

CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE

10 APRIL 2025

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

ITEM 1 DC/090690

SITE ADDRESS Land East of Hopes Carr, Stockport

PROPOSAL Proposed site clearance/demolition and construction of 106 residential apartments (Use Class C3), with access, car parking landscaping and delivery of associated infrastructure works.

ITEM 2 DC/091409

SITE ADDRESS 198 Buxton Road, Great Moor, Stockport, SK2 7AE

PROPOSAL Conversion of existing bed & breakfast property into 5 self contained flats. Insertion of rooflights, demolition of existing single storey elements and installation of new windows.

ITEM 3 DC/094450

SITE ADDRESS 99 Adelaide Road, Edgeley, Stockport, SK3 9LP

PROPOSAL The conversion of the basement and ground floor to a 5-bedroom/5-person house of multiple occupation (Use Class C4), a single-storey rear extension, provision of a basement lightwell, window/door replacements boundary treatment improvements and associated landscaping works.

INFORMATION

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants [and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations] have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Development and Control has concluded that some rights conferred by these Articles on the applicant(s)/objectors/residents and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. He believes that any restriction

on these rights posed by approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

This Copyright has been made by or with the authority of SMBC pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 ('the Act'). Unless the Act provides the prior permission of the copyright owner'. (Copyright (Material Open to Public Inspection) (Marking of Copies of Maps) Order 1989 (SI 1989/1099).

ITEM 1

Application Reference	DC/090690
Location:	Land East of Hopes Carr Stockport
PROPOSAL:	Proposed site clearance/demolition and construction of 106 residential apartments (Use Class C3), with access, car parking landscaping and delivery of associated infrastructure works.
Type Of Application:	Full Application
Registration Date:	22.12.2023
Expiry Date:	
Case Officer:	Jane Chase
Applicant:	Tala Homes
Agent:	Bramhall Town Planning

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Planning & Highways Committee – Residential Development of more than 100 dwelling units. Departure – No contribution to children's play and formal recreation.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application proposes the clearance of the site and demolition of small structures so as to facilitate a residential redevelopment and associated access, car parking and landscaping.

The proposed development would be L shaped in its footprint with the long elevation parallel to the western boundary onto Hopes Carr and the short elevation parallel to the northern boundary and adjacent existing residential development. Having regard to changes in ground levels the development would be laid out over 6 to 7 floors. A mix of 1 and 2 bed apartments (38no. 1 bed and 68no. 2 bed) are proposed on the lower ground floor level to 4th floor level. Of these 9no. 2 bed duplex apartments are proposed together with 1no.1 bed accessible apartment and 4no. 2 bed accessible apartments.

Basement parking accessed via a ramped entrance from Hopes Carr is proposed and would provide parking for 43 cars (including 11 accessible spaces). EV charging points will be installed to 28 parking spaces with access to such from all accessible spaces. Cycle parking is scattered throughout the development within the basement car park, externally to the front and rear of the building along with a cycle store at ground floor level accessed from Hopes Carr. Vehicle access into the basement car park is proposed as being via a ramp from Hopes Carr.

Level access into the building is proposed from two entrances to the front elevation with stair and lift access to all floors. There is also stepped and level pedestrian access from the basement car park to the rear of the site. Externally the proposed building occupies most of the application site however a pedestrian and cycle link is proposed parallel to Hopes Carr and around the northern end of the building. As well as providing a link between Hopes Carr and the rear of the building this will also give access for service vehicles required in connection with the maintenance of Hempsshaw Brook (which as existing and proposed is culverted under the application

site). An application for the adjacent open land to the rear of the site through which Hempshaw Brook flows, is also under consideration by officers seeking planning permission for the creation of an urban park (application ref: DC/090691). This proposed route from Hopes Carr would link into and through the proposed park where a new connection is proposed back onto Hopes Carr. It is also envisaged that as adjacent sites come forward for development such as that to the north east of the application site, the routes afforded by this link would be continued to Wellington Road and Lavenders Brow.

The development is of a contemporary design being largely of a red brick construction, projecting bays and floor to ceiling window openings. Dark grey pressed metal spandrel panels would be positioned adjacent to dark grey aluminium window openings to add visual interest and dark grey flat metal balustrades would provide protection from opening doors. A balustrade around the perimeter of the flat roof is proposed to provide maintenance protection. An array of solar panels are proposed to the flat roof together with air source heat pumps and a sedum roof.

The application is accompanied by the following documents:

- Planning Statement
- Design & Access Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Transport Note
- Framework Travel Plan
- Waste Calculation Report
- Heritage Statement
- Heritage Impact Statement
- Energy Statement
- Sustainability Statement
- Air Quality Assessment
- Phase 1 Site Investigation (Contamination)
- Noise Assessment
- Arboricultural Report
- Landscape Design Statement
- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey
- Updated Ecological Appraisal
- Tree Climbing Inspection
- Flood Risk Assessment
- SuDS & Foul Drainage Strategy
- Financial Viability Assessment
- Fire Statement
- Statement of Community Involvement

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located on the east side of Hopes Carr and comprises some 0.27ha of vacant scrub land. Ground levels within the site slope down steeply from Hopes Carr to Hempshaw Brook which runs parallel to Hopes Carr. Beyond the site to the east land levels rise up from the Brook to Orchard Street.

To the north of the site is a 5 storey apartment building at the junction of Hopes Carr and Wellington Street and to the south is Waterloo House a 2 storey commercial building. Opposite the site to the west is a commercial building at the junction of Lower Hillgate and Wesley Street; being at a significantly higher ground level, a

retaining wall is present to Hopes Carr. To the rear of the site is a further parcel of vacant scrub land through which flows Hempshaw Brook (south to north). This brook is culverted under the application site and land levels either side of it rise steeply to Hopes Carr and Orchard Street.

The site is located within Stockport town centre (south east quadrant) and is surrounded by a variety of commercial and residential developments. To the west of the site on the opposite side of Hopes Carr is the boundary with the Hillgate Conservation Area. The application site itself does not however contain any heritage assets.

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 comprises the saved policies of the UDP Review and the Core Strategy DPD. The NPPF is also material to the consideration of this application presenting the most up to date policy position.

UDP Review

- NE1.2 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance
- EP1.7 Development and Flood Risk
- L1.1 Land for Active Recreation
- L1.2 Children’s Play
- MW1.5 Control of Waste from Development
- TCG3.6 South East Quadrant

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

Core Strategy

- CS1 Overarching Principles: Sustainable Development – Addressing Inequalities and Climate Change
- SD1 Creating Sustainable Communities
- SD3 Delivering the Energy Opportunities Plans – New Development
- SD6 Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change
- CS2 Housing Provision
- CS3 Mix of Housing
- CS4 Distribution of Housing
- H1 Design of Residential Development
- H2 Housing Phasing
- H3 Affordable Housing
- CS8 Safeguarding and Improving the Environment
- SIE1 Quality Places
- SIE2 Provision of Recreation and Amenity Open Space in New Developments
- SIE3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment
- SIE5 Aviation Facilities, Telecommunications and Other Broadcast Infrastructure
- CS9 Transport and Development
- T1 Transport and Development
- T2 Parking in Developments
- T3 Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network

- CS11 Stockport Town Centre
- TC1 Stockport Town Centre

<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

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Affordable Housing SPG

Town Centre Residential Design Guide 2024

The Stockport Town Centre Residential Design Guide published in November 2024 provides a framework for high-quality, sustainable residential development in Stockport Town Centre.

It aims to guide developers, planners, and architects in creating liveable, diverse, and vibrant urban communities while preserving the town's heritage and character through a series of design principles.

The guide defines Character Areas for the whole of the Town Centre and begins to identify unique historic, urban and natural features that should shape new developments within each zone.

The guide reinforces the importance of high-quality design in shaping Stockport's urban future.

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 12th December 2024 replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & subsequently revised thereafter). 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".

Relevant paragraphs within the NPPF include:

- Para. 1-2: Introduction

- Para. 7-14: Achieving Sustainable Development
- Para. 39, 48, 49, 55-59: Decision Making
- Para. 61, 64 – 66, 73: Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes
- Para. 90: Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres
- Para. 96, 100, 102, 103, 105: Promoting Healthy & Safe Communities
- Para. 109, 110, 115-118: Promoting Sustainable Transport
- Para. 124, 125, 129: Making Effective Use of Land
- Para. 131, 135-137, 139-140: Achieving Well Designed Places
- Para. 161, 163, 164, 166, 170, 181: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding & Coastal Change
- Para. 187, 193, 195, 196 - 199: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- Para. 202, 207 – 210, 212 – 216, 218: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Para. 231, 232: Implementation
- 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>

Planning Brief

The Council published a planning brief for the application site and wider Hopes Carr area in 2004 which encourages a mixed development combining residential, light industrial and office uses with existing areas of open space. That brief is however now 21 years old, references RPG policies and since its publication, the UDP Review and Core Strategy have been adopted as well as various iterations of the NPPF. As such, it is advised that limited weight will be attached to this Brief in the assessment of development proposals. Notwithstanding that it is of note that the overall aims of the brief are not too far removed from the Council's current aspirations for the redevelopment of this site although it should be noted that the application of more recent local and national policy will now carry more weight.

Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) – Emerging Town Centre East Strategic Regeneration Framework

The application site forms part of the emerging MDC proposals for Town Centre East. This strategic regeneration framework will set out the Council's plans to regenerate this side of the town centre through the provision of up to 4000 new homes over the next 15 years. Work on this plan however is in its early stages and it is anticipated that a paper will be submitted to GMCA (Greater Manchester Combined Authority) to request that the Mayor go out to consultation in April and May 2025 on the proposal to designate the east of the town centre as a Mayoral development area. As such whilst this provide useful context to this application, the proposals cannot be considered against this emerging plan due to its infancy.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DC090691 - Land East of Hopes Carr and North of Waterloo Road

Stockport: Proposed regeneration of urban scrubland to create an urban park, landscaping and delivery of associated infrastructure works. Undetermined and remains under consideration by Officers.

