

ITEM 1

Application Reference	DC/091485
Location:	Dairyground Farm, Lytham Drive, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 2JX.
PROPOSAL:	Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and the erection of up to 60 dwellings (including 50% affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping and vehicular access point from Lytham Drive. All matters reserved.
Type Of Application:	Outline Application
Registration Date:	14.03.2024
Expiry Date:	13.06.2024
Case Officer:	Mark Jordan
Applicant:	Wain Estates (Land) Ltd

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

The application is required to be considered by the Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee, by virtue that 6 or more objections have been received, contrary to the case officer's recommendation.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Outline planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and the erection of up to 60 dwellings (including 50% affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping and a vehicular access point from Lytham Drive.

All matters (appearance, means of access, landscaping, layout and scale) are reserved for later determination, via subsequent detailed applications. This submission seeks approval for the principle of the development.

Indicative layout drawings, together with details of the footprint and massing parameters of a potential two storey residential development, accompany the application. The parameter details submitted in support of the outline application, set out the maximum height that would be proposed for the development. This would include a maximum eaves height of 4.8m and maximum ridge heights of between 6m and 7.5m

Detailed access is a reserved matter that would be dealt with as a part on a subsequent reserved matters application, however the indicative potential access is shown as being via an extension to Lytham Drive. Surfacing and accessibility improvements are also indicated to an existing public right of way which borders the northern and eastern site boundaries.

In addition to the indicative plans that have been provided, the application is also accompanied by a large number of supporting reports which are listed below:-

- Planning Statement;
- Design & Access Statement;
- Air Quality Screening Note;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment;
- Energy Statement;
- Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy;
- Landscape & Visual Appraisal;
- Noise Assessment;
- Phase 1 Ground Conditions Survey;
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, BNG Strategy & BNG Metric
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Transport Assessment & Travel Plan

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site comprises a roughly rectangular parcel of land of approximately 2.74 hectares, which includes a former agricultural holding and a pond. Vehicular access is taken via Lytham Drive. A public footpath runs along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site.

A number of single and two storey buildings, structures and areas of hardstanding exist within the site. These are currently in use for a mix of commercial (including car repairs and open storage), residential and equestrian purposes.

Open fields and areas of paddock exist immediately to the north, south and east of the site, whilst a residential estate of a mix of two storey detached and semi-detached houses exists to the west off Lytham Drive.

Ground levels are relatively flat across the site. The boundaries of the site are largely defined by mature trees and hedgerows.

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
HP1.3 Avoidance of Loss of Dwellings
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
CS7 Accommodating Economic Development
AED-6 Employment Sites Outside Protected Employment Areas
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

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in December 2024 replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & revised in 2018, 2019, 2021 and 2023). The NPPF has not altered the fundamental legal requirement under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations (such as the NPPF) indicate otherwise.

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

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

The following paragraphs are considered relevant to this application:

Chapter 1 Introduction: para’s 1 & 2

Chapter 2 Achieving Sustainable Development: para’s 7 to 12

Chapter 4 Decision Making: Para’s 39 to 44, 48 to 51; 56 to 59

Chapter 5 Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes: Para’s 61 to 68, 71, 73

Chapter 8 Promoting Healthy & Safe Communities: Para’s 96, 98, 100

Chapter 9 Promoting Sustainable Transport: Para’s 109 & 110, 115 to 118

Chapter 11 Making Effective Use of Land: Para’s 124 & 125, 129

Chapter 12 Achieving Well Designed Places: Para’s 131, 135 & 136, 139

Chapter 13 Protecting Green Belt Land: Para’s 142 & 143, 153 to 158

Chapter 14 Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change: Para’s 161, 163, 164, 166, 170, 173 to 179, 181 & 182

Chapter 15 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment: Para’s 187 193, 195 to 199

Annex 1 Implementation: Para 231, 232

Annex 2 Glossary

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

The site and associated buildings have an extensive planning history, of which the following applications are of relevance to the current proposal:-

J/5807 - Erection of building to be used for accommodating cattle and horses, also to be used on a regular basis once weekly in winter, for exercising horses, i.e., partly for riding school purposes. Granted 21/07/76.

J/17827 - Proposed Overhead Power Line. Granted 22/01/80

J/29075 - Proposed Cattery. Refused 15/09/83.

J/61738 - Change of use and conversion of agricultural building to form dwelling. Granted 27/04/95

J/35446 – Proposed Feed Store. (Retrospective). Granted 04/02/86

J/11410 - Proposed house and garage. Refused 04/04/78.

J/26477 - Renewal of temporary permission for 3.564 sq.m polythene tunnels for plants. Granted 12/10/82

J/27337 - Erection of storage and potting shed. Granted 08/02/83

J/26906 - Proposed Cattery. Granted 13/01/83.

J/11106 -Erection of 10,000 sq.ft. of temporary polythene plant tunnels on Nursery land 08/03/78

J/45506 - Continuation of use of site for storage of motor vehicles. Refused 13/06/89

J/12348 - Proposed new farm track. Refused 14/09/78

J/16603 - Extension of planning permission for siting of 2 caravans for use of Agricultural Workers. Refused 09/10/79

J/17543 - Erection of 972 sq.m of temporary polythene plant tunnels. Granted 08/11/79.

J/24009 - Retention of two residential caravans for farm workers 12/11/81.

J/38529 - Retention of 972 sq.m plant tunnels. Granted 07/04/87.

J/44133 - Proposed second farmhouse. Refused 28/03/89.

J/47936 - Proposed manager's dwelling. Refused 26/04/90

DC/068770 - Retention of house built under planning permission DC055844. Granted 17/04/18.

DC/091435 – Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Request:
Residential development of up to 68 dwellings. EIA not required 03/05/24.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The application has been advertised by way of site and press notices. The occupiers of 209 nearby properties have also been notified directly in writing.

The expiry date of the notification period was 01/05/24. At the time of report preparation a total of 171 responses have been received.

4 representations make comments on the proposal as summarised below:-

- 1) Has consideration been given to future residents being able to access local NHS dentists, GP's and local schools;
- 2) The carriageway width of the vehicular access should be no less than that of the current farm track.
- 3) How will surface water drainage be managed without causing further flooding or surcharging the existing drainage systems?
- 4) How will access be maintained along the current farm track from Lytham Drive, to all current users both pedestrian, equestrian and vehicular, throughout the works, as there is no alternative route?
- 5) Traffic calming features on the new access road proposal should be implemented as per the current farm track
- 6) The design speed of the new access road should be 20mph and therefore visibility splays should be reduced, leading to a reduction in vegetation clearance.
- 7) The current vegetated embankment that encompasses the north and east boundaries of the site should be retained to mitigate noise and light pollution.
- 8) The proposed access road should not be illuminated by lighting columns or other means throughout the hours of darkness to minimise ecological effects
- 9) How will the development prevent rat running of vehicles along the farm track/PRoW beyond the proposals towards Woodford Rd?
- 10) As Waterloo Road is a private road, the Waterloo Road Residents Association is responsible for the upkeep of the road including any repairs. Should the application be approved, the Construction Method Statement produced would need to have restrictions included so that any traffic associated with the development is routed to avoid Waterloo Road. This would avoid damage to a road which is not maintained by the local authority;
- 11) Given the need for housing, and the limit on perfect sites, development has to be done in a way that works well;
- 12) Any development will need to consider (a) steps to prevent school parents clogging the roads with their parking around Dairyground Rd and Seal Rd; (b) measures to ease traffic exits at both ends of the estate to Bramhall Lane; and (c) steps to repair and maintain entry/exit roads;
- 13) More houses will likely mean more train commuters and more overcrowding. Will train operators expand the capacity?
- 14) It is important that the developer stands by making 50% affordable housing;

