unlikely the key employment centres within a 45 minute drive time of the site will have changed significantly. This suggests that there is unlikely to be a material difference in the pattern of morning and evening peak period vehicle movements in this locality given the route options from the site, which are via the A555, the A34 or Wilmslow Road. The data shows the likely distribution is Stanley Road eastbound for 32.6% of trips, Stanley Road westbound 67.4% then Wilmslow Road southbound 43.8% (of the 67.4% figure) and Wilmslow Road northbound 23.6%. Vehicle departures associated with the development are predicted to be 21 movements on Stanley Road eastbound, 45 movements on Stanley Road westbound and thereafter 20 movements on Wilmslow Road southbound and 25 movement Wilmslow Road eastbound.

Due to the scale of development proposed, the predicted movements, the need to avoid queuing and delay on Stanley Road and minimise safety concerns, it is necessary that the site entrance junction is provided with a design standard compliant ghost island right turn lane. It is also necessary that the development's vehicular traffic impact on the Stanley Road / Wilmslow Road junction is suitably mitigated so that the junction can operate within tolerable and acceptable conditions.

In this respect the proposed development is considered acceptable and will not give rise to levels of traffic generation that cannot be accommodated on the highway network in an acceptable manner.

The site entrance detail needs to be considered alongside off site interventions that are proposed off to tie in to the access and mitigate for the impact of development traffic on the network. The submission, as required, brings forward a package of accessibility improvements for pedestrians and cyclists and this includes improvement to the Stanley Road junction with Wilmslow Road. Various upgrade options have been given consideration by the applicant in discussion with Council Officers and the conclusion reached and scheme that has been submitted with the application is to remove the signalised arrangement and reconstruct the junction with a roundabout with bespoke crossing facilities on desired lines.

In addition to the shared use cycle footway on the north side of Stanley Road a widened an improved footway will be provided on the southern side between the Wilmslow Road junction and a pedestrian refuge crossing point which will benefit the movement of pedestrians across Stanley Road and accessing westbound bus services.

At the junction, the existing signal controlled arrangement would be replaced with a roundabout arrangement with controlled crossing facilities on the Stanley Road and Wilmslow Road southern arms. Although not currently indicated on the drawing, an uncontrolled refuge crossing is required on the Wilmslow Road northern arm. A segregated cycleway will be provided on the west side of Wilmslow Road running

north to Bolshaw Road and to tie in with the cycleway recently provided and continuing along Wilmslow Road. In a southerly direction away from the junction, a shared footway cycleway will be provided to tie in with existing crossing facilities that area adjacent to the A555 junction. Some minor amendments are required to this element of the drawing detail, this being a matter that could be addressed at detailed design stage.

The provision of new facilities for cyclists to connect the site entrance to existing network infrastructure and improved pedestrian facilities will enhance the overall safety of the network, with cyclists having bespoke facilities and not being required to share carriageway space with vehicular traffic.

The site entrance junction has been subjected to traffic modelling. The output shows that in the 2027 future year scenario with the inclusion of development flows the junction will operate comfortably within capacity with no excessive or unacceptable delay to drivers or queuing of vehicles likely to occur. It is capable of free and safe operation and will not affect or be materially affected by the proximity of or operation of the Stanley Road / Wilmslow Road junction.

The construction of a roundabout at the Wilmslow Road junction offers opportunity for optimising and delivering these interventions for pedestrian and cycle traffic and should improve the efficiency of the junction. In order to assess the impact of the scheme on existing traffic flows, future traffic flows and with development traffic imposed, the proposed roundabout design has been modelled using industry wide accepted junction modelling software. The results show that the junction should operate within capacity in all scenarios with a ratio of flow to capacity close to or below 0.85 (the preferred maximum value) on all arms. This informs that queue lengths would not be excessive on any arm with likely maximum queues of five vehicles forming and generally a more efficient operation of the junction.