DC092135 - Waterloo House: Outline planning application seeking approval for access for the partial demolition and erection of 28 residential apartments (all other matters reserved for subsequent approval). Undetermined and remains under consideration by Officers.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The receipt of the application was publicised by way of a site and press notice. Occupiers of 57 neighbouring properties were also notified in writing.

1 neighbour objection has been received and can be summarised as follows:

- This small patch of nature situated in Stockport centre is a location many locals use to get away from the mental stresses of life and one of the few areas people can actually allow dogs off the lead.
- I also fear for our privacy given this will allow lots of people to breach this privacy with direct view of and inside our property.
- The development will cause pollution to the air and will impact quality of life, especially for people with breathing difficulties.
- The development will also potentially block natural daylight.
- Hopes Carr is an archaeological site. The results obtained from the evaluation trench demonstrated that some buried remains of archaeological interest do survive on the site.
- Leave the river, as a river in nature.

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 hybrid 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 prior to the submission of the application the applicant launched a website where details of the proposed development could be viewed. A leaflet outlining the proposals and signposting recipients to the website and associated telephone line was distributed to 700 homes and businesses.

A series of questions were posed asking recipients to respond on the following:-

- Is Hopes Carr and Covent Garden an appropriate location for new town centre homes?
- Will new homes make a positive contribution to Stockport's housing stock?
- Would you welcome new homes to buy, rent or shared ownership?
- Is secure car parking for residents important to you?
- Should there be a secure, dry cycle storage space for every new home?

The questionnaire elicited nine responses. Seven respondents completed the questionnaire and eight respondents gave their feedback (some respondents gave

feedback without completing the questionnaire). Four of the seven respondents who completed the questionnaire gave 100% positive answers. Of the negative responses, when asked: "Is Hopes Carr and Covent Garden an appropriate location for new town centre homes?" two respondents said no. When asked: "Should there be a secure, dry cycle storage space for every new home?" one respondent said no.

The feedback can be summarised as focussing on:

- a perception of inadequate car parking or more parking spaces required
- loss of current open space (without mention of the new open space provision being applied for)
- concern about proximity to existing residential buildings

The applicant advises that the feedback received has informed the proposals for the site.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

SMBC Estates & Valuation – No objections to the findings of the financial viability assessment subject to a S106 to secure a late stage review of viability.

SMBC Strategic Housing – Note that no affordable housing is being offered and that the applicant has submitted a viability appraisal. Should an assessment of the appraisal agree that the scheme is currently unviable with either policy compliant on site provision of affordable housing or a contribution towards provision off site for the balance of the policy compliant affordable dwellings, then it is requested that a S106 agreement be entered into that includes a mechanism for a late stage review of viability. If this reveals that profit has been made beyond that forecast then these should be utilised by the Council for provision of affordable housing elsewhere in the Borough.

SMBC Planning Policy (Education) – No objections subject to the development contributing towards the provision of secondary and SEND school places that will need to be provided as a result of the proposed development.

SMBC Planning Policy (Energy) – No objections and support the proposed strategy.

SMBC Nature Development Officer – No objections subject to conditions and a S106 to secure biodiversity net gains.

SMBC Tree Officer – No objections subject to conditions to secure offsetting for tree loss and an enhanced landscaping plan. Conditions should also be imposed to protect any retained trees on or adjacent to the site.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – An ecology report has been submitted with this application (Rachel Hacking Ecology, March 2022) which included a daylight assessment of structures and trees in relation to bats. As this survey data is nearly two years old, we would advise that this survey is required to be updated, especially for mobile species such as badgers and bats (including aerial inspections of trees). As part of the survey work we would also recommend that the habitats are recorded using the UKHab methodology and a condition assessment for BNG is carried out.

NB: GMEU have not responded to the reconsultation on this application sent further to the receipt of additional information.

SMBC Conservation Officer – No objections subject to a condition to secure a detailed schedule of all materials of external construction including a sample panel of brickwork and mortar.

Greater Manchester Archaeology Advisory Service – No objections subject to a condition to secure the carrying out of a programme and recording of archaeological works.

SMBC Highway Engineer – no objections subject to conditions and S106.

SMBC Public Rights of Way Officer – No comment on this application other than to note that the Lavender Brow to Wellington St passage (the north/south route) are on the list of excluded area routes and the Lavender Houses phase of the development should take that into consideration.

Transport for Greater Manchester – No objections and suggest that traffic regulation orders are in place in the vicinity of the development (noting the level of parking proposed vs apartments).

SMBC Community Recycling – No objections subject to satisfactory waste storage and access arrangements.

SMBC Lead Local Flood Authority – No objections subject to a condition to secure a detailed drainage design and the development being completed in accordance with the approved details.

Environment Agency – No objections subject to a condition to secure the carrying out of the development in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment, the setting of finished floor levels and maintenance of the culvert.

In relation to biodiversity, a condition should also be imposed to secure a method statement in relation to the control of Japanese knotweed and Himalayan balsam.

In relation to contamination, a condition should be imposed to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a remediation strategy together with a validation report to confirm that the remediation works are complete and identifying any further requirements. Piling shall only be allowed where it has been demonstrated that there is no unacceptable risk to groundwater and development should not commence until a monitoring and maintenance plan in respect of contamination has been submitted and approved.

United Utilities – request a detailed drainage plan prior to the determination of the application. There is an expectation that no surface water should discharge to the sewer given the proximity of a watercourse. UU note the position of the LLFA and the submission of a detailed plan would allow UU to review this position. Any detailed drainage plan must include a solution to the sewer that crosses the site. In the absence of this information UU request the imposition of conditions to secure these details along with the management and maintenance of the drainage system.

SMBC Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land) – No objections subject to conditions to secure the carrying out of further investigations and if required, remediation.

SMBC Environmental Health Officer (Noise) – No objections subject to conditions to secure a construction environmental management plan and the carrying out of the development in accordance with the submitted Noise Impact Assessment in relation to window and ventilation specifications and strategies.

SMBC Environmental Health Officer (Air Quality) – No objections.

Health & Safety Executive – Planning Gateway One (Fire) – No objections

Greater Manchester Fire Authority – No comments received.

Manchester Airport – No objections in relation to aircraft safety.

Coal Authority - No objections as the site is not within a defined coalfield.

ASSESSMENT

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.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, including the provision of homes, commercial development and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner. So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

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 adjacent Conservation Area 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.

This assessment is set out in the report below.

Housing Delivery

Core Strategy policy CS2 confirms that a wide choice of homes should be provided to meet the needs of existing and future households in Stockport. The focus will be on providing new 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. 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 seeks to direct residential development in line with 3 spatial priorities including to accessible locations. These include 1 - The central housing area. 2 - Neighbourhood renewal priority areas and the catchment areas of District and Large Local Centres and 3 – other accessible locations.

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. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community (NPPF para 61).

Local planning authorities are required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. The supply of specific deliverable sites should in addition include a buffer of 20% where there has been a significant under delivery of housing over the previous 3 years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply (para 78). The NPPF confirms at para 124 that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for new homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes, 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 (para 125d). Planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land (para 129).

Following the publication of the updated standard method for calculating housing need published by government in December 2024 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 tilted 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 and the adjacent Conservation Area in this instance) 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.

The proposed development will provide a mix of 1 and 2 bed apartments (38no. 1 bed and 68no. 2 bed). Within this overall mix are 9no. 2 bed duplex apartments, 1no. 1 bed accessible apartment and 4no. 2 bed accessible apartments. The development therefore accords with policy CS2 in terms of providing for existing and future households and in proposing a mix of housing in terms of type and size (including 5no accessible apartments) accords with policy CS3. Noting the location of this site within Stockport town centre, the development delivers residential accommodation in accordance with the 1st spatial priority set out in policy CS4 (that being the central housing area). Noting the very significant undersupply of housing within the Borough, the provision of 106 residential dwellings in this highly accessible location is very welcome and will assist in addressing this position. The provision of residential accommodation in this location also accords with Core Strategy policies CS11 and TC1 both of which support the provision of residential accommodation within this location together with the NPPF. At a density of 392 dwellings per hectare the development clearly makes effective use of urban land and is compliant with policy CS3 together with para's 124 and 129 of the NPPF.

Affordable Housing

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.

To help achieve the 50% target affordable housing will be sought on site providing 15 dwellings or more and sites of 0.5ha or more. Subject to viability the Council will seek 5% to 15% of dwellings in the town centre as affordable housing (CS policy H3).

The NPPF confirms that affordable housing provision is expected on site unless off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified (para 64). Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major development (para 65). Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning 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 (NPPF para 66).

To accord with the above policy position at least 5 apartments should be provided as affordable dwellings. The application however makes the case through a Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) that the viability of the development is such that no contribution can be made in this respect. Put simply if such contribution was required then the development would not proceed. The NPPF at para 59 confirms that where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for

a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force.

The FVA has been the subject of considerable scrutiny and discussion with the applicant. It is concluded that a negative land value ranging from £3.05m to £4.4m will arise based on 4 scenarios (both 100% Open Market Scheme and 100% Build to Rent with and without S106 contributions) and thus is not viable whether S106 contributions are made or not. The applicant advises however that they take a long-term approach to investment and regeneration within Stockport and remain committed to redeveloping the site and will mostly likely proceed with development despite the unfavourable results presented. Given the viability position of the scheme, the applicant is exploring potential development partners and hopes to reduce costs where possible. However, given the current economic climate which has seen high cost inflation, albeit stabilising, the existing cost plan remains realistic and any anticipated savings are likely to not bridge the viability gap solely.