161 representations object to the proposal on the following summarised grounds:-

- 1) The site is Green Belt land and should not be built on;
- 2) There may be a need for more houses in the area, but these should be built on brownfield sites;
- 3) Re-developing the land would be unfair to existing local residents who bought their properties to benefit from the surrounding Green Belt;
- 4) If approved, this development could result in a further 700+ homes being built in the surrounding area;
- 5) The proposal would have an unacceptable environmental impact in terms of noise, air pollution, mud and dirt from construction traffic as well as from any completed housing development
- 6) Alternative access points from Woodford Rd should be explored, as there are limited routes into and out of the Dairyground Estate;
- 7) Lytham Drive, the wider Dairyground Estate, including Seal Road and Bramhall Village / Bramhall Lane South, as a whole can barely cope with existing levels of traffic congestion and cannot support the proposed development;
- 8) How will the affordable housing be truly affordable;
- 9) This would represent unwarranted development adjacent to a specialist nature reserve and would result in the loss of greenery and disruption to / destruction of local wildlife including to that of 'Happy Valley'
- 10) Comments objecting to the proposal as part of the applicants' Statement of Community Involvement have been omitted and the consultation exercise was flawed and mis-leading;
- 11) Local nurseries, primary and secondary schools are already operating at full capacity / near to capacity. Future occupants of the proposed development would put a greater strain on these schools and nurseries and would impact on the quality of education for existing residents children;
- 12) An Environmental Impact Assessment has not been carried out;
- 13) There are existing flooding problems in the area, these will be made worse by the development as there is nowhere for surface water to drain to;
- 14) The proposal would need greater sewerage infrastructure and would result in the loss of areas of rainwater soakaway;
- 15) The area that would be built on is a green space that is currently enjoyed by families and there are already not enough green spaces in the area, without losing more;
- 16) The health infrastructure does not exist in the area to support future occupants of the development. Existing local residents are already unable to get appointments within a reasonable time for local health centres, GP's and dental surgeries, this will only be made worse;
- 17) The existing site isn't unsightly or unneighbourly with noise and disturbance from the existing farm being very low;
- 18) Views from existing properties would be completely changed;
- 19) Existing properties would be overlooked by the proposed houses;
- 20) The application is driven by housing targets and proposes little that would benefit existing local residents;
- 21) More policing and street cleaning is already needed in Bramhall Village, this proposal will only serve to put a greater strain on these matters;
- 22) Bus and train services into and out of Bramhall are already insufficient to cater for local residents, this will only be exacerbated by the proposed development;

- 23) Existing HGV traffic would be unlikely to be reduced as this is largely associated with the garden nurseries, which are to remain;
- 24) The site is not accessible or sustainable in terms of transportation or its proximity to other facilities, shops, etc;
- 25) Documents and reports submitted in support of the application appear to be flawed;
- 26) Loss of trees and hedgerows.

3 representations support the proposal on the grounds summarised below:-

- 1) The land is brownfield / industrial and has poor amenity value;
- 2) The existing lane is currently too poor for cycling. This will be improved as part of the building works, with better bike access being provided to the A555
- 3) The local community will benefit from affordable homes, which are needed across the borough but especially in Bramhall;
- 4) This will provide a boost to a local, under-subscribed secondary school;
- 5) There is an organised campaign objecting to the proposal;
- 6) Building housing allows more people to own their own homes;
- 7) Providing smooth, paved roads can improve the environment.

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 this 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 40 to 44).

The Statement advises that the applicant engaged with the local community and political stakeholders on the proposals. This included a consultation leaflet being distributed to 320 local residents, local schools, ward councillors and local MP's. In addition a dedicated public consultation website was published and made available for interested parties to view and provide feedback.

The applicant has provided a summary of the responses received. This is set out in the submitted SCI and is also included below:-

Principle of development

- Bramhall is overdeveloped
- The site is designated as Green Belt
- What is meant by 'affordable housing'
- Already enough affordable housing in the area

Community infrastructure and facilities

- Concerns in relation to the capacity of local services and facilities

- Local doctor's surgeries are already over capacity
- There is already a lack of provision of dental services within the area
- Lack of places at local primary and secondary schools – how will schools cope with an influx of new students as a result of the development

Highways

- Highway safety concerns due to increased traffic both during the construction phase and as a result of the proposed development once occupied;
- An alternative vehicular access should be considered avoiding the Dairyground Estate
- Vehicular access should be via Woodford Road, rather than Lytham Drive providing connection to the A555
- Vehicle movements associated with the existing commercial use of the site are not a cause for concern to local residents

Environmental

- Disturbance during construction phase
- Impact on air quality during construction phase and as a result of the increased vehicle movements once the proposed development is completed and fully occupied
- Impact of the proposals on local wildlife
- Concerns development of the site would result in flooding and drainage issues
- Loss of views to existing residents;
- Impact on the existing public right of way and potential loss of amenity to local residents as a result
- The proposals provide welcome opportunity for redevelopment

Other matters

- Impact of affordable housing on local property values
- Concerns in relation to the scale and duration of the public consultation exercise
- Impact of the proposals on the existing businesses located at Pennington's Stables
- Impact of the proposals on the existing equestrian facility and on the well-being as result of relocation
- Concerns how current proposals relate to the applicant's promotion of the wider site surroundings for removal from the Green Belt for future development.

The applicant advises that they consider that the feedback received has been fully considered and addressed through the various documents supporting the current planning application.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee comments are summarised below:

Planning Policy (Green Belt, Housing & Employment): No objection.

The proposal does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not result in substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposal complies with Core Strategy policy H3 in terms of affordable housing provision.

The proposal would comply with Core Strategy policy AED-6 relating to loss of non-allocated employment sites.

Planning Policy (Education): Developer contributions are required. These can be controlled via a legal agreement.

Planning Policy (Energy): No objection subject to conditions ensuring the delivery of high standards of sustainable homes and green infrastructure, at any reserved matters stage.

Highway Engineer: No objection, having regard to the info submitted in support of the application and noting that specific details relating to 'access' will be fully assessed as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s)

The submitted illustrative layout gives sufficient comfort that a development of up to 60 residential units, alongside the required road network and other associated access and parking infrastructure, can be accommodated within the land that is available for redevelopment.

Conservation & Heritage Officer: No objection.

Arboricultural Officer: No objection. Further landscaping details required at reserved matters stage.

Nature Development Team: No objection subject to conditions.

Strategic Housing: No objection subject to further details relating to affordable housing provision.

Environment Team (Air): No objection subject to conditions.

Environment Team (Noise): No objection subject to conditions.

Environment Team (Contaminated Land): No objection subject to conditions covering site investigation and subsequent remediation.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA): Further information is requested in respect of surface water drainage.