It is worth noting that the existing signalised junction has operational difficulties particularly during the peak traffic periods. The need for development to demonstrate suitable accessibility and provide measures to enhance access and ensure convenient and safe access for pedestrian and cycle traffic would have necessitated the introduction of more controlled crossing facilities at the signals. This would affect signal cycle times and phasing of the junction and would inevitably impact on junction operation and efficiency and it is likely that the junction would struggle to operate efficiently under signalised operation in the future with development traffic imposed.

As a comparison, a draft scheme for signal upgrade that was initially considered was modelled and this shows a maximum queue of 14 vehicles (PCU's), which is significantly greater than the roundabout that is now proposed. Furthermore, the maximum delay with the proposed roundabout scheme is around 20 seconds maximum average per arriving vehicle, compared to up to 50 seconds for a scheme involving upgrade to the signals.

An overall change to the nature of the junction with construction of a roundabout enables provision of suitable and safe facilities for pedestrians whilst also having an acceptable effect on the operation and efficiency of the junction for vehicular traffic. This leads Officers to conclude that the delivery of a replacement design for the junction in conjunction with new and better facilities for pedestrians and cyclists represents the required and necessary interventions to mitigate the impact of development traffic.

All off site works would be delivered under conditional control and a S278 Highway Agreement. Traffic Regulation Orders will need implementing to prevent parking along Stanley Road as such would inhibit junction operation and safety. The cost of such regulations would be covered by the development and secured by S106 agreement.

In terms of the site layout, the proposed development would be served by a central spine road, constructed as a minor residential access road with a 5.5m carriageway width and a 2m footway on either side. A number of 6.5m wide shared surface roads then take access from the spine road. Following some minor revisions to the internal layout, Members are advised that the overall layout generally satisfies the Council's design standards.

The vehicle movements using the spine road would be low in volume relative to the design capabilities and theoretical capacity of such a road and it is acceptable that cyclists can mix with vehicular traffic where vehicle speeds should not be excessive due to the nature and design of the road. The shared surface streets will be modular in construction and designed to allow all users to share the space and move more freely in a safer environment.

The site layout has adequate pedestrian walkway provision to afford permeability across the site and access routes to apartments from parking areas. Matters of detail such as construction, drainage and any lighting can be covered under conditional control.

Dropped crossing arrangements for private driveway parking areas are acceptable, matters of detail can be covered under conditional control. Access arrangements to apartment communal parking areas are also acceptable and detail can be covered by condition.

The road infrastructure has been designed to ensure there is adequate standing and manoeuvring space for daily delivery vehicles, for example home food deliveries. Refuse and recycling arrangements for all dwellings and apartment blocks have been suitably designed in terms of access and collection arrangements. Information has been provided with regard to receptacle numbers and the detail can be covered under conditional control.

A secondary pedestrian / cycle access and emergency link is proposed at the northern end of the site to connect to Wilmslow Road, the merits and delivery mechanism for this having been discussed earlier in the report above.

In terms of car and cycle parking provision each dwelling is provided with two off street parking bays and a cycle parking facility within private curtilage. The matters of detail for driveway parking area formation, cycle parking and electric vehicle charging facilities for each dwelling can be covered under conditional control.

The southern block of 47 apartments will be provided with 48 car parking bays which includes 4 disabled bays and 10 bays to be provided with electric vehicle charging facilities. The two smaller blocks of apartments at the northern end of the site containing four and six residential units will have 6 and 9 parking bays respectively. The larger block at the northern end with 24 apartments will have 28 parking bays. An element of disabled parking is proposed to all apartment buildings.

There is also the provision of 14 visitor spaces integrated into the site road layout in layby areas and there is kerblines availability where incidental parking can occur without giving rise to highway operational and safety issues. It is acknowledged that

this informs that overall dedicated parking for the apartments is in the region of 1 space per residential unit, that visitor provision is included and some kerbside parking would be available. Such an identified level of provision is in accordance with the Council's parking standards and considered representative of the likely and realistic demand associated with apartment parking, particularly where a proportion are 1 bedroomed. An objection on parking grounds if it could be demonstrated that overspill parking will give rise to highway operational and safety concerns and when it is noted that visitor spaces are integrated into the design and kerbside parking will be available, this would not be the case. The location of the site and the interventions that will be brought forward to improve access for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users should assist enabling residents to enjoy more convenient access to services, amenities and public transport, live a more sustainable lifestyle and potentially reduce their reliance on car travel. In conclusion there is no reason to sustain an objection based on parking provision or the consequent adverse impact of any additional or overspill parking needs.