Members are advised that the FVA is considered to be a robust and thorough assessment of viability such that it evidences that a contribution to affordable housing (and indeed other S106 costs, see report below) cannot be made. Noting that policy H3 and the NPPF confirm that viability is a material consideration, the proposed development can be considered to accord with policy H3 and Chapter 5 of the NPPF. It is however recommended that should planning permission be granted, this is subject to a S106 agreement to secure a late stage review of viability once the development is nearing completion. Should this reveal that the scheme has been more profitable than currently forecast then a contribution to affordable housing could be secured at that stage.

Children's Play and Formal Recreation

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

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 align with policy requirements as well as being fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed and should be in a location where it would be of direct benefit to the occupiers of the proposed development. Off site contributions will be secured by S106 agreement.

The NPPF at para 96 confirms that planning policies and decisions should achieve healthy places which enable and support healthy lifestyles through the provision of green infrastructure and sports facilities. Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate (para 103).

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

In terms of children's play, the 2017 Open Space Study records quantitative shortfalls across the Borough for a number of typologies of open space including within the area of the application site. In relation to formal provision, the 2024 PPS notes a range of capacity and quality issues across a number of sports in the area.

Applying the above policy position to the proposals, the expected population of the development (following the rates set out in Core Strategy paragraph 3.335) would be 280 residents. As such it would be expected that there be on site provision in the form of local areas of play. Typically these are only 100m² in area and contain very few features of play. Instead, a LAP would be imaginatively landscaped to encourage play, although no play equipment or safety surface is to be provided. The play value should come from the enhancement of existing natural features, the modification of the landform (i.e. mounding) and planting. Noting that on site provision would not meet all of the requirement in respect of children's play, the remainder would be secured by way of a commuted sum payment and invested at a play area close to the application site.

Members will note that no on site play areas are proposed and given that the proposed built development occupies nearly the entire site, such provision is not possible. Given the town centre location of the site and the constraints that brings in terms of land availability, a lack of provision on site is often accepted so that housing delivery can be maximised. As such and in this instance, compliance with the above policy position is expected by way of a commuted sum payment. For the proposed development that sum is £83,300.

In relation to formal recreation, Core Strategy policy SIE-2 sets out that new residential development should provide for formal recreation on the basis of 1.7ha per 1,000 population. Given the size and location of the development on site provision of formal recreation would not be expected and therefore compliance with the above policy position would be by a commuted sum payment. For the proposed development that sum is £252,280.

Members will note from the planning history that Officers are also considering an application on land to the east and south of this application site which proposes the

creation of an urban park (DC090691); pathways from the proposed residential development into the park are proposed. This urban park application has been submitted by the same applicant for the residential proposals and reflects their collaboration over many years with the Council in terms of seeking the wider regeneration of the Hopes Carr area. At present however it is not confirmed who would be responsible for delivering the urban park if permission is approved nor can it be assumed that it would definitely proceed given that there would be no legal linking of the implementation of both proposals (such as through a S106 agreement). It is however acknowledged that if approved and implemented, the urban park would provide opportunities for informal and nature led children's play and therefore would be of benefit to the occupiers of the proposed apartments. The delivery of that urban park cannot however be relied upon and whether it proceeds or not it remains the case that the proposed residential development should meet policy requirements for children's play.

The FVA referenced above in relation to affordable housing provision also makes the case that with or without contributions to children's play and formal recreation the development is not viable. Development is only proceeding as the applicant is taking a long term view on their investment however should the required financial contributions to children's play and formal recreation have to be made, the development would not proceed. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies L1.1, L1.2 and SIE2 together with para 96 and 103 of the NPPF.

This clearly weighs against the application however as confirmed by the NPPF, viability is a material consideration and this adverse impact must be considered against the benefits that the development will deliver. This is explored further at the end of this report however Members are advised that should planning permission be granted, this should be subject to a S106 agreement to secure a late stage review of viability once the development is nearing completion. Should this reveal that the scheme has been more profitable than currently forecast then a contribution to children's play and formal recreation could be secured at that stage.

Education

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF confirms the importance of ensuring 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. They should:-

- Give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter early years, schools and post-16 facilities through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
- Work with early years, school and post16 promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.

In relation to primary education, the site is located in the Stockport Primary Planning Area which currently has 15% surplus places in mainstream sector and is expected to remain in this position for the next 5 years. The schools in the Stockport Primary Planning area are Dial Park Primary School, Great Moor Infant School, St George's Church of England Primary, St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, St Philip's Catholic Primary School, St Thomas' Church of England Primary (Stockport). The catchment school is St Thomas CE Primary School, a 1FE primary school. The development will not significantly impact sufficiency in this area.

In relation to secondary education, the site is located in the East Secondary Planning Area which currently has no surplus places in mainstream sector and is expected to remain in this position for the next 5 years. The schools in the East planning area are Marple Hall School, and Stockport School. The catchment school is Stockport School, a 9FE secondary school. The development will significantly impact sufficiency in this area and cause the Council to commission additional places.

Special Education provision within Stockport currently has a shortage of places available with at present too great a reliance on special and independent special school places. As such, the development will directly impact the shortfall in this area and will cause the Council to commission special needs places.

The cost of providing the additional school places required as a result of the occupation of this development will be £54,301 (that being £39,819 for secondary school places and £14,482 for SEND).

The FVA referenced above in relation to affordable housing provision also makes the case that with or without contributions to education the development is not viable. Development is only proceeding as the applicant is taking a long term view on their investment however should the required financial contributions to education have to be made, the development would not proceed. The proposed development is therefore contrary to para 100 of the NPPF.

This clearly weighs against the application however as confirmed by the NPPF, viability is a material consideration and this adverse impact must be considered against the benefits that the development will deliver. This is explored further at the end of this report however Members are advised that should planning permission be granted, this should be subject to a S106 agreement to secure a late stage review of viability once the development is nearing completion. Should this reveal that the scheme has been more profitable than currently forecast then a contribution to education could be secured at that stage.

Heritage Implications & Impact on the Character of the Area

Saved UDP Review policy HC1.3 confirms that development which would affect the setting or views into and out of a Conservation Area will not be permitted unless the development is sympathetic to the site and surroundings, the proposal safeguards important spaces, views, skylines and other features that contribute to the Conservation Area and the application is accompanied by sufficient detail to show the proposals within their setting and the likely impact on the Conservation Area.

Core Strategy policy H1 'Design of Residential Development' requires that development should be of a high quality design and respond to the townscape and landscape character of the area. Good standards of amenity should be retained and provided. This is reiterated in Core Strategy policy SIE1 which requires new development to achieve a high standard of design, respect and respond to the character of the area.

Development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to a sustainable, attractive, safe and accessible built and natural environment will be given positive consideration. Development which preserves or enhances heritage assets will be welcome (CS8). Development proposals affecting trees, woodland and other vegetation which make a positive contribution to amenity should make provision for the retention of the vegetation unless there is justification for felling, topping or lopping to enable the development to take place. Even where there is a strong justification for a proposal the design

should maximise the potential for retaining some mature planting, and replacement planting of appropriate species and covering a similar area should be provided within the site or nearby (SIE3).

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities (NPPF para 131). Planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and establish or maintain a strong sense of place to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit (para 135).

Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible (NPPF para 136).

In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets (NPPF para 210).

The recently adopted Stockport Town Centre Residential Design Guide identifies key components to promote sustainable, compact and contextual urban form in Stockport Town Centre. These include:

- ensuring that development secures a place for all through accessible development and considering the needs of users;
- animating the public realm through active frontages, surveillance, boundaries and lighting; the inclusion of sustainable measures such as open spaces, streets, courtyards, SuDS, tree planting, biodiversity, and sustainable building measures;
- prioritising pedestrians and cyclists;
- responding to context and character;
- being practical in terms of layout and occupation;
- ensuring high quality architecture;
- creating a home through the environment secured externally and internally; and
- making sure development is deliverable through construction and viability.

The application site is located within the Middle Hillgate Character Appraisal Area as identified in the Town Centre SPD. The townscape character of Middle Hillgate represents a transition in the urban form, a space between the fragmented urban grain of Higher Hillgate and the fine grain Historic Core to the north. To the east of Middle Hillgate, where this application site is located, development presents a more organic, informal townscape responding to the Hempsshaw Brook valley. Streets lined with stepping terraced buildings slope down towards the brook on an east-west alignment, providing framed views of landmarks and the countryside

from junctions along Hillgate. Prominent gable ends and roof pitches of old mills and warehouses step with the topography, creating a layered roofscape image and a distinctive industrial character. Within this character area development should intensify the grid and grain of the urban fabric; respond to level changes and views; activate the street; conserve and enhance the special character, appearance and historic identity of the area and mediate a transition in scale.

The application site lies immediately adjacent to the Hillgate Conservation Area. It does not accommodate any individual heritage assets subject to statutory or local listing. The site is however adjacent to a number of locally listed buildings, notably Churchgate Mill and 34 Hopes Carr. The river valley of which it forms a part is of considerable historic interest, particularly in relation to the late C18th and C19th industrial development of Stockport. A heritage assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal which considers the impact of proposals upon the setting of the Hillgate Conservation Area to the west of the site and the setting of statutory and locally listed buildings. The design of the submitted scheme has been developed through a process of pre-application advice and external input from Places Matter. The mass, form and appearance of the proposed L-shaped apartment block has been informed by the former industrial use of the site and a significant change in level between the site and the adjacent Hillgate Conservation Area greatly assists in avoiding or minimising any harmful impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area or upon longer distance views and vistas featuring heritage assets across the town centre.