Greenspace Team: No response received.

Public Rights of Way Unit (PRoW): The proposal will not directly impact on the PRoW network. Opportunities remain for further improvements to the rights of way network.

Waste Management Team: Standing advice relating to waste storage.

Director of Public Health: No response received.

Environment Agency: No response received.

United Utilities: Further information is requested in respect of drainage solutions. Conditions recommended if the application is approved.

Civil Aviation Authority: No response received.

Manchester Airport Group: No objection subject to conditions.

Cheshire East Council: No response received.

The Coal Authority: No comment.

Design for Security: No response received.

Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service: No response received.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS): No objection, subject to a condition covering a programme of archaeological works.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

Members are reminded that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must be taken into account in preparing the development plan and is a material consideration in planning decisions. 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 at Paragraph 7 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. Paragraph 8 states that 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.

Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states that 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.

Members are aware that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply with the current position being 1.77 years of deliverable housing sites. Under paragraph 11d of the NPPF this means that where there are either no relevant development plan policies (note this does not apply for this application) or the policies which are the most important for determining the application are out of date, granting permission unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (the Green Belt in this instance) provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

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 H-2 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 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 Uses

The site is currently used for a variety of commercial and equestrian purposes, including car repairs and open storage, as well as including a single dwelling. The existing commercial uses largely appear to be long established and are unrestricted in terms of planning controls.

Core Strategy Policy AED-6 seeks to protect employment sites outside of allocated employment areas unless:

- a. it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer viable as an employment use;
- b. the proposal will not adversely affect the operations of neighbouring premises;
- c. the loss of employment land would not lead to significantly longer journey to work patterns; and
- d. the development does not conflict with other policies.

The applicant has sought to address the matter of the loss of the employment uses via a supporting planning statement and an accompanying employment land statement. These provide evidence as to the current and future suitability of the site for employment purposes and conclude that:

- 1) The site is poorly located, with access through a residential area;
- 2) The buildings are in a poor state of repair, blighted by asbestos;
- 3) There are a number of modern industrial and warehouse units available on established existing employment sites such as Bramhall Technology Park and Newby Road Industrial Estate. Modern industrial premises will provide better facilities for industrial and engineering processes such as car repairs and commercial storage use.

Officers have assessed the above mentioned supporting information and consider that whilst there is a potential need for additional, better quality, well located office and industrial stock across the borough, the application site does not appear to satisfy modern occupier requirements for industrial or warehouse premises and is poorly located and accessed for such uses.

Given the wider considerations detailed above, the site isn't considered to provide viable or deliverable employment premises. As such, its release for alternate use isn't considered to detrimentally affect local employment land supply and consequently the requirements of policy AED-6 are met.

Whilst the proposal would result in the loss of an existing single dwelling on site, given that the proposal seeks the re-development of the site for up to 60 dwellings, which would make a significant contribution to the Council's housing provision when in a period of under-supply, the proposal would be in compliance with Saved UDP policy HP1.3.

Green Belt

The site 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. This policy 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.

Whilst policy 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) (December 2024); the more recently adopted provisions of chapter 13 are considered to provide a more suitable framework for the determination this application.

'Saved' UDP Review policy GBA1.5 'Residential Development in Green Belt' would also be of relevance to this proposal as it contains more detailed provisions relating to residential development proposals in the Green Belt. However, this is also not consistent with more recent national policy set out in the NPPF.

NPPF paragraph 154 sets out that "Development in the in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions apply..." One of these exceptions is found in part g) which states: "limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt."

In this instance the proposal now before Members involves the redevelopment of previously developed land. The matter of the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt will be addressed later in this report. Notwithstanding this, the NPPF also sets out what are described as 'Golden Rules' with para 156 stating:

Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions ('Golden Rules') should be made:

a. affordable housing which reflects either: i) development plan policies produced in accordance with paragraphs 67-68 of this Framework; or ii) until such policies are in place, the policy set out in paragraph 157 below;

b. necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and

c. the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces.

In this respect and as detailed later in this planning report, the proposal would comply with para 156 (parts a, b and c) of the NPPF through the provision of 50% affordable housing, the securing of an education contribution via a S106 Agreement and improvements to the provision of publically accessible open space both within the development and off-site.

The most recent assessment of Green Belt is set out in the 'Stockport Green Belt Harm Assessment' available at <https://www.stockport.gov.uk/evidence-planning-policy/environment-and-heritage>. The parcel of land to which the application relates is NEB 2, although that parcel of land is larger than the application site.

In terms of the assessment of the value of the land in relation to the five purposes of Green Belt, this is as follows, with the reasons for the assessment set out in that document:

- i) Purpose 1 - Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas:
Moderate
- ii) Purpose 2 - Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another:
Relatively Limited
- iii) Purpose 3 - Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment:
Moderate
- iv) Purpose 4 - Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns:
Limited/No
- v) Purpose 5 - To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: Equal contribution (All Green Belt land is considered to make an equal contribution to this purpose.)

In addition, the Assessment identifies that impact on adjacent Green Belt land would be minor, for the following reasons: "Release of the sub-area would partially increase the containment of adjacent Green Belt land to the north, although the influence of this would be limited somewhat by the presence of mature woodland cover along Lady Brook. Release would also increase the containment of adjacent Green Belt land to the south and west, although as this is not stronger performing Green Belt no additional harm would occur. The woodland cover to the north and east of the sub-area would form a stronger and more consistent boundary between the inset settlement and Green Belt. Tree belts and agricultural fencing would provide an alternative boundary to the south, which would represent no significant change in the strength of distinction between the inset settlement and the Green Belt."

In this case, it is important to note that the proposal does not constitute a 'release' of Green Belt and as noted above, forms only part of the wider parcel of land assessed for those purposes. Nevertheless, it provides an indication of the value of the sub-area in Green Belt terms, which overall is rated as 'moderate'.

As noted above, the proposal is for the redevelopment of previously developed land. It is this and that the scheme would deliver affordable housing, which would help to meet identified needs within the borough. The key question is whether it would meet the requirements of 154g in respect of the harm to openness.

Members will be advised that assessing the impact on openness is not simply a matter of assessing the scale of development proposed and, in this case, comparing it to what exists on the site. This has been established via the Court of Appeal, in *Turner v. SSCLG* [2016] EWCA Civ 466, in which it was noted that "openness" was capable of having a visual dimension and that visual impact is a permissible consideration which is a matter of planning judgment to be made on the facts of the case. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Green Belt (Reference ID: 64-001-20190722) reflects such caselaw in setting out that openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects ("... the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant, as could its volume.")

The applicant has submitted a Landscape Visual Assessment (LVA) to support the application. This indicates that there are limited available views of the site, with existing views restricted largely to those available from a nearby public right of way and the existing residential development to the west of the site.

Officers note that the applicant has provided figures which indicate a negligible increase in the building footprint on site, but a significant increase in the building volume (53%).

In terms of impact on openness, the majority of the existing larger buildings are located towards the edges of the site, so that views into and through the site, where they exist, are already significantly affected by the built form on site. There is significantly less built form towards the central area of the site, however this element does not afford greater openness in the context of the Green Belt due to the nature of the larger buildings and the relatively restricted views into and across the site.