Each aspect of apartment blocks will be provided with covered and secure cycle parking, the detail a matter that can be determined under conditional control. Facilities will also be required for a proportion of the apartment parking bays and again this can be dealt with under conditional control.

There may be a need and requirement for parking regulation on the main spine road and this is a matter that can be judged and determined whilst progressing the necessary S38 Agreement for road adoption, with the development required to cover all associated costs. The highway impacts of construction works can be adequately mitigated through the imposition of a condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a construction management plan.

In conclusion on highway matters, Members are advised that the proposed development has been the subject of extensive discussion both at pre-application stage and during consideration of the application. The submission is proposing meaningful interventions to improve the accessibility of the site and enable residents the opportunity to choose to live a more sustainable lifestyle, which is an approach that is supported by Officers and accords with local and national planning policies. It has been demonstrated that the impact of development traffic on the adjoining highway network will not give rise to unacceptable operating conditions or risk to user safety, satisfying the requirements of local and national policies. The internal site layout has regard to Council standards and is acceptable. On this basis the proposal is considered to accord with Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 together with para's 105, 110, 112 and 113 of the NPPF.

Accessible Development

Accessibility for all is key to the attainment of sustainable development and is recognised as such within Core Strategy policies CS1, SD1, CS3, H1, CS8, SIE1, CS9, T1 and T2 which seek to influence the design and layout of new development. This is reflected throughout the NPPF in seeking to create places that are inclusive and accessible (para's 8, 84, 92 and 130).

In this respect the application advises that all dwellings will have level access thresholds and 53% of all dwellings will be fully accessible units (comprising 58no. 2 beds and 21no. 1 beds). Lift access is proposed to all floors of the larger apartment building fronting Stanley Road. A proportion of the communal parking to all the flats will comprise accessible spaces in locations close to the main entrances. The existing access to Wilmslow Road is to be retained as a shared space for pedestrians and cyclists which then links into the network of pathways around and within the site. Public footpaths are proposed throughout the

development linking the open space to the west and east of the site with the wider development, the communal parking to the apartments in the south of the site to the main spine road and communal parking areas to all the apartments. Whilst construction details have yet to be submitted, these will be secured by condition to ensure that dropped kerbs and tactile paving is delivered in all the required locations across the development.

For the above reasons the proposal accords with Core Strategy policies CS1, SD1, CS3, H1, CS8, SIE1, CS9, T1 and T2 together with para's 8, 84, 92 and 130 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

UDP Review policy EP1.7 confirms that the Council will not permit development where it would be at risk of flooding, increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, hinder access to watercourses for maintenance, cause the loss of the natural floodplain, result in extensive culverting, affect the integrity of the existing flood defences or significantly increase surface water run off.

The Core Strategy at policy SD-6 requires all development to be designed to avoid, mitigate or reduce the impacts of climate change. All development will be expected to incorporate SUDS so as to manage surface water run off from the site and development on previously developed land must reduce the unattenuated rate of surface water run off by a minimum of 50%.

Policy SIE3 confirms that areas of hardsurfacing should be of a permeable construction or drain to an alternative form of SuDS

The NPPF confirms at Chapter 14 that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (para 159). Local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment (para 167). Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems with maintenance arrangements in place for the lifetime of the development (para 169).