The Heritage Statement submitted with the application does not afford any consideration to potential assets of archaeological importance. Previous studies carried out by the University of Manchester in 2004 concluded that there is significant potential for archaeological remains to survive intact. As such it is considered that a programme of archaeological works in advance of development commencing should be secured by condition. This should comprise the excavation of a series of evaluation trenches across key components of the two former mills to confirm the presence, extent, condition and significance of any archaeological remains, thereby enabling an appropriate strategy to mitigate any impact from development to be devised.

Compliance with the Town Centre Residential Design Guide is explored throughout this report however for the purpose of considering the impact upon the character of the area it is noted that the development responds to the context and character of the area by reinforcing the enclosure of the streetscene afforded by the 5 storey bulk of the adjacent residential development to the north and solid mass of the retaining wall and higher development on the opposite side of Hopes Carr. The development also includes an animated frontage through the presence of floor to ceiling windows, Juliet balconies, recessed and projecting bays, a reception area and access around the building to the rear of the site.

The application accommodates a small cluster of goat willow trees, a group of alder, crack willow, sycamore, ash and goat willow together with another group of silver birch, alder, goat willow, sycamore, ash and cherry laurel. None of these trees are legally protected and being of moderate to low quality are not of sufficient amenity value to warrant legal protection. These trees will be removed to accommodate the proposed development and given the site coverage of the proposed development there is no opportunity within this application site to accommodate replacement planting.

Whilst tree planting especially to the front of the site would be beneficial in terms of enhancing the character of the area, it is noted that the adjacent development to the north lacks tree planting to the site frontage (other than a small provision at the junction with Wellington Street) with the built form being positioned at the back edge of the footpath. Existing development opposite the site and to the south on both sides of Hopes Carr (Waterloo House, 34 Hopes Carr and Birchfield House at 48 Hopes Carr) is also positioned on the back edge of the footpath again with no soft landscaping fronting the street. That which does exist, apart from within this application site, generally comprises self seeded specimens growing in what might be considered to be inappropriate locations/positions. As such, whilst the failure to provide for replacement planting conflicts with policy SIE3 and the NPPF, having regard to the character of development within the locality, it is not considered that this would be particularly harmful.

Given the site coverage of the proposed development, there is also little or no scope for soft landscaping to the rear of the apartment building other than a few very small areas. Members will note from the proposed plans that the layout of pathways to the rear of the proposed apartments are such that interconnection with the wider landscape proposals for the urban park (DC090691) would be possible. Should the proposals for the urban park be brought forward then the setting of the residential development would be enhanced by those extensive landscaping proposals. If however that adjacent site remains as existing then the development will be viewed in the context of this informally landscaped open space.

Whilst the provision of landscaping within a site is expected and to be encouraged, it is acknowledged that in the town centre constraints exist in terms of land availability vs the desire to maximise housing delivery. Given the context of the site and wider character of the area, whilst the lack of soft landscaping in the site is regrettable, it is not considered that this would be particularly harmful in this instance.

Subject to the imposition of conditions to secure details of materials of external construction and landscaping, it is considered that the proposed development will preserve the setting of adjacent heritage assets and reflect the character of the locality in accordance with policies HC1.3, H1, SIE1, and SIE3 together with chapters 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

Core Strategy policy H1 confirms that good standards of amenity and privacy should be provided for the occupants of new and existing housing. This is reinforced by policy SIE1 which confirms that satisfactory levels of amenity and privacy should be maintained for future and existing residents. The NPPF confirms that development should create places that promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users (para 135).

In considering the impact of the proposed development upon the amenities afforded by the existing and future residential occupiers, regard has been paid to the Council's SPD 'Design of Residential Development'. The SPD confirms that the design and layout of a development should minimise overlooking and should not impose any unacceptable loss of privacy on the occupiers of existing dwellings. Guidance is also offered as to the level of amenity space required for dwellings. The recently adopted Stockport Town Centre Residential Design Guide is also a material consideration and seeks to create homes through the provision of private amenity, privacy and neighbourliness. Communal amenity spaces should be welcoming and attractive and sensitive design and mitigation is required to ensure residential amenity is not compromised, especially relating to noise and odour. Bin

stores, plant rooms and car parking areas should be well-separated from active residential or commercial ground floor frontages to ensure the amenity of residents is not compromised. Large windows with a vertical emphasis to maximise exposure to natural daylight as well as providing opportunities for natural surveillance are welcomed and should be orientated to address the street, public open spaces and internal communal amenity spaces. Design should take an innovative approach to achieving a compact urban form that reinforces a fine urban grain, without compromising residents' privacy or amenity.

Adjacent to the site to the north is a residential development of apartments. Windows in the flank elevation face the application site and are understood to be secondary windows to living rooms and kitchen. These rooms are served by larger windows to the front and rear elevations. The proposed development would be positioned 7.5m from this flank elevation and would also project 23.7m beyond the rear elevation of this adjacent development. Where directly opposite the adjacent flank elevation habitable room windows are proposed to bedrooms and living rooms. Given the small secondary nature of the existing facing windows, it is not considered that this relationship will give rise to an unacceptable impact on these adjacent occupiers in terms of overlooking or visual amenity nor would the future occupiers experience similar impacts. Where the development projects beyond the rear of this neighbouring building habitable room windows would overlook the external amenity area however this area is already overlooked by neighbouring development to the north. Being to the south of this neighbouring development that proposed would cause some loss of light during the day however it is considered that residents of this adjacent site would still continue to receive an acceptable level. The proposed development whilst higher than that adjacent by 2 storeys is similar in scale and as such it is not considered that it would appear visually obtrusive when viewed from this adjacent site.

To the east of the site on the opposite side of Hempshaw Brook are commercial and residential properties on Orchard Street. The projecting wing to the north of the building would be positioned circa 39.9m from the rear of the commercial units and the main rear elevation of the proposed building would be 52m to 54m from the rear of the residential dwellings. This complies with and exceeds the separation distances set out in the SPD and will ensure that an acceptable level of amenity is retained and provided. Given the degree of separation it is not considered that there will be any impact in relation to light or visual intrusion.

To the south of the application site is Waterloo House, a detached commercial building. A planning application to demolish this and erect 28 apartments remains under consideration by Officers. As this application is in outline form with all matters reserved, it is not possible to confirm where the building would be positioned or where there would be facing windows. This adjacent site is however small in size and as such it is reasonable to assume that the built development would be positioned on the boundary as it is at present. The application also has not been approved and even if it were, it could not be confirmed if the development would proceed. Notwithstanding that it is appropriate that consideration be given to the impact upon it whether that be in relation to the existing building or that proposed.

The end, south elevation of the proposed development would be positioned 1.7m to 3m from the existing side elevation of Waterloo House however has been amended such that it only contains secondary windows to living rooms and kitchen areas. Noting that the principle aspect from these apartments will be to the west and east (front and rear) this will ensure that the future occupiers benefit from an acceptable level of amenity. It is also important to note that this revision would ensure that this

development does not prejudice any future proposals for Waterloo House adjacent to the south.

Whilst the siting of the proposed development relative to the flank elevation of the neighbouring apartments and Waterloo House does not accord with the separation distances set out in the SPD for residential development, the SPD acknowledges that in providing adequate space between dwellings account needs to be taken of local character. The Council may accept the need for a flexible approach between new dwellings, within the town centre, for example. Members will be aware that the density of development is much higher within the town centre given that there is simply not the space that exists in the more suburban and rural parts of the Borough. In the town centre it is generally accepted that developments are close together and residents are accepting of this when choosing to live in this location. The proposed development is considered in keeping with the character of development in the town centre in terms of its interface with existing development adjacent to it and amendments have been secured to address issues relating to amenity. It is therefore considered that there will not be an unacceptable impact on amenity as a result of this interface and as such a relaxation of the guidance in the SPD is considered appropriate in this instance.

There are no residential occupiers opposite the application site to the west and the only development that does exist is a vacant retail show room at an elevated level and set back from Hopes Carr. The side elevation of this building facing the application site contains no windows. As such it is not considered that the proposed development will have an adverse impact on this property. The proposed development is positioned 22.5m to 26m from the side of the showroom and thus accords with the space standards in the SPD. The future occupiers of the proposed development will there be afforded with an acceptable level of amenity.

The SPD for residential development confirms that whatever the size or location of a dwelling there will always be a requirement for some form of private amenity space ranging from balconies, roof gardens and communal private space associated with flats. 1 bed flats should have either a 5m² balcony or 18m² of communal space and 2 bed flats should have 35m² of communal space (with no standard for balconies).

All 15 apartments (2 beds) to the lower ground floor with an aspect to the north and east will benefit from terraces ranging in size from 4.2m² to 15.5m². At ground floor level the 2 duplex apartments (1 beds) facing Hopes Carr will each have a terrace ranging in size from 3.5m² to 4.1m² and the 1 bed accessible apartment will have a terrace 10.1m². At first floor to 4th floor level there will be no external amenity space provided; whilst these apartments will have Juliet balconies, these will not afford any external space. At 5th floor level, a communal terrace 120m² will provide outdoor space for the 3 apartments (all 2 beds) at the northern end of the building which directly overlook this terrace. These 3 apartments will also each have a private terrace ranging in size from 20.5m² to 31.5m². Of the remaining apartments at 5th floor level the 1 beds (8no.) will have a terrace ranging from 6.4m² to 11.4m² and the 2 beds (2no.) will have a terrace ranging in size from 11.5m² to 15m².