As this is an outline application and therefore the final layout and scale of the development is not determined at this stage, the submitted indicative drawings and parameter details of scale and massing, provide an indication of the scale and type of development which could be accommodated on the site. The impact of development in relation to openness of the Green Belt can, in part, be controlled through condition to be applied at any future reserved matters application, should this application be approved.

As noted earlier in this report, the wider parcel of land makes an overall moderate contribution to the Green Belt. Given the existing built nature of the site the specific contribution of the site in the regard is relatively limited.

Having regard to all of the above, Officers consider that on balance, given the location and scale of existing buildings on the site and the likely built form, albeit at this outline stage, it is concluded that development of this site would not have substantial harm on the openness of the Green Belt. In the context of para 154g of the current NPPF it is therefore advised that the development is not regarded as 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt.

For the above reasons, notwithstanding the conflict with saved UDP Review policies GBA1.2 and GBA1.5, the proposal accords with the more up to date provisions of NPPF paras 154 – 158 and whilst the concerns of local residents as to the loss of Green Belt are acknowledged, the impact of the proposed development can, in principle, be accepted.

Housing Delivery

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

Policy CS3 confirms that a mix of housing will be sought in terms of tenure, price, type and size to meet the requirements of new forming households, first time buyers, families with children, disabled people and older people. New development should contribute to the creation of more mixed, balance communities by providing affordable housing in areas with high property prices. The overall strategic affordable housing target of the core strategy (2011) is 50% of total provision. The development plan advises that the Council will aim to achieve this with the assistance of Stockport Homes and other affordable housing providers on 100% affordable housing developments, by maximising opportunities on Council owned land, by releasing additional land for housing and through developer contributions. Support will be given to the provision of specialist and supported housing for older people and people with a disability. The mix of housing provided should be based upon the findings of up to date evidence. On sites that are capable of accommodating a range of housing types and sizes, development should contribute to the provision of an appropriate borough wide mix of housing reflecting the different types and sizes of housing likely to be required over the plan period. Developments in accessible suburban locations may be expected to provide the full range of houses and contain fewer flats however they should still achieve a density of 30 dwellings per hectare.

Policy 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.

To help achieve the 50% overall strategic target, affordable housing will be sought on applications seeking residential development. On Green Belt sites the level of affordable housing provision should be at least 50% (CS policy H3).

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 (Paragraph 61).

Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are essential for Small and Medium Enterprise housebuilders to deliver new homes, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes (Paragraph 73(d)).

Planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses while safeguarding the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions (Paragraph 124). Planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land (Paragraph 125(c)). 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 (Paragraph 129). . Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site (Paragraph 130).

Following the publication of the updated standard method for calculating housing need published by government in December the current housing land supply position is currently established as 1.77 years. The level of supply was considered as part of the recent Gatley Golf Club appeal decision where the Inspector recognised that the level of supply is very significantly below the five-year deliverable supply position that local authorities should be able to demonstrate. As such the requirements of NPPF para 11d continue to apply to decision-making (the titled balance). This means that applications for residential development should be approved unless the application of policies relating to areas or assets of particular importance (defined in footnote 7 of the NPPF) provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed, or if any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and/or providing affordable homes.

Housing Mix

Given that the current application purely seeks outline permission for the principle of residential re-development of the site for up to 60 dwellings definitive details of the housing mix of any proposed development are not required at this stage, with a full assessment of this to take place as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s).

Notwithstanding the above the indicative details provided in support of the current application identify the potential provision of a mix of 2 to 5 bed dwellings, which would be compliant with the broader aims of policy CS3.

Housing Density

The site area measures approximately 2.74ha and the proposed development would therefore result in a housing density of 22 dwellings per hectare (dph). This falls below the aims set out in policy CS3 of the Core Strategy which seeks to achieve a density of 30dph and above in suburban locations.

In considering the lower density of the proposal, material weight should be given to the context of the site as previously developed land within the Green Belt and the potential impact of a residential development of a greater density on the openness of the Green Belt and on other planning matters including, but not limited to, traffic generation.

Notwithstanding the above Members are also advised that the density of development currently proposed, has been reduced during the planning process as a result of the applicant seeking to address comments previously made by Officers and consultees, noting that a pond which exists within the site was previously identified for removal. In seeking to provide an alternative solution to drainage and ecological matters, the indicative layout now proposed shows the retention of this pond.

Affordable Housing

With regard to affordable housing provision, Paragraph 66 of the NPPF requires that where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect that the mix of affordable housing required meets identified local needs, across Social Rent, other affordable housing for rent and affordable home ownership tenures.

Stockport, as a Borough, has a net affordable need of 549 dwellings per annum, as identified in its Housing Needs Assessment.

The proposal now before Members provides an offer of 50% affordable housing (30 dwellings), which exceeds the Council's policy requirement on a brownfield, Green Belt site in this location, which would be 40% as set out in Core Strategy policy H3.

On the basis that the current application seeks outline permission only, full details of any tenure split of the affordable housing offer would be provided and further

assessed as part of future reserved matter applications. However to ensure compliance with policy CS3, a S106 Legal Agreement will need to be entered into as part of any outline approval as a mechanism to control the provision of affordable housing.

For the above reasons, the proposed development in terms of housing delivery and affordable housing accords with the NPPF together with Core Strategy policies C2, CS3, CS4 and H-3. It is also of note that as well as complying with Paragraph 66 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy H-3 the proposed development exceeds policy requirement. In proposing 50% 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.

Character and Appearance of the area

The site is located within the Ladybrook Valley Landscape Character Area and River Valley.

Saved UDP Policies LCR1.1 and LCR1.1a are applicable. Policy LCR1.1a is particularly relevant and advises that “Proposals for development in the urban fringe should protect, conserve and improve the landscape quality and natural history of the locality, and encourage the development of a variety of attractive landscape types. Development should help to create a landscape which is capable of absorbing the pressures associated with urban recreation. Where appropriate, the Council will seek to re-establish a “countryside” character and development proposals should maintain or enhance the predominantly informal recreational role of the Landscape Character Areas covered by this policy.

Access to the urban fringe including the river valleys, for all people including those with disabilities and using all travel modes, should be enhanced. Riverside and other long distance walking routes, and access for water users should be protected and completed. Improvements to the built environment will be carried out and encouraged. Where appropriate, the relocation or screening of unsightly and unneighbourly development will be sought.”

The design of residential development should be high quality, inclusive, sustainable and contribute to successful communities. Proposals should respond to the character of the area (CS policy H1). Development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard paying regard to the built and/or natural environment within which it is sited will be given positive consideration. Specific account should be had of the site’s characteristics including landform, landscape and vistas as well as the sites context in relation to surrounding buildings and spaces (CS8 & SIE1 of the Core Strategy).

The Borough’s varying urban and rural landscapes create a unique and distinctive local character of considerable value to residents and visitors alike and will be conserved in line with the Borough’s Landscape Character Assessment (SIE3).

Planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment (para 123). Planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places (para 129). The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve (para 131).

For the purposes of Policy LCR1.1 and LCR1.1a, the proposed development is taken to be acceptable in principle. The description of the Landscape Character Area in Appendix 12 of the UDP has been taken into account, and it is considered that the proposed redevelopment of the site can be accommodated without significant, adverse impact on the landscape quality of the area, and that the development is appropriately sited in this regard.