The application site is not identified on the UDP Proposals Map as being in a location liable to flooding and as confirmed by the Environment Agency's mapping, is within Flood Zone 1. The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

The Assessment and Strategy are as follows:

- *The site is located within Flood Zone 1 on the Environment Agency (EA) 'Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)' – an area considered to have the lowest probability of fluvial and tidal flooding. The risk of flooding from all sources has been assessed and the flood risk to the site is considered to be Low and Acceptable. In the event of a flood, safe evacuation is available along Wilmslow Road heading south.*
- *The proposed development will introduce impermeable drainage area in the form of buildings, access and car parking. This will result in an increase in surface water runoff.*
- *In order to ensure the increase in surface water runoff will not increase flood risk elsewhere, flow control will be used, and attenuation provided on*

site to accommodate storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 45% climate change event.

- *All methods of surface water discharge have been assessed. A CCTV survey of the culverted unnamed Ordinary Watercourse that crosses the site has been organised and depending on its capacity, the site will either discharge into the culvert or into the United Utilities sewer on the opposite side of Wilmslow Road. The sewer ultimately discharges into the watercourse after it emerges from the culvert to the north of the site so both methods end up in the same watercourse.*
- *1470m³ of attenuation storage will be required on site in order to restrict surface water discharge to 18.6 l/s. Attenuation can be provided within the sub-grade of permeable paving in proposed car parking areas or in the form of a pond and swales located throughout the site. There is also the potential for an underground attenuation tank located beneath the designated car parking areas in the north of the site.*
- *Foul flows should be discharged to the 300 mm public foul sewer in the north of the site. The manhole within the site has a cover level of approximately 77 m AOD. Therefore, a gravity connection can be achieved and this connection has been approved by United Utilities.*

Members are advised that extensive discussions between the applicant and LLFA have been ongoing for the duration of this application. The FRA is considered to be an accurate and robust assessment of flood and demonstrates that there will be a low and acceptable risk in this respect (that being less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding). As such there is no need for mitigation measures to be secured.

The Drainage Strategy confirms that given ground conditions, soakaway is not feasible however alternative options for infiltration including porous paving, swales and shallow attenuation ponds are proposed. These will drain at a controlled rate into the watercourse on the west side of Wilmslow Road. The final details of this strategy are yet to be agreed however it is considered that there is sufficient information submitted to conclude that the scheme presented to date is acceptable and will deliver the most feasible and practical solution possible for this site. The implementation of this strategy together with the results of the survey of the culverted watercourse (so as to inform the final detailed design) will be secured by condition.

On this basis Members are advised that the proposed development accords with Saved UDP review policy EP1.7, policies SD6 and SIE3 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Aviation Safety

Saved UDP Review policy EP1.9 confirms that development which would adversely affect the operational integrity or safety of Manchester Airport or Manchester Radar will not be permitted. This is reflected in Core Strategy policy SIE5. The main issues for consideration in this respect include bird strikes and glint and glare.

The application through its drainage strategy proposes the create of swales and channels that are capable of holding surface water at times of heavy and prolonged rainfall. These are potentially capable of attracting birds to the site however the applicant has confirmed that these would drain down within 24 hours. This is an acceptable solution and one to which Manchester Airport have

confirmed that they have no objection to. The draining down of the swales and channels within this period of time will be secured by condition.

In relation to PV panels, it is noted that none are specifically proposed by this application. This does not mean however than in time, homeowners could not install them by utilising permitted development rights. In the interests of aviation safety, these rights could be withdrawn by a condition. This would not prevent the installation of PV panels however the required planning application would need to demonstrate that there would be no harm to aviation safety. This can be achieved in several ways including confirmation that the panels will have a matt finish, that the perimeter of them will be enclosed with mesh to stop birds nesting under the warmth of the panels or by the submission of a glint and glare assessment.

On this basis Members are advised that the proposal accords with policies EP1.9 and SIE5.

Pollution

Core Strategy policy SIE3 confirms that development of contaminated land will be permitted provide it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no remaining risk from contaminants or that satisfactory measures can be taken to make the site suitable for its proposed use.

The NPPF at Chapter 15 confirms that planning decisions should prevent new development from contributing to, being put to unacceptable risk from or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of pollution (para 174). Planning decisions should ensure that a suitable is suitable for its proposed use by taking into account ground conditions and contamination (para 183). Planning decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development (para 185).