Of the 106 apartments proposed 31 will have some form of external amenity space and 75 will have no provision. Some of that proposed exceeds and accords with the recommendations of the SPD (or is very close to according) and some proposed is less than that suggested as appropriate. Whilst there is a flat roof that could potentially provide a roof garden, that will accommodate PV panels and air source heat pumps and be laid with sedum to assist in the reduction of carbon emissions

and enhance biodiversity; as such the use of this area for communal amenity space is not feasible.

To secure communal amenity space in full accordance with the recommendations of the SPD would certainly result in the footprint of the development being reduced and the number of dwellings that could be delivered. The redevelopment of sites within the town centre where land is constrained give rise to challenges in terms of delivering much needed housing whilst also providing for amenity; it is therefore accepted that the same level of amenity cannot be delivered as within the suburban and rural areas of the Borough. Those within the development who are provided with a terrace or communal space will have external space that is of a size and layout that either accords with the SPD and where not, still allows for meaningful use. With regard to those apartments that have no provision it is expected that residents will make a conscious decision to live in the town centre where they can enjoy and take advantage of all it has to offer in terms of access to services, shops, restaurants and public transport vs amenity space provision. Having regard to the above, it is not considered that the lack of amenity space will result in an unduly harmful impact.

For sake of completeness on the issue of amenity space provision, it is acknowledged that if approved and implemented, the urban park proposed on the adjacent site would provide opportunities for the occupiers of this development to benefit from external amenity space (and into which the application proposes connecting pathways). The delivery of that urban park cannot however be relied upon and whether it proceeds or not, it remains the case that the proposed residential development should make provision for residential amenity space where possible. St Thomas recreation ground is a circa 20 minute walk away as is Woodbank Park and as such, there are no existing public parks within a reasonable distance of the site that could compensate for that not provided within the development. The failure of the development as a whole to provide for amenity space and conflict with policies H1, SIE1, para 135 of the NPPF and both the SPD's referenced above is weighed against the benefits of the development at the end of this report.

No means of site enclosure is shown on the proposed site layout however it is noted that there is already a wall enclosing the existing residential development to the north. To the south the application site will in part be adjacent to Waterloo House however to the rear, the development would be open to the adjacent land to the west of Hempshaw Brook. Having regard to the current condition of this land and it being outside of the application site, it is considered necessary for there to be some form of enclosure so as to separate the application site from the wider area on either side of the brook and to provide security for the proposed development. Noting the proposed pathways into what would be the urban park, this could include lockable gates where appropriate and can be secured by condition.

In response to the Town Centre Residential Design Guide, members are advised that bin stores, plant rooms and car parking areas are well-separated from the apartments; large windows with a vertical emphasis are proposed to the main elevations to maximise exposure to natural daylight as well as providing opportunities for natural surveillance and are also orientated to address the street. Furthermore the design approach, with the exception of amenity space provision will reinforce the urban grain, without compromising residents' privacy or amenity.

Putting aside the consideration of amenity space provision, the application can therefore be considered compliant with policies H1, SIE1 and para 135 of the NPPF in relation to all other matters relating to amenity.

Control of Pollution

Policy SIE3 seeks to ensure that new development does not cause unacceptable pollution nor suffers from such. The NPPF confirms that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the 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 or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions and by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate (para 187). Planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum any potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life (para 198).

The application is supported by an Air Quality Assessment, a Phase 1 Site Investigation (Contamination) and a Noise Assessment.

In respect of air quality, the assessment has considered dust and fine particulate matter during the construction phase, and road traffic emissions during the operational phase. During the construction phase, the risk of dust soiling effects is classed as low for earthworks, and medium for construction and trackout; the risk of human health effects is classed as low for earthworks, construction and trackout. Mitigation measures have been proposed to further reduce any potential impacts based on best practice guidance. For the operational phase assessment, annual mean NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations have been modelled at eight existing and three proposed receptor locations, using the most recent Emission Factor Toolkit available from DEFRA (EFT v11.0) at the time of preparation. Predicted annual mean concentrations have been compared to the relevant air quality objectives and target level. The operational phase assessment has concluded that the development will result in concentrations of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} remaining below the air quality objectives/target values, both without and with the development for the proposed 2025 Opening Year and 2028 Future Year. The impact of the development is predicted to be negligible at all eight existing sensitive receptors that were assessed. Air quality effects are therefore considered to be 'not significant'. The assessment has demonstrated that the proposed development will not lead to an unacceptable risk from air pollution, or to any breach in national objectives. A condition can be imposed to secure the submission, approval and implementation of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) which will assist in the reduction of air pollution during construction works. No conditions are necessary to control air pollution during the occupation of the development.

With regard to noise pollution, the impacts arising from transportation and commercial premises has been considered and assessed against the relevant British Standards. The proposed development will achieve the required internal noise levels in all noise sensitive rooms through the use of thermal double glazing. Compliance with the Noise Impact Assessment can be secured by condition. The above mentioned CEMP will also assist in the reduction of noise during construction works.

Given the historic and more present use of the site for fly tipping, there is the potential for contamination to be present with the ground. As such a detailed review of the site will need to be undertaken and proposals for remediation developed.

Subject to the imposition of conditions to secure this review together with the implementation of any required remediation, it can be concluded there the proposed development will not give rise to adverse impacts in relation to ground contamination.

The proposed development is therefore compliant with policy SIE3 and para 187 and 198 of the NPPF.

Highway Considerations

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

In considering development proposals the Council will require that adequate provision is made for the storage, handling and removal of waste from the site (policy MW1.5).

Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health. Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making (NPPF para 110).

In assessing specific applications for development, local and national policies seek to ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location. Safe and suitable access to the site should be achieved for all users; the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach (NPPF para 115).

Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe (NPPF para 116).

Applications for development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second (as far as possible) to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use. Development should address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; create places that are safe, secure and attractive which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards; allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency

vehicles; and be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations (NPPF para 117).

All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed (NPPF para 118).

The proposed development is likely to generate in the region of 32-34 two-way vehicle movements during the AM peak and 31-33 during the PM peak. This includes traffic associated with the proposed on site parking as well as from those who do have a parking space but choose to travel by taxi, get lifts or use a car club car as well as visitors. Noting that that vehicle movements would access the site from both the north and south and would then be distributed across the wider highway network, it is concluded that this level of vehicle movements should not have a material impact on any junction on the local highway network or result in a material increase in queues or delays.

The proposed apartment building will incorporate a 43-space basement car park. Vehicular access to the car park will be via an access ramp within the building which will take access via a new access on Hopes Carr located immediately to the south of the existing access ramp down to Lower Carrs. This will benefit from an acceptable level of vehicular visibility and there will be sufficient room for vehicles to turn into and out of the access. Whilst the access will be of sufficient width to allow vehicles to independently turn into and out of the site and pass, the access ramp will be single lane. Traffic signals will therefore be provided to control vehicle movements on the ramp and a passing area will be provided at the bottom of the ramp to allow vehicles to pass at the bottom of the ramp. Formation of the access, adjacent servicing layby and new footway across the site frontage will require the existing kerb line on the east side of Hopes Carr to be built out. This will result in the carriageway being reduced to 5.5m in width, which should be sufficient to allow service vehicles to pass.

Pedestrian access into the building will be via two ramped access on Hopes Carr located to the north and south of the vehicular access (with the latter also having 2 steps to Hopes Carr). In addition, two duplex apartments will have their own accesses, again on Hopes Carr. Pedestrian accesses will also be provided from 3 points of the basement parking to the rear of the development such that connection could be made into the proposed urban park if approved and delivered. This rear access from the basement car park will also allow vehicles to exit the rear of the building; this is primarily afforded to vehicles involved in the maintenance of the culvert noting that there is a manhole directly into the culvert beneath the building. These means of access are all considered acceptable and will be safe and practical to use; a condition will be imposed to restrict the use of the rear vehicle access to culvert maintenance vehicles only.

The existing ramped access route from Hopes Carr to Lower Carrs (which is adopted highway) is proposed to be retained and regraded as part of the proposed development so as to provide a route for pedestrians, cyclists and service vehicles (to service the open space to the east of the apartment building). Access will be controlled by drop-down bollards and it will be used by the Council's maintenance vehicles, such as vans, JCBs and 7.5T tippers, when maintaining the open space to the east of the site. The existing setts on the ramp would be retained, with new paving strips added to provide a smooth surface for pedestrians and the section of

Lower Carrs is proposed to be surfaced in stone sett paving carriageway. This is considered acceptable and be of a sufficient width and layout to allow proper use.

43 car parking are proposed to be provided in a basement car park), including 11 spaces for disabled badge holders. 28 of these parking spaces will have electric vehicle charging points, including 2 rapid charge points. Long stay cycle parking for 109 cycles is proposed to be provided within 4 cycle stores within the ground floor of the building accessed via an access ramp from Hopes Carr and 4 cycle stands are proposed to be provided to the front and 4 spaces to the rear of the building so as to provide short-stay cycle parking. 12 Sheffield stands are also proposed to be provided within the basement car park.

This level of parking accords with the adopted parking standards (in terms of minimum standards for disabled badge holders and cycles and maximum standards for general car parking) and the Council's guidance on parking provision for electric vehicles (assuming a 2025 year of occupation). If the development is to be occupied later than 2025, a greater number of charging points will be required but the provision of these can be secured by condition.

The overall number of car parking equates 40.5% of the maximum number of spaces that would be permitted based on the adopted parking standards or around 2 spaces for every 5 apartments. The Transport Assessment (TA) includes an assessment of expected parking demand, using 2021 Census data. This outlines that only 36.1% of people living in flats in the area of Stockport where the development will be situated have access to a car and if the level of car ownership for the proposed development was to be same as that for other developments in the area, parking demand by residents would be around 38 cars. As such, the proposed level of parking should meet the demand of residents, as well as that of visitors, and should not increase on-street parking demand. In addition and noting that there are parking restrictions in the area, it is concluded that the proposal should not adversely impact on highway safety or on the availability of public car parking in the area. With respect to cycle parking, the proposed level of long-stay cycle parking will accord with the adopted parking standards and should meet the demands of visitors.