Although the application is in pure outline form and the proposed layout and detailed design is not fixed an indicative layout plan has been provided showing how a development of up to 60 dwellings could potentially be accommodated on the site. Whilst matters relating to detailed design, including impacts on trees and matters of landscaping would remain to be fully assessed as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s), parameter details relating to scale and massing of a potential development have been submitted in support of the application (as detailed earlier in this report), together with an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. These combined with the submitted illustrative drawings show that a development could potentially be delivered on site which would seek to retain and reinforce tree coverage and hedgerows that exist within and around the site. In this respect the Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection to the application. Furthermore it is considered that the overall design principles of the proposed development could appear acceptable within the locality.

Overall, the principle of the proposed development is considered to appropriately respond to the constraints of the site, and is in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS8, SIE-1 and SIE-3 and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Historic Environment

Core Strategy policy SIE-3 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 Council's Conservation and Heritage Officer notes that the application site does not contain any known above ground heritage assets. However, the site does have an entry in the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record in relation to the existing farmhouse and outbuilding and therefore has potential for below ground archaeology.

Members are advised that in accordance with the NPPF, the application is supported by a Heritage Statement, which shows that the potential for below ground archaeological significance has been considered.

Greater Manchester Archaeology Advice Service has advised that after assessing the application they raise no objection, subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological works.

Having regard to the above it can be concluded that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the historic environment and accords with relevant Development Plan policies and the NPPF.

Accessibility & Traffic Generation

Core Strategy policy CS9 supported by Policy T-1 requires development to be in locations which are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. Policy T-2 requires developments to provide car parking in accordance with the maximum standards and confirms that developers will need to demonstrate that developments will avoid resulting in inappropriate on street parking that causes harm to highway safety. Developments are expected to be of a safe and practical design (Policy T-3).

The NPPF confirms at Paragraph 116 that Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Whilst detailed access does not form part of the outline application currently before Members, with this issue to be fully assessed as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s) should outline permission be granted, applicants are still required to state the area or areas where access points will be situated. The drawings appended to this report show the access point to be taken off Lytham Drive.

The submission is accompanied by a Transport Assessment, addendum transport and traffic technical notes and a road safety audit for the site entrance road that is proposed.

The existing site lies to the west of Lytham Drive and currently accommodates Pennington's Stables and equestrian facilities, together with light industrial / commercial uses including an auto body repair business and a fencing business. The site is currently accessed from a private road that extends from Lytham Drive and for part of its length is a public right of way, 27HGB. The private road extends beyond the site, as the public right of way to the adopted highway network at Woodford Road.

As part of the proposal a circa 100 metre section of private access track between Lytham Drive and the site would be upgraded to adoptable standard to serve the

development. The realignment and improvement to this link is likely to require a diversion to the public right of way.

The determinant factors for residential development are site accessibility, traffic generation, consequent impact on highway operation and safety/any mitigation requirements and the site layout/detailed requirements.

In terms of site accessibility the NPPF is clear in stating that significant forms of development should be within a location which is or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This will help to reduce congestion and emissions, improving air quality and public health. Furthermore, new development should ensure that opportunities to promote sustainable travel choice and alternative modes of travel are identified, pursued and incorporated into development proposals.

The Council's Core Strategy is clear in Policy that development should be in a location that is accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, which should reduce the need to travel by car. New development that generates a significant number of trips should be sustainably accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and where additional transport infrastructure and/or public transport is required to make the site accessible then developers will be required to provide such infrastructure and/or services. The Council's Highway Engineer does not consider that the development site in isolation can be deemed to be suitably accessible or sustainable (in transport terms).

Accessibility is judged on residents having alternative modes of travel readily available should they not have access to a vehicle. To be a sustainable development it is expected that the frequency, safety, suitability and convenience of the alternative travel modes would be to such a level and quality that residents would be realistically encouraged to make the choice to travel by any alternative means other than a private car.

The Greater Manchester Accessibility Levels (GMAL) map, which is a detailed and accurate measure of the accessibility of a point to both the conventional public transport network and Local Link flexible transport service, scores the site level 1. This is within a range where 1 is the lowest level of accessibility and 8 being the highest.

The Council's Highway Engineer notes that the site lies in excess of 400m from the nearest bus stop on a high frequency bus route, it lies in excess of 1000m from the nearest railway station, it lies in excess of 800m from a district shopping centre and is in excess of 1000m of convenience shops, likely places of employment, various services and amenities.

In summary, there is a lack of high-quality public transport, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure in the vicinity of the site and Officers consider this may deter residents making sustainable travel choices and could lead to a likely reliance on car travel.

The Council's Highway Engineer considers that there will be a material change in trip modes, travel patterns and person profiles compared to the current site use, for example children walking and cycling to school.

Infrastructure deficiencies would at this stage lead Officers to conclude that, without infrastructure improvement and interventions being provided, residential development in this location could be judged to be counter to local and national policies on accessibility.

It is acknowledged that the NPPF recognises that sites may have to be found adjacent to existing settlements and in locations that are not well served by public transport and in these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport).

This leads to a balanced judgement and reasonable expectation that pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities should be given high priority in terms of consideration and where it can be shown to be reasonably in proportion, interventions should be brought forward to address the deficiencies that are likely to present as barriers to modal choices being made. In this respect it is accepted that the applicant has been proactive and given some consideration to interventions and improvements that could support the application.

In terms of public transport improvements, Officers do not consider that it would prove viable for the development to contribute to bus service enhancements and it would be disproportionate to the scale of development that is proposed. As it is not considered that a substantive reason exists to object to the application based on the absence of public transport improvements.

Having regard to the above, focus and priority should be directed towards walking and cycling opportunities and it is essential that the development addresses any shortfalls with the delivery of interventions and improvement to the surrounding network. This would enable the development to be considered within a walkable neighbourhood, where it could achieve more sustainable patterns of movement and reduce the likely reliance of residents and visitors on car travel.

The applicant has acknowledged the need to provide improvement to the walking and cycling network and has proposed the following in support of the application. These are:

- the provision of a shared footway cycleway between the site and the easterly end of Lytham Drive,
- the upgrading of PROW 27HGB between the site access road and Camberley Close with corridor clearance and new surface treatment and lighting provision,
- the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at side road crossings of Warton Close, Westby Close and Nevin Close,

- the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at Seal Road, north of the junction with Lytham Drive,
- surfacing, regrading, access control and lighting to the public right of way connecting between the site entrance road and Lytham Drive,
- entry radii tightening to 6m at the Lytham Drive junction with Seal Road junction, to reduce the crossing distance and reduce vehicle turning speeds, along with the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on the crossing desire line and
- the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at the Gleneagles Close junction with Seal Road.

It is considered that these interventions would assist making the walking and cycling opportunities between the site and nearby schools and the wider area safer, which should contribute towards a less car dependant development. The walking and cycling routes for children, between the site and the nearest schools, would be a safer environment and would have greater potential for usage with clear benefit to all concerned.

In conclusion, the identified works represent a meaningful package of interventions and improvement, which sufficiently addresses matters relating to the site's accessibility shortcomings. It is recommended that the detail of the works be addressed via appropriately worded planning conditions.