The application is accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) and Geo Environmental Assessment (GEA).

The AQA considers the impact of the development during its construction and operational phases and in summary, advises accordingly:

- *Following the construction dust assessment, the site is found to have at worse 'Medium Risk' in relation to dust soiling effects on people and property, and 'Low Risk' in relation to human health impacts. Providing mitigation measures are implemented, residual effects from dust emissions arising during the construction phase are considered to be 'not significant'. Given the short-term nature of the construction phase, there is predicted to be an insignificant effect on air quality from construction generated vehicle emissions.*
- *Mitigation measures during the construction phase includes (but is not limited to) communication with stakeholders, storage of materials in bunded areas and dampening thereof, regular monitoring, no idling vehicles, avoid the use of diesel or petrol powered generators (mains or battery instead), dust suppression measures, avoiding water run off from*

the site, covering, reseeded of fencing stockpiles to prevent wind whipping, regular site management and wheel washing etc.

- *Following the operational assessment, concentrations of emissions at all assessed existing receptor locations are considered to be 'negligible'. Unmitigated effects associated with concentrations of emissions at all assessed receptor locations are therefore considered 'not significant'. Furthermore, the predicted concentrations at receptors newly introduced across the site are low and therefore the site is considered to be suitable for its proposed residential use. As such, effects associated with likely exposure of future occupants are considered to be 'not significant'.*

The GEA considers the composition and condition of the site and assesses this and the impact of the development in relation to human health, controlled waters, the built environment and ground gas. The assessment in summary advises accordingly:

- *Additional investigation in areas where ground improvement or piling may be required to confirm ground conditions and an appropriate foundation solution and to inform detailed design.*
- *Detailed foundation and road/pavement design by a suitably qualified structural engineer.*
- *Preparation of a Remediation Strategy, to set out the proposed watching brief, a capping layer, ground gas protection measures and subsequent verification will be required. Classification of the ground gas regime should be agreed with the Local Authority, who may request additional monitoring or additional protection to mitigate the risk of elevated ground gases.*
- *Bunded materials should be appropriately managed and graded for reuse or removed from site under Duty of Care.*
- *Any earthworks carried out as part of the proposed redevelopment will need to be undertaken under a Materials Management Plan (MMP) in accordance with the CL:AIRE Code of Practice to facilitate the reuse of these materials.*
- *Given the reported results some excavation arisings are likely to meet the requirements for disposal at a facility licensed to receive inert waste, however, some soils are unlikely to be acceptable at such a facility and some soils will need to be sent to a hazardous waste facility. Appropriate assessment and management/processing of the bunded material will be required prior to reuse or off-site disposal.*
- *Hotspots of localised contamination associated with Made Ground including asbestos cannot be discounted. Groundworkers and sub-surface maintenance workers should be made aware of the possibility of encountering contaminated soils through toolbox talks. Safe working procedures should be implemented, good standards of personal hygiene should be observed and appropriate levels of personal protective equipment (PPE) provided and utilised. This recommendation should be captured in site health and safety documentation and in maintenance plans;*

- *Provision of analytical data associated with the ground investigation to the appropriate Statutory Undertakers to agree and adopt an appropriate barrier pipe/design for the proposed development.*

Members are advised that the above demonstrates that the proposed development will not give rise to unacceptable air quality issues during the construction or occupation of the development. Whilst no mitigation is required for the occupational phase, that for the construction phase as outlined in the AQA can be secured by condition. This will ensure that the worst impacts of construction works are minimised to an acceptable level.

In relation to contamination, the report identifies that remediation measures required and that further gas monitoring should also be undertaken. In this respect it proposes 4 rounds over a 5 week period however this is not considered sufficient given the size of the development, sensitive end use and made ground present. To address this and ensure that carrying out of the development in an appropriate manner, conditions can be imposed to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a remediation scheme to bring the site up to a suitable condition, a validation report assessing the effectiveness of the remediation and identifying any other measures required, further gas monitoring and a validation report associated with that.