A servicing layby is proposed to be constructed on Hopes Carr to the south of the site access for use by vehicles when servicing the site. This is intended to be flush with the footway allowing it to be used by pedestrians when it is not occupied by a vehicle and will be formed by amending the existing kerb line on the east side of Hopes Carr. This will result in the carriageway being reduced to 5.5m in width, which should be sufficient to allow service vehicles to pass. Formation of the layby will also require an existing speed cushion to be amended and the loss of three on-street pay and display parking spaces.

Two bin stores are proposed to be provided to serve the proposed apartments. These will comprise of a store to the southern end of the that can accommodate 7 no. 1280l Eurobins and 2 no. 360l bins and a store to the immediate south of the vehicular access that can accommodate 15 no. 1280l Eurobins and 2 no. 240l bins. Both would be accessed from service doors on Hopes Carr close to the servicing layby. The TA outlines that on-site staff would manage the bin stores, ensure bins do not block the footway and are returned promptly to the bin stores. With respect to post and parcels, mail boxes and a parcel room / area will be provided within / adjacent to both entrances of the apartments.

A review of the proposed servicing arrangements concludes that, subject to detail, they should be acceptable. The servicing layby should meet the servicing

requirements of the development and the bin stores should be of sufficient size to accommodate the required volume of waste and are sufficiently close to the layby. Notwithstanding that details of servicing needs to be agreed (e.g. details of access and parcel lockers) however can be secured by condition. The lay-by has been amended slightly so as to allow a 2m wide footway to be provided adjacent to it. Vehicle swept-path tracking diagrams are included in the Technical Note to demonstrate that refuse vehicles will be able to turn into and out of the amended layby, as well as travel along Hopes Carr and pass a car. Tracking does show, however, that it would be quite tight for two refuse or other large vehicles to pass. Noting that this is unlikely to happen on a regular basis and such a manoeuvre could be carried out at low speeds, it is concluded that this should not adversely impact on the safe operation of Hopes Carr.

A “Loading Only” Traffic Regulation Order will be required to manage the servicing layby and, as the existing traffic calming features will need to be amended, a notification process will be required. The developer will be expected to meet the cost of this (£7500 with RPI indexation). The developer will also be expected to compensate the Council for the loss of car parking income that will result from the loss of the pay and display parking spaces that will be lost as a result of the proposed development. Both these matters can be secured by Section 106 agreement.

In terms of accessibility, all parts of Stockport Town Centre are within reasonable walking distance of the site (1km) and this includes food stores, primary schools and various other shops and services. Other parts of the Borough, including the Heaton, Reddish, Brinnington, Bredbury, Offerton, Davenport, Cheadle Hulme and parts of Cheadle, Bramhall and Hazel Grove are within a reasonable cycle distance (5km) of the site and a number of cycle routes pass through the area. With respect to public transport, Stockport Train Station and Bus Interchange are also within reasonable walking distance of the site (1km), there are a number of bus stops within 300m of the site with routes that serve a range of areas and Stockport Railway Station is served by a wide range of rail services.

A detailed / qualitative review of all routes and infrastructure in the vicinity of the site concludes however that not all routes and infrastructure allow or encourage access to the site by foot, cycle and public transport. For example, there are not continuous footways on Hopes Carr, Lavenders Brow Steps and the link to Wellington Street are poorly surfaced, unlit and overgrown and have sub-standard handrails, Lower Carrs is not properly surfaced, unlit and overgrown, not all crossing places benefit from dropped kerbs and tactile paving and not all bus stops in the area have shelters.

Whilst the scheme includes proposals to provide a continuous footway along Hopes Carr, as well as proposals to improve part of Lower Carrs, improvements should also be carried out to the other parts of Lower Carrs, as well as Lavenders Brow Steps and the link to Wellington Street, so as to improve access to the east. Uncontrolled pedestrian crossings (dropped kerbs with tactile paving) should also be provided at a small number of locations. The requirement to carry out such improvements can be secured by condition (and delivered by means of a S278 Agreement).

A Framework Travel Plan (FTP) has been submitted in support of the application, which the TA states “outlines initial strategies and measures for encouraging travel by sustainable modes, rather than single occupancy car trips”. A review of the FTP concludes that it provides information on travel plans, the proposed development, access arrangements and the accessibility of the site, existing travel to work modal share, the aims and objectives of the plan, some information on targets (including

indicative modal share targets) and how the travel plan will be monitored and information on various measures that would be implemented to encourage sustainable travel.

The FTP also outlines that a residents' travel survey would be carried out once 50% of the apartments are occupied or after 12 months (whichever is sooner) and annual surveys would be carried out for a minimum of 5 years, with the modal split calculated from the surveys.

A review of the FTP concludes that whilst the key measure of providing residents with a Travel Information Pack may encourage some residents to travel by sustainable modes, many more measures should be included in the travel plan. In addition, the travel plan needs to clarify how information will be provided (other than in the Residents' Travel Information pack), it is also considered that it needs to include further information on the development (including details on parking, EV charging provision, parking allocation and management and site servicing), surveys should include parking demand and trip numbers, an objective should be to ensure parking demand does not exceed supply and a full travel plan (with initial targets based on census data) should be prepared prior to occupation to allow a Travel Plan to be brought into operation upon occupation of the building. These issues, however, could be addressed through the development of the FTP to a full Travel Plan prior to occupation of the development and can be secured by condition.

As with all development, construction of the apartment building and associated works will obviously have highway implications and is likely to require highway closures and hoardings and scaffolding within the public highway. Vehicle routing, contractor's parking and where vehicles will load and unload will also need to be determined and agreed. The TA outlines that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be drawn up for approval by the Council prior to the commencement of any construction works and contractors would be required to carry out works in accordance with the approved CTMP. It also outlines that this would include details on traffic management, access, parking, cranes, temporary works and where materials will be unloaded and the principle of a CTMP will be to minimise the impact of construction operations.

The applicant's willingness to produce and implement a CTMP is welcomed, and it is concluded that the production and implementation of a detailed and robust CTMP should ensure that the impact of the development will be minimised. The requirement to do this can be secured by condition. The applicant / developer should note, however, that, whilst the Council may permit part of Hopes Carr to be hoarded to enable construction (subject to suitable traffic management), they cannot assume a large area will be able to be hoarded or that infrastructure or materials will be permitted to be stored on the highway. As such, it is likely that an off-site compound will be required.

The proposed development will not impact on any designated public rights of way as the route between Lavenders Brow and Wellington Street referred to the Public Rights of Way Officer is outside of the application site.

Having regard to the above the proposed development is considered compliant with policies CS9, T1, T2, T3, MW1.5 and the NPPF.

Accessible Development

Accessibility for all is key to the attainment of sustainable development and is recognised as such within Core Strategy policies CS1, SD1, CS3, H1, CS8, SIE1,

CS9, T1 and T2 which seek to influence the design and layout of new development. This is reflected throughout the NPPF in seeking to create places that are inclusive and accessible (para's 96 and 135).

The application advises that all apartments are designed to comply with Building Regulations approved document M and as such will be of a size and layout that are accessible for wheelchair users visiting any apartment. In addition to this, 5 apartments will be designed such that they can be occupied by wheelchair users. From this it can be concluded that all pathways, ramps, access points, doorways, lifts, communal spaces and apartments will be accessible by all. Whilst a cobbled surface is proposed to the pedestrian/cycle link from Hopes Carr, smooth surfaces will be inserted into this to allow use by the less ambulant, cycles and buggies.

Accessible parking spaces are proposed within the basement to a level that accords with the Council's parking standards and which also include provision for EV charging. These spaces are positioned closest to the lift shafts so as to allow convenient access to the building by users of them.

The proposed development can be considered compliant with policies CS1, SD1, CS3, H1, CS8, SIE1, CS9, T1 and T2 together with para's 96 and 135 of the NPPF.

Ecology and BNG

Saved UDP Review policy NE1.3 seeks to protect natural habitats and development must secure the continuing viability of the habitat or wildlife interest of the site by adopting flexibility of the design of development, the inclusion of mitigation measures and appropriate maintenance. The Core Strategy at policy CS8 confirms that development will be expected to make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of the borough's natural environment and biodiversity. 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 (CS policy SIE3).

Chapter 15 of the NPPF reinforces the importance of biodiversity and development securing gains.

The application is supported by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat & Bat Survey, an Aerial Tree Inspection, a BNG Metric, Ecological Appraisal and BNG Assessment.

The site has no nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise. Many buildings have the potential to support roosting bats and the proposed works. The existing buildings will be demolished as part of the proposed works. All trees on the site have been assessed for bat roost potential. Suitable sett building and foraging habitat is available on the site and badger are widespread through the Stockport area. The site was surveyed in 2022 and again in 2023 for evidence of badger activity and none found. Buildings, trees and other vegetation on-site have the potential to support nesting birds. Habitats on site have the potential to support hedgehog. Invasive non-native species (INNS) surveys have been undertaken, Japanese Knotweed and Himalayan Balsam were recorded on the site. Both of these plants are on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it an offence to spread or otherwise cause to grow these invasive species in the wild. A brook runs through the site and this provides potential water vole and otter habitat. This area surveyed and no evidence of either species was found. Given the poor condition of the brook and the fact that it is culverted for significant distances up and down stream of the site, likelihood of these species being present is very low.