With regard to traffic generation a traffic survey has been submitted in support of the application which shows that the existing site generates regular movements throughout the day and during the peak hours. In the morning peak hour there were 15 vehicle movements, averaging at one every four minutes, the evening peak hour 29 movements which is approximately one every 2 minutes. Across the 24-hour period there were 301 vehicle movements with 47 being larger vehicles such as middle-sized trucks or large vans.

As part of the assessment of the likely traffic generation associated with the proposed development, a multi-modal TRICS assessment has been undertaken. This suggests that the development has the potential to generate 35 two-way vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 34 two-way trips during the PM peak hour.

The multi-modal analysis shows that the development is forecast to generate 12 non-motorised trips during the AM peak hour and 7 non-motorised trips during the PM peak hour.

When compared to the exiting site use, the forecast net change in vehicle trips shows that the proposed residential development would generate an additional 20 two-way trips during the AM peak hour and an additional 5 two-way trips during the PM peak hour. This equates to an additional two-way vehicle trip every 2-3 minutes during the AM peak hour and every 10 minutes during the PM

peak hour. The Council's Highway Engineer does not consider that such changes in trips are significant in number and would not prove excessive along Lytham Drive. Furthermore, when spread across the wider network the net effect would be less than could be expected to occur as daily fluctuations, where hourly traffic numbers vary daily informed by many external factors. Furthermore, it is also noted that the residential development would generate significantly fewer goods vehicle trips than the existing site use and the reduction in numbers and trip types would present environmental benefit to residents who live along roads near to the application site.

Turning to the potential Impact on highway operation and safety, it is noted that the site would be accessed from the end of Lytham Drive, a residential street that connects to Seal Road. Lytham Drive carriageway is generally varying 6-7 metres in width with circa 2 metre footways either side. The road is subject to a 30mph speed limit and currently serves around 50 residential dwellings and links to the unadopted road that currently serves the development site and the adjacent Ladybrook Nursery.

Seal Road, which is typically a major residential access road, serves the wider estate and provides routes via Dairyground Road and Fir Road to the strategic network and Bramhall Lane South. Seal Road is also of width between 6-7m and has a footway on either side and is the highway fronting Bramhall High School.

Development traffic would be distributed and spread on the wider network via Seal Road, Dairyground Road, Delfur Road, Northcote Road and Fir Road, with connection to the strategic road network at the Fir Road and Dairyground Road junctions. There is also potential for traffic to access the site via Jacksons Lane, Valley Road and Colwyn Road, however travel towards Bridge Lane is not permitted by virtue of one direction no entry regulation on Colwyn Road.

As concluded earlier in this report, it is considered that the proposed residential development will not give rise to significant increases in traffic during the peak traffic periods, with an additional vehicle only being appreciable in numerical terms every two to three minutes during the AM period. Given the potential for traffic to take various routes of travel when connecting to and from the wider network and there being no overriding evidence that unacceptable levels of congestion exist on these residential parts of the network, Officers are unable to justify any concern on capacity or operational grounds.

The design and geometry of the estate roads, although historic, generally accord with the Council's design guidance for a highway network that provides access to expansive residential development and as such the Council's Highway Engineer cannot therefore reason any concern or material departure in this respect.

There is no overriding accident history for the wider estate during the last 5 years, which would give any reason for concern with the estate road geometry. And as such the proposal will not result in an unacceptable risk to the safety of users of this part of the network or lead to any overriding change to the characteristics or nature of this part of the network.

In terms of traffic accessing Bramhall Lane South and the wider network, the volume of new development vehicular traffic would not be at a level that would justify any further junction capacity testing or any consequent mitigation work. The imposition of residual development traffic would be negligible in terms of its effect on the operation of the junctions at Bramhall Lane South. As such there can be no objections to the results of the traffic modelling exercise which accompanies the application or to the proposed development itself.

To conclude whilst it is acknowledged that a detailed assessment of any proposed site layout would need to be undertaken as part of any reserved matters application(s), the illustrative drawings submitted with the application show the potential for an acceptable layout, means of access and parking to be designed and accommodated on the site for up to 60 dwellings.

In summary the Council's Highway Engineer raises no objections to the application subject to a package of appropriate planning conditions.

With regard to any potential impact on the public rights of way network, the Public Rights of Way Officer has assessed the proposal and notes that there seem to be no undue impacts on public rights of way in this application. Reference is made by the Public Rights of Way Officer towards exploring opportunities for improvements to the rights of way network in the vicinity of the site. In this respect Members will be aware that as set out earlier in this report upgrades are proposed to PROW 27HGB between the site access road and Camberley Close via corridor clearance and the provision of a new surface treatment and lighting.

To conclude, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in relation to Core Strategy policies CS1, SD-1, CS3, H-1, CS8, SIE-1, CS9, T-1, T-2, T-3, CS10, Saved policy L1.7 and the NPPF.

Ecological interests & Biodiversity

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 H-1, CS8 and SIE-1 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.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF confirms that 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. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF confirms that 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 application 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). Whilst the area is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (IRZ), this type of development is not relevant to the designation.

A suite of ecological surveys / reports and a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment have been submitted in support of the application and these have been fully considered by the Council's Nature Development Officer.

In respect of bats an adequate level of bat survey effort has been undertaken on the buildings on the site and there was no evidence of bats using these buildings to roost in. Two trees were identified within the woodland as offering potential for roosting bats. As the trees are not in a location where removal is proposed or impact anticipated, no additional bat survey effort is required.

Any future reserved matters application should include a sensitive lighting scheme to protect features used by bats, to be approved in writing by the LPA.

In terms of Great Crested Newts (GCN) and amphibians the relevant surveys returned negative results and risks to GCN are considered very low. However, common amphibians such as toad (a UKBAP Priority Species and listed as a Species of Principle Importance under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006) may be present. Therefore, it is recommended that precautionary measures are included.

With regard to badgers, although no signs of badger were recorded during the surveys, badger are widespread within the local area and are likely to at least pass through the site on occasion. Therefore, precautionary working measures are required during site works and can be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Given that badgers can build new setts relatively quickly, it is advised that any future reserved matters application should include a pre-works survey for badger, carried out [no more than three months] in advance of any development commencing to confirm badger sett absence and ensure no change in baseline conditions since the May 2024 survey and allow mitigation measures to be updated as appropriate. This survey should be carried out by a suitably experienced ecologist and in accordance with best practice survey guidance and can be secured by condition.

In respect of reptiles, no evidence of reptiles was observed during the 2023 / 2024 surveys. However, precautionary measures during site clearance are recommended within the ecology report and can be included within the CEMP as preferred.

In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain, an assessment report (technical note) was submitted in support of the application. This details an initial assessment of baseline and post-development habitats within the red line boundary as well as an additional parcel of land to the north of the site, also within the applicant's ownership and defined within the 'blue line boundary'.