No details of external lighting are proposed at present and as such it cannot be determined what impact if any there will be in terms of light pollution. This however is not considered essential to the current consideration of the application and can be addressed by way of a condition. Any external lighting shall be designed to minimise potential loss of amenity caused by light spillage onto adjoining properties. The details of the location, height, design, and luminance of any external flood lighting shall be provided. The external lighting scheme shall show levels of illumination around the site (isolux drawings) and any overspill lighting beyond the site boundary. Mitigation measures or installation requirements shall be clearly identified on the external lighting scheme drawings: time controls/light sensors or other control methods.

On the basis of the above Members are advised that the proposed development will not have a harmful impact in relation to pollution and thus accords with policy SIE3 and para's 174 and 183 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Objections regarding the impact of the development on GP practices in Heald Green and the alternative use of the site to provide a healthcare centre are noted. As set out in the report above, the Council is and has been for many years in a position of housing under supply. As such applications which propose new residential development are afforded significant weight. Notwithstanding that, it is appreciated that the delivery of new homes has the potential to place an added burden upon services within the Borough however there is no policy requirement for large scale residential developments to include such provision within those developments. Rather, policies in the UDP Review and Core Strategy welcome and encourage the provision of healthcare facilities and that additional provision where proposed can be made within the community in line with that policy position in order to meet the demand generated by the level of housing need within the Borough.

Summary

The loss of the existing use of the site in relation to parking is acceptable and does not conflict with the development plan or NPPF.

The proposed development in terms of housing delivery and affordable housing accords with para's 60, 65, 69, 77, 119, 120, 124 and 125 of the NPPF together with Core Strategy policies C2, CS3, CS4 and H3. It is also of note that as well as complying with para 65 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy H3, the proposed development significantly exceeds policy requirement. In proposing 100% affordable housing, given the need and shortfall of provision which exists in the borough and locally, this weighs heavily in favour of the proposed development in terms of the overall planning balance.

With regard to development in the Green Belt, the redevelopment of the northern section of the site accords with para 149g of the NPPF and therefore is appropriate in the Green Belt. The redevelopment of the southern section of the site does not fall within any of the excepted forms of development however it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated the 'very special circumstances' required to justify this otherwise inappropriate element of development. On this basis, the proposal accords with the Governments approach to development within the Green Belt set out within para's 147 to 149 of the NPPF.

The removal of the extensive and unsightly parking to the northern part of the site and the redevelopment in the manner proposed will deliver a development of a size, siting and design that responds to, protects and enhances the character of the locality. The proposal is therefore compliant with saved UDP Review policy LCR1.1, Core Strategy policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 together with para's 119, 124, 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

The proposed development will deliver an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers and safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal therefore accords with policies H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 of the Core Strategy together with para's 119, 124, 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

The provision of a single LAP on site and the payment of £752,658 secured by way of a S106 agreement ensures that the development accords with the provisions of saved UDP Review policies L1.1 and L1.2, Core Strategy policy SIE2, the Council's SPD 'Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments' and para's 92 and 98 of the NPPF.

Given the absence of a local plan policy in relation to education contributions and having regard to the viability of the proposed development, it is not considered reasonable to require contributions in this respect.

The layout will deliver a development that is safe and one which assists in deterring crime. The proposal therefore accords with policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 together with para's 92, 97 and 130 of the NPPF.

The unlawful loss of the woodland that previously existed on the southern section of the site weighs against the proposed development however cannot be considered in isolation. Regard has to be paid to the proposed landscaping of the development and net gains to biodiversity that will compensate not only for the lost woodland but also for the proposed development. Subject to the imposition of conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement, it is considered that the proposed development will cause no harm to protected species and will also deliver the required net gains to biodiversity. The proposal therefore accords with saved UDP policy NE1.2, Core Strategy policies H1, CS8, SIE1 and SIE3 together with para's 131 and 174 of the NPPF.