The buildings were assessed for bat roost potential and all are considered to offer negligible potential. All trees on the site were assessed and roost features identified on 4 trees within the south-western section albeit with low potential. Two of the four trees to be felled during construction were subject to further climb and inspection surveys; one has no potential for bat roosting however the other contains a single viable bat roost feature. This can be removed but felling should be undertaken by way of a Precautionary Working Method Statement. In addition, appropriate compensation should be provided in advance of impacts in the form of an additional woodcrete bat box suitable for crevice dwelling bats fixed to a mature tree on site. The location and specifications of this bat box should be provided on a plan and can be secured by condition. As the site offers potential for foraging and commuting bats, any lighting should be of a suitable design and luminance such that it does not result in adverse impacts on this protected species; this can be secured by condition. Prior to work commencing, a badger survey will need to be undertaken to check the site for new mammal holes and the potential setts outside the site. If any new mammal holes are found or evidence of recent badger activity, the ecologist must advise the construction team on how to proceed lawfully (e.g. by applying for a licence and/or implementing appropriate buffer zones to prevent disturbance). This can be secured by condition.

To minimise the potential risk to badgers and other wildlife during construction, reasonable avoidance measures can be secured by condition.

To protect breeding birds a condition should be imposed to ensure that no vegetation clearance works take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before vegetation clearance works commence and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site, including a minimum 4m exclusion zone left around identified active nests until nesting is confirmed complete by a suitably qualified person.

The application site is located adjacent to watercourse which provides an ecologically important corridor which wildlife use to move between fragmented habitats. In order to protect the watercourses' function as a wildlife corridor, a watercourse pollution avoidance method statement should be secured by condition to include measures to protect the watercourse from pollution harmful to wildlife.

As invasive non native species have been recorded adjacent to the site, an invasive non-native species protocol should be secured by condition prior to the commencement of development. This will detail the containment, control and removal of invasive species on site.

Noting that the ecological surveys are now over 2 years old, a condition should be imposed to secure repeat surveys prior to the commencement of development. These will establish if there have been any changes in the ecological baseline; and should identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes. Where the survey results indicate that changes have occurred that will result in ecological impacts not previously addressed in the approved scheme, the original approved ecological measures and BNG calculations will be revised and new or amended measures, and a timetable for their implementation, should be submitted for approval prior to the commencement of development. Works will then be carried out in accordance with the proposed new approved ecological measures and timetable.

Although the current application pre-dates the requirement for mandatory min. 10% BNG under the Environment Act 2021, measurable gains for biodiversity are expected within development in accordance with national and local planning policy (NPPF and paragraph 3.345 of the LDF). This planning application provides an opportunity to incorporate features to increase the biodiversity value of the final development in accordance with these policies. A biodiversity enhancement strategy should therefore be secured by condition to provide:

- features for nesting birds and roosting bats within the proposed building; 4 bird boxes e.g. swift boxes or sparrow terraces and minimum 4 bat boxes;
- invertebrate provision in addition to wildflower / pollinator planting e.g. insect tower, bee bricks, log piles or brash/dead wood piles etc;
- any close-board fencing should incorporate gaps suitable for maintaining connectivity and allowing movement of hedgehogs through the site (approximately 130 x 130mm);
- native species planting including fruit and berry bearing species including native species hedgerows (e.g. holly/ yew) could be planted at site boundaries where possible; and
- native tree planting along the street front (Hopes Carr) and boundaries.

In relation to BNG the redevelopment of the site results in the loss of all existing habitats and the only habitat creation on site will be that associated with the green roof. The application therefore proposes to replace this habitat together with the 9.82% gains on the adjacent site as part of the proposals to create an urban park (DC090691 refers). Noting that this residential application is not subject to delivering the mandatory 10% gains to biodiversity (having been submitted before this mandatory requirement came into effect), the gain proposed is considered acceptable. Details of how this gain will be delivered on the adjacent site will be secured through a BNG management and monitoring plan.

As advised above in this report, it is not confirmed who would be responsible for delivering the proposed urban park if permission is approved nor can it be assumed that it would definitely proceed given that there would be no legal linking of the implementation of both proposals (such as through a Section 106 agreement). To account for the scenario that it is not possible to deliver the BNG for the residential development within the urban park, a commuted sum of £23,716 will be secured by a Section 106 agreement such that the Council can deliver that BNG elsewhere off site.

Subject to the above, members are advised that the proposed development in relation to ecology and BNG accords with policies NE1.3, CS8, SIE3 and the NPPF.

Energy and Climate Change

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

Policy SD3 requires development to demonstrate how it will assist in reducing carbon emissions through its construction and occupation through the submission and approval of an energy statement. Notwithstanding this Members will be aware that changes to Part L of the Building Regulations in June 2022 focus on greater fabric performance, lower energy demand, and a move away from fossil fuels (gas

and oil boilers) to electric heating systems. The changes should cut carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from new homes by around 31% and non-domestic new builds by 27%. In existing buildings, regulations will typically apply to new build extensions or the installation of new materials or technology. These standards for energy efficiency are now higher than that required by policy SD-3.

Development should be designed in such a way as to avoid, mitigate or reduce the impacts of climate change (policy SD6). Measures might include:

- Provision of appropriate green cover (shaded green space and tree cover);
- Provision of green roofs, walls and boundaries;
- Urban design that encourages air flow throughout the development;
- Passive cooling that allows natural ventilation to cool the building or development in preference to mechanical cooling;
- Solar shading designed into buildings to avoid internal overheating; or
- Water features such as lakes, ponds, fountains and watercourses.”

The NPPF at para 161 confirms that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050. It should help to shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The need to mitigate and adapt to climate change should also be considered in assessing planning applications, taking into account the full range of potential climate change impacts (para 163).

The UK has set into law a target to bring all its greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050. In March 2019, Stockport Council declared a climate emergency, and agreed that Stockport should become carbon neutral by 2038, in advance of the UK 2050 target. The Stockport CAN strategy was developed to underpin this agreement and was approved by the Council in October 2020. The strategy sets out to ensure that Stockport achieves carbon neutrality by 2038, in order to support global efforts to prevent global warming going above 1.5°C.

The Energy Statement submitted in support of the application confirms that carbon emission reductions will be achieved using building materials with high fabric efficiency, implementing passive design (utilising natural ventilation and sunlight) and installation of renewable/low carbon technologies including solar photovoltaics, air source heat pumps, waste water heat recovery and mechanical ventilation and heat recovery. The proposed development has been designed to be compliant with the current expectations of Part L 2025 requirements.

Each apartment will operate a dual heat pump system which will replace traditional gas boilers. 112 Internal wall-mounted air-to-air source heat pumps will individually supply each dwelling and the additional communal areas with space heating (also capable of providing cooling if this feature is enabled). The roof-mounted air handling units draw in external air for heat exchange, which supply the space heating. Domestic hot water will be supplied for each dwelling by an air-to-water heat pump integrated into the hot water cylinder, which connects to the air handling units via air ducts or the façade.

A 0.545kWp roof-mounted solar PV panel is proposed for each of the 106 dwellings mounted on the roof space of the apartment block. The amount of electricity generated from these will offset the electricity demands of the development.

Limited space on the roof means that it will be difficult to include more panels that can generate meaningful amounts of electricity.

Waste Water Heat Recovery will be used to capture heat in waste water from showers and baths that would otherwise be lost. Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery will be implemented to overcome ventilation issues caused by high air tightness and capture heat energy that would otherwise be lost in the ventilation process.

EV charging points will be installed in 28 car parking spaces in line with local policy. Building Regulations Part S may exceed this requirement depending on how the spaces are allocated in which case the greater of the requirements will be implemented.

A sedum roof is also proposed which will assist in combatting the issues presented by the urban heat island effect, reducing surface water run-off and improving the efficiency of solar PV panels.

The above measures are supported and will ensure compliance with policies CS1, SD3 and SD6 together with the NPPF. A condition should be imposed to secured a glint and glare assessment of the PV panels to ensure that they do not cause harm to aviation safety due to the proximity of Manchester airport and the associated flight paths. A further condition should also ensure that the development accords with the submitted Energy Statement.

Flood Risk and Drainage

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

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

Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere (para 170).

A sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding (Para 173). Within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to

areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source (para 174).

When determining any planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment (para 181).

Para 182 confirms that applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. These should provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, through facilitating improvements in water quality and biodiversity, as well as benefits for amenity. Sustainable drainage systems provided as part of proposals for major development should:

- Take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority;
- Have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; and
- Have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development.

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore has a low probability of flooding. Given this location there is no requirement for a sequential or exception test to be undertaken.

By way of background, within the application site the Hempshaw Brook is in part culverted before flowing openly through the adjacent site to the south. Discussions have taken place between the applicant, LLFA and the Environment Agency as to the daylighting (opening up) of the culvert and it was concluded and agreed that the culvert should remain. The reasons for this include the constraints of the site in terms of the depth of the culvert, the alignment with existing sewers, impacts on biodiversity net gains that would arise from daylighting together with the impact that the naturalisation of the brook would have on adopted highways that cross the site. As such the brook will remain culverted as existing within the site.

Responsibility for the maintenance of the culvert will remain with the riparian owner who will be obliged to maintain the culvert in accordance with a strategy set out within the Drainage Strategy submitted with the application. This includes an annual inspection for blockages and damage to ensure that debris build up is routinely removed so as to avoid blockage of the culvert and regular year round inspections of the culvert screen and proposed security fencing to remove debris (around the side and top of the existing culvert mouth).

Whilst providing access for the Environment Agency and riparian owner for maintenance, the proposed development closes off the culvert entrance from the general public and residential occupiers of the development.