Preliminary summary of results

Baseline biodiversity values

Red line boundary = 3.14 Habitat Units & 0.62 Hedgerow Units

Blue line boundary = 2.23 Habitat Units & 0.31 Hedgerow Units

Post development biodiversity values

Red line boundary = 5.55 Habitat Units & 1.04 Hedgerow Units

Blue line boundary = 4.39 Habitat Units & 0.31 Hedgerow Units

Biodiversity Net Gain = +4.57 Habitat Units (+145.58%) & +0.42 Hedgerow Units (+68.96%)

It is recognised that this calculation is indicative as the application is at outline stage. However, Officers consider that this gives an indication that provision of a biodiversity net gain within the site is likely, as long as the future biodiversity gain plan and HMMP are adhered to. Nonetheless, a number of technical issues will need addressing as part of any future reserved matters application(s), including in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain and Construction Ecological Management Plans (CEMP).

With regard to biodiversity enhancements, integrated bat roosting and bird nesting facilities should be provided within new dwellings and as well as on retained mature trees. As a minimum, it would be expected that at least one bat or bird feature would be provided per two new dwellings. The proposed number, locations and specifications of bat and bird boxes / features should be submitted to the LPA for review as part of any reserved matters application(s).

Locally native species hedgerows should be planted at site and plot boundaries instead of installing fencing. Where fencing must be used, occasional gaps (13cm x 13cm) should be provided at the base of close boarded fencing (minimum of one gap per section) to maintain habitat connectivity through the site for species such as hedgehog. This matter would be dealt with as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s).

The submitted masterplan indicates existing vegetation may be retained at the external boundaries of the site, which is welcomed and complies with the

mitigation hierarchy. Additional planting to enhance these vital wildlife corridors is expected with structural diversity within the proposed planting and the use of a range of locally native wildlife-friendly species which will produce a year-round supply of nectar and berries. In particular, buffer planting to retain and enhance the north – south habitat corridor along the eastern edge of the site will be required to ensure habitat connectivity is maintained. These matters would be dealt with as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s).

The retention of the pond and green corridor running north – south across the centre of the site is very much welcomed within the design. The current indicative landscape scheme also contains areas of public open space which are likely to be subject to moderate levels of disturbance. Where possible provision of features providing shelter or other benefits to wildlife are encouraged, for example, log piles, insect houses, bee bricks, hedgerow or scrub planting (e.g. small areas of gorse, holly or hawthorn etc), buffer planting around the pond etc. A minimum of 2 hedgehog houses, 2 invertebrate houses and 2 reptile hibernacula should be included in these plans. These measures would be particularly welcomed given the identification of the site as an opportunity area in the LNRS for Greater Manchester and would be dealt with as part of any subsequent reserved matters application(s).

In terms of lighting the site was identified as offering potential for foraging and commuting bats. In accordance with the BCT Guidance Note 08/18 (Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK), any future reserved matters application should be accompanied by details of the proposed lighting scheme.

In relation to breeding birds, a suitable condition covering vegetation clearance is recommended.

In respect of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS), a condition is recommended covering avoidance of and the control, management and treatment of invasive species.

To summarise the Council's Nature Development Officer has assessed the proposal in respect of ecology and biodiversity net gain, and raises no objection to the application, subject to a package of appropriate conditions.

Having regard to the above, Members are advised that subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposed development will not have an unduly detrimental impact on protected species and will deliver the required net gains to biodiversity. The proposal therefore accords with saved UDP policy NE1.2, Core Strategy policies H-1, CS8, SIE-1 and SIE-3 and the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The application site is identified on the Environment Agency's Flood Map as being within Flood Zone 1 which means there is a low probability of flooding. The NPPF, Core Strategy Policies SIE-3 and Saved UDP Review Policy EP1.7 deal with flood risk and seek to ensure that developments are not at risk of flooding and will not increase the risk of flooding.

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%. Areas of hardsurfacing should be of a permeable construction or drain to an alternative form of SuDS (policy SIE3).

The NPPF confirms at Chapter 14 that new development should be planned for in ways that avoid increasing vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through incorporating green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems (para 164).

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy have been submitted in support of the application. These include a preliminary design and a range of SuDs measures, including retention of an existing pond on site, which seek to limit any increase of surface water runoff into local infrastructure.

It is acknowledged that both the Lead Local Flood Authority and United Utilities, have requested that further details be provided prior to determination of the application. No consultee response has been received from the Environment Agency. The concerns of local residents as to the potential impact of the development in terms of flooding and drainage matters are also acknowledged.

Notwithstanding the above, Officers are of the view that it would be unreasonable to require such details as part of an indicative outline application and that these outstanding matters are capable of being resolved through the use of appropriate planning conditions to secure a suitable drainage scheme. This conditional approach would ensure compliance with the aims of Saved UDP policy EP1.7, policies SD-6 and SIE-3 of the Core Strategy and paragraphs 181 and 182 of the NPPF.

In summary there are currently no reasons to resist the proposal from a flood risk and drainage perspective.

Pollution

Core Strategy policy H1 requires new development requires development to be sustainable and contribute to the creation of successful communities. Good standards of amenity should be provided for occupiers of existing and proposed housing.

Policy CS8 confirms that development should take into account hazards including contamination, air water, noise, vibration, light and other pollution. Policy SIE3 seeks to ensure that development can be accommodated without adverse impacts in relation to pollution.

Planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution and by remediating and mitigating contaminated land, where appropriate (NPPF para 187). Planning decisions should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from contamination (NPPF para 196). Where a site is affected by contamination responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner (para 197). 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 (NPPF para 198).

Land Contamination

In respect of ground contamination, Policy SIE-3 seeks to protect development from matters relating to contaminated land. A Phase 1 Contaminated Land Report supports the application to assess the risk of potential contamination at the site and impact on the proposed development.

After due consideration the Council's Environmental Health (Contaminated Land) officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions. On the basis of the above Members are advised that the proposed development accords with Core Strategy policies H1, CS8 and SIE3 together with para's 196, 197, 198 and 201 of the NPPF.

Noise and Air Pollution

In respect of air quality, the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer are noted. In this respect the applicant has submitted an appropriate air quality screening note. This includes potential, indicative mitigation measures which could be carried out as part of any future development. Notwithstanding this full details of air quality management and mitigation would be capable of being fully assessed as part of any future reserved matters applications. In light of the above and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposal is considered to be policy compliant.

In terms of noise impacts, the main considerations are in providing an acceptable level of attenuation for any future residential use of the site and safeguarding the amenity of existing properties in the vicinity of the site. In this respect the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer are noted.

Notwithstanding the above, further specific details of noise management and mitigation measures would be capable of being fully assessed as part of any future reserved matters applications which would include the layout and design of any development. In light of the above and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposal is considered to be policy compliant.

On the basis of the above Members are advised that the proposed development accords with Core Strategy policies H1, CS8 and SIE3 together with paragraphs 198, 199 and 201 of the NPPF.

Sustainability & Energy

Delivering sustainable development is the primary aim of NPPF. Sustainability and energy efficiency is also key theme of the adopted Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that new development is designed in way to reduce Co2 emissions and minimise climate change.

It should be noted that as the proposal is an outline application, with all matters reserved for future assessment, the development is only indicative and has not been designed up to a level where the measures that would deliver these requirements can be established in detail. The application has however been supported by an Energy Statement which considers the opportunities for the development to deliver the desired energy savings and Co2 reduction.