The proposed development will preserve and enhance the setting of nearby heritage assets. The proposal therefore accords with Core Strategy policy SIE3 together with para's 189, 194 and 197 of the NPPF.

The proposed development in terms of energy efficiency and the reduction of carbon emissions accords with Core Strategy policies CS1, SD1 and SD3 along with para 152 of the NPPF.

The development will deliver meaningful interventions to improve the accessibility of the site and enable residents the opportunity to choose to live a more sustainable lifestyle. It has been demonstrated that the impact of development traffic on the adjoining highway network will not give rise to unacceptable operating conditions or risk to user safety, satisfying the requirements of local and national policies. The internal site layout has regard to Council standards and is acceptable. On this basis the proposal is considered to accord with Core Strategy policies CS9, T1, T2 and T3 together with para's 105, 110, 112 and 113 of the NPPF.

The proposal will deliver a form of development that is accessible for all users in accordance with Core Strategy policies CS1, SD1, CS3, H1, CS8, SIE1, CS9, T1 and T2 together with para's 8, 84, 92 and 130 of the NPPF.

The proposal will not give rise to any adverse impacts in relation to flooding and will deliver a SuDS compliant drainage strategy for the site in accordance with saved UDP policy EP1.7, policies SD6 and SIE3 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

The development will cause no harm to aviation safety and thus the proposal accords with UDP Review policy EP1.9 and Core Strategy SIE5.

The proposed development will not have a harmful impact in relation to pollution and thus accords with policy SIE3 and para's 174 and 183 of the NPPF.

Application of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF

Members are well versed with the housing land supply position and the implications this has in respect of the presumption in favour of development. In short, where there is a shortfall against the required five-year supply, footnote 8 of the NPPF deems the policies which are most important for determining planning applications to be out-of-date, with the consequence that planning permission should be granted unless either:

- (I) The applications of policies in the 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 as a whole.

In respect of sub paragraph (I) the NPPF at Chapters 12 and 16 seek to protect areas or assets of particular importance, those being the Green Belt and neighbouring heritage assets. As outlined in the report above, the application of those policies secures a development that is in accordance with the NPPF and therefore does not provide a clear reason for refusing planning permission.

In respect of sub paragraph (II) the only adverse impact of the development is limited to the unlawful loss of the woodland. This however has to be weighed against the merits of the application which include:-

- The removal of the unsightly airport parking and enhancement of this part of the site in terms of visual amenity and landscape quality.
- The compliance of the development in part with Green Belt policy and the existence of VSC to justify the development in all other respects.
- The provision of a high level of amenity for existing and future residential occupiers.
- The contribution to children's play and formal recreation.
- The inclusion of measures to deter crime.
- The safeguarding of protected species and net gains to biodiversity both on and off site.
- The retention of trees and provision of landscaping throughout the site which will secure a high quality landscape setting.
- The preservation and enhancement of the setting of heritage assets.
- The inclusion of measures to reduce carbon emissions.
- The delivery of development in an accessible location with off site improvements to promote sustainable modes of travel and measures to ensure that there is no harm to the safety and operation of the highway.
- The delivery of a development that is of an acceptable highways layout and provides for parking in accordance with the Council's standards.
- The inclusion of measures to ensure accessibility for all.
- The delivery of a development that will not give rise to adverse impacts in relation to flood risk and which includes a SuDs compliant drainage strategy.
- The inclusion of measures to protect aviation safety.
- The remediation of the site and creation of a development that causes no harm in relation to pollution.

Having regard to the significant merits of the proposals, it is not considered that the loss of the woodland significantly or demonstrably outweighs these substantial benefits when assessed against all the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

The proposal will therefore achieve sustainable development by:

- Ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right place and at the right time to support growth (the economic objective);
- Delivering a significant number, range and type of new homes to meet the needs of the present and future generations. By fostering a well designed and safe place with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support the health and well being of the community (the social objective) and:
- Protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution and adapting to climate change (the environmental objective).

RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to the imposition of conditions and the completion of the S106 Agreement