The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment which confirms that during the 1 in 100 year event, the 1 in 100 year event plus 41% climate change and in the 1 in 1000 year event, the site is not inundated with floodwater and will be flood free. It is only when there is an extreme blockage of the culvert (to 66%) running under the site that the site might be flooded in the 1 in 100 year event (plus 41% climate Change) and then only the part of the site closest to the brook would flood. Given the scale and nature of the development and the size and location of fluvial flooding sources it has been concluded that the fluvial flooding poses a low flood risk to the site. In relation to surface water, the application site in relation to this residential

development will not be impacted by flooding and again is of a low risk. The site is therefore unlikely to flood except in extreme conditions.

Notwithstanding the low risk, to mitigate against flooding the finished floor levels of the residential development will be set 2.95m above the 1 in 100 year (plus 41% climate change) event, 2.65m above the 1 in 1000 year event and 1.05m above the 1 in 100 year (plus 41% climate change) culvert blockage event. The parking undercroft and external routes will be positioned at a lower level however will still be set above the flood events referenced above.

Basements include access to higher levels thus allowing a safe and dry escape should a flood occur. Hempshaw Brook will continue to flow through the site as it does now and no major changes to the watercourse and/or culvert are proposed. Access to the culvert will be retained so as to allow for its maintenance.

On the basis of the above it is considered that any flood risk can be effectively managed and therefore the consequences of flooding should it occur are acceptable. Noting that the site is located within flood zone 1 (and therefore has the lowest risk of flooding and is the most sequentially preferable location for development, the proposals are considered acceptable in this respect.

The application is also supported by a Drainage Strategy which notes the presence of made ground in the location of the residential development extending to 4.2m below ground levels. Below this the underlying natural strata comprises sand, gravel, silt and clay. Groundwater levels were recorded at between 2m and 3.5m below ground level with shallower levels adjacent to the brook. The site also evidences contamination sources though its historical use as a cotton mill and engineering works but also from more recent fly tipping, demolition rubble and waste materials present at ground level.

Given the above conditions the discharge of surface water via infiltration has been discounted and instead it is proposed to discharge site surface water directly to the brook. Surface water will be stored on site and its flow into the brook will be attenuated through the use of a hydrobrake to a minimum rate of 2 litres per second. This has been designed to ensure that there is no surcharge in the 1 in 1 year event, that surface water flows remain on site up to a 1 in 100 year (plus 45% climate change storm event) and sufficient storage will be available to ensure there is no risk to property.

Foul drainage will connect to the on site adopted combined sewer network.

Maintenance of the drainage system will be carried out by a maintenance management company who will be responsible for regular inspections and the carrying out of required repairs and maintenance.

The above strategy is considered to be well informed, robust and appropriate given the constraints and location of this site. Members are advised that subject to the imposition of a condition to secure further details of the drainage system and management thereof, the proposals can be considered acceptable. It is noted that United Utilities have requested a detailed drainage plan prior to the determination of the application however it is considered that the application includes sufficient information to allow for the determination of the application with further details being secured by condition.

Having regard to the above the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy are considered compliant with policies EP1.7, SD6 and SIE3 together with the NPPF.

Fire Safety

This issue is generally a matter for consideration as part of the Building Regulations where detailed design and construction matters are considered; there are no development plan policies or advice within the NPPF that specifically refer to the need for fire prevention measures however development is expected to be safe (policy H1, CS8, SIE1 and para's 96, 115, 124 and 135).

The NPPG also advises that following the Grenfell Tower fire on 14 June 2017 the Government commissioned the Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety led by Dame Judith Hackitt. The report highlighted the need to transform the fire and building safety regime and recommended that *"some minimum requirements around fire safety will need to be addressed when local planning authorities are determining planning applications and will require input from those with the relevant expertise."*

Government made a commitment in 'A Reformed Building Safety Regulatory System: Government Response to the 'Building a Safer Future' Consultation' to introduce 'planning gateway one'. Planning gateway one has two key elements:-

- to require the developer to submit a fire statement setting out fire safety considerations specific to the development with a relevant application for planning permission for development which involves one or more relevant buildings, and
- to establish the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) as a statutory consultee for relevant planning applications.

Noting that 'relevant buildings' comprises development that contains two or more dwellings or educational accommodation and meet the height condition of 18m or more in height, or 7 or more storeys, the proposed development is expected to demonstrate consideration of this issue.

The application is therefore accompanied by a Fire Statement which documents the principles, concepts and guidance relating to fire safety that will be applied to the scheme, in so far as these can reasonably be established at the project planning stage, as required at Planning Gateway One.

In this respect the fire statement is intended to support the consideration of information on fire safety issues relevant to land use planning matters e.g. where fire safety issues relate to site layout and access. It is not a full consideration of Building Regulation or Fire Safety Order requirements as further detailed design is required to establish these.

The Fire Statement confirms how the development will be constructed and occupied in relation to materials of construction, means of escape, evacuation alert systems, sprinkler systems together with fire service access and water supplies for firefighting purposes. Having considered the Fire Statement, the HSE advise that the fire safety design of the proposal is acceptable to the extent that it affects planning considerations. Being a statutory consultee on this application, the position of the HSE is afforded significant weight in the consideration of fire risk and Officers have no reason to disagree with their response.

On the basis of the above the proposal accords with the development plan and NPPF.

Crime Prevention

Policy H1 of the Core Strategy requires development to provide good standards of safety and security. This is reiterated in policies CS8 and SIE1 together with the NPPF at para's 96, 124 and 135.

Submitted with the application is a Crime Impact Statement which identifies the positive benefits of the development as being:

- The redevelopment of this vacant site (which currently can attract antisocial and criminal behaviour, such as fly tipping, loitering, and drug/alcohol consumption) will reduce the potential for misuse due to increased residential activity.
- The development will introduce more residential units into this area which will be beneficial to the local area and the existing apartments to the north of the site.
- There will be a basement area which will allow residents to park their vehicles securely within the building.
- Inside the building there will be bicycle stores allowing residents to store their bicycle securely within the building where they are less vulnerable to theft.
- The main entrances into the apartment building will be taken from Hopes Carr where it can easily be seen from the public highway, allowing for natural surveillance from surrounding buildings and passive surveillance from those passing by on foot and in vehicles.
- Mail will be delivered within the lobbies of the building. the configuration of the internal layout will prevent postal workers from having further access into communal areas of the building.

The CIS only identifies 3 areas of possible concern. These are:

- Apartments with terraces should be inaccessible from the public realm due to level changes and/or balustrades/boundary treatments.
- There is a recessed area to the rear of the building at the southern end of the which could generate misuse.
- Access control and physical security of the buildings should be carefully considered.

Additionally, the CIS makes a number of recommendations which would enhance the security of the development. These include:

- Access the basement car parking area should be restricted with a high speed shutter, or gates, positioned as close to the entrance of the car parking ramp as possible to prevent creating a recessed area or concealment from view, which could facilitate misuse of this space.
- Access into and around the building should operate on a robust access control system.
- Lower ground floor terraces should be well defined with an appropriate boundary to prevent them being easily accessed from the landscaped area to the rear of the building. Consideration should be given to installing alarms to these properties, with alarm boxes located on the external elevation to deter offenders. Doors, windows, and glazing to these terraces should be to a burglary resistant standard and there should be illumination to the terraces operating on a photocell.

- The recessed area to the car park at the southern end of the building could potentially conceal an offender, or antisocially minded individuals/groups, which could generate misuse to the detriment of residents. It is recommended that this recessed area is omitted or well overlooked/illuminated to deter unwanted behaviour.
- External communal access doors must be compliant with and certified to BS PAS 24, STS202, or LPS 1175 SR2, including a lock capable of being operated via an electronic access control system. The communal entrance doors should be self-closing and secured with a multi-point electronic lock operating with an electronic access control system, these features should be permitted under the scope of the certification.
- Access into the buildings should be controlled by a video entry phone system (with the picture viewable on the phone unit, rather than on a television set) so that residents can vet visitors before allowing them access into the building. There should be no unrestricted trade access into the building.
- Doors into cycle stores should operate on an access control system, operated with resident's key card/fob. Access into cycle stores should be restricted to genuine users rather than every resident of the building/block. Cycle stands should allow both wheels and the frame to be secured (i.e. Sheffield stand or similar). Two tier systems are permitted, but the locking of both wheels and the frame should be possible.
- Basement car parking and bicycle parking areas should be illuminated in accordance with BS 5489.
- Access into amenity spaces, should operate on access control to restrict these spaces to residents and legitimate visitors. The access control system in these areas should be fully auditable so that access logs can be examined in the event of an incidents, or if there is any damage.
- The development should be covered with a comprehensive CCTV system covering the main entrances, elevations of the buildings, entrance to the car park, car parking areas and reception areas.

Members are advised that the need to secure a development must be balanced against the need to deliver a development that is attractive and welcoming to use and live within. In response to the comments made by GMP the proposed west elevation shows a roller shutter to the top of the ramp into the basement and external terraces at lower ground floor level being 2m above ground level are also enclosed by balustrades. Coupled with the provision of locks to windows, it is considered that the occupiers of these apartments will be adequately protected. The applicant has advised that there will be access controls into the building and details of external lighting will be secured by condition.

Recommendations such as those relating to access control and the management, lighting and security of internal areas go beyond planning control and whilst desirable, cannot be insisted upon or secured through the grant of planning permission. Notwithstanding that, an appropriately worded condition can secure compliance with the Crime Impact Statement where it relates to matters within the control of planning and the applicant can be advised through the imposition of an informative to consider the inclusion of other measures identified in the Statement.

For the above reasons and subject to the imposition of a condition to secure additional details, the proposed development can be considered compliant