The comments of the Council's Planning Policy (Energy) Officer are noted and the general approach towards the sustainable principles of the development is welcomed. Planning conditions should therefore be imposed to require that the targets as set out in policy SD-3 are met. On balance and in light of the above the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable in respect of relevant energy and climate change Core Strategy Policies.

Education

In terms of impacts on social and community infrastructure (education), paragraph 100 of the NPPF confirms it is important that a sufficient choice of early years, school and post-16 places are 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 choice in education. Whilst there is no corresponding policy within the development plan, regard has been had to the Council's draft Education Contributions SPD.

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 August 2023, 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).

As the education contributions are based on the size of dwellings and these are not yet fully known as part of the outline application, full details cannot yet be calculated. Nonetheless a mechanism will need to be included within a S106 legal agreement attached to any outline planning permission, setting out how this will be calculated and secured at a later application stage.

On this basis the proposed development accords with para 100 of the NPPF. The development also accords with para 156b in relation to the 'Golden Rules' for major residential development in Green Belt through making the necessary improvements to local infrastructure.

Residential Amenity

The design of residential development should be high quality, inclusive, sustainable and contribute to successful communities. Proposals should maintain and provide for good standards of amenity. (CS policy H1). Development that is designed to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to the environment will be given positive consideration. Specific account should be had of the safety and security of users and provision and maintenance and enhancement (where suitable) of satisfactory levels of amenity for users and residents (CS8 & SIE1 of the Core Strategy).

The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Design of Residential Development' is a material consideration and sets out the Council's expectations as to the design and layout of residential development.

Planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, create places that are safe with a high standard of amenity and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life (para 135).

With regard to residential amenity, CS policy SIE-1 seeks to ensure that adequate levels of privacy and amenity for existing and future residents are provided. The NPPF also reflects this objective. A detailed assessment of any effects, arising from the proposed housing development, would be undertaken at any reserved matters application stage(s), when detailed layouts and design would be known. Notwithstanding this, it should be acknowledged that there is potential for harmful impacts on the amenity of local residents that already from the existing, un-restricted, commercial uses operating from the site, to be reduced / removed by the residential re-development.

As the exact number, size, layout and design of the dwellings will not be established until any reserved matters stage, it is not possible to fully and accurately assess separation and privacy distances, both within and outside of the site, or the level / layout of amenity space that would be required.

Notwithstanding the above the indicative site layout plan submitted with the application, shows how a development of up to 60 dwellings could potentially be accommodated on the site, which could potentially provide satisfactory living standards and which could potentially safeguard the amenity of both the occupants of existing properties adjacent to the site and future occupants of the development.

Recreation and Open Space Provision

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”.

Core Strategy 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 proposal for up to 60 dwellings will generate the need for both the provision of formal recreation facilities and children’s play space. As precise needs are based on population calculations and the number, size and mix of dwellings is not yet fully known, full details cannot yet be calculated. Nonetheless, the applicants through their Planning Statement and indicative drawings have indicated that a Local Equipped Area of Play could potentially be provided on site as part of any residential development. This would be assessed in detail at reserved matters stage when full details of layout and landscaping are considered. Commuted sums for any off-site recreational open space

contributions would be secured by way of a S106 legal agreement, attached to any outline approval.

Other Matters

In terms of crime prevention CS policy SIE-1 confirms that safety and security measures should be incorporated into designs whilst not compromising overall design quality. In support of the proposal, the applicant has submitted a Crime Impact Statement. No consultee response has been received from Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security).

Notwithstanding the above given that the application now before Members is purely seeking outline consent, with all detailed matters being reserved for consideration at a later date as part of future applications, a detailed assessment cannot be made at this stage. In light of the above, subject to appropriate conditions the proposal is considered to accord with CS policy SIE-1.

Turning to the potential for impacts on existing health services within the local area, whilst it is acknowledged that a large number of objections have been received from local residents expressing their concern that there is inadequate community infrastructure in the form of public health and social care services to meet the needs of both existing and future residents, there are no development plan policies which require the provision of new / upgraded public health services as part of new housing development. As such Officers do not consider that a refusal of the current application on these grounds would be warranted or would be capable of being substantiated at appeal.

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 SIE-5. The Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer for Manchester Airport has been consulted on the proposals and raises no objection subject to appropriate conditions.

Summary

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 application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of

land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

As detailed earlier in this planning report, the application proposes an outline form of development that is in accordance with relevant development plan policies and the NPPF and therefore no clear reasons for refusing planning permission exists.

The proposal will 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, with the potential for 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).

In conclusion, having taken into account all the objections to and support for this application, consultation responses, Development Plan policies, the NPPF and any other material considerations, it is concluded that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. In coming to this view and as required by para 11d), particular regard has been paid to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes. The presumption in favour of sustainable development therefore applies and planning permission should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the imposition of conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement.

BRAMHALL & CHEADLE HULME SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE COMMENTS (13/03/25)

Cllr Wynne declared a personal, prejudicial interest and left the committee meeting taking no part in the consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer introduced the report and provided Members with a number of updates.

Committee were advised as to the receipt of a further objection to the application from a local resident, which raised no fundamentally new issues above and beyond those already summarised in the planning report.

In relation to a separate matter, Members were advised as to the receipt of updated calculations from the applicant indicating that a potential indicative development of 60 dwellings could have a built volume 53% greater than the existing buildings / structures on site. This was a reduction from the 73% figure provided in the planning report.

The Planning Officer responded to questions made by Members in relation to the accessibility of the site, clarification of peak traffic timings, definition of there being no significant increase in traffic and the weight that should be given to the Council's inability to provide a 5 year housing supply.

A person spoke against the application commenting that the proposal was inappropriate and not sustainable for the location proposed. It was felt that the application would result in mass environmental damage and the destruction of local wildlife. Concerns were expressed that the development would place further pressure on existing health and education services in Bramhall, which are already considered to be under significant pressure. Comments were made as to the significant traffic problems that would result from the proposal, with the existing 24 vehicles of residents using Lytham Drive increasing to 120. It was felt that this would result in a significant increase in traffic pollution and accidents, which would also be exacerbated by construction traffic. It was concluded that the proposal would destroy the local environment and turn it into another extension of the urban jungle.

Members asked questions of the person who had spoken against the application in relation to health and education impacts, impact of traffic on the wider area as well as on Lytham Drive - including at differing times throughout the day and the Council's role in considering the application.

A person spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the proposal. Comments were made as to the very significant undersupply of housing within the borough, that the site comprises brownfield land, that the existing commercial uses are unrestricted, that the buildings on site are unsuitable for modern employment uses, that the proposal complies with relevant Green Belt policies and that there would not be a significant increase in traffic. It was commented that the application would be beneficial in terms of providing 60 new dwellings, of which 50% would be affordable, would add to the local economy and would provide areas of open space.

Members asked questions of the person who had spoken in support of the application in relation to the nature and viability of the existing employment uses and how the road network would be affected by construction vehicles.

Committee debated the application, noting that further applications for residential development could follow having a potential greater impact on the Green Belt. A resolution was passed that the application be referred to the Planning &

Highways Regulations Committee, with no recommendation, and that an inspection be carried out by the Visiting Team.

The webcast of the meeting can be viewed via the following link: [Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee - Thursday 13 March 2025, 6:30pm - Stockport Council Webcasting](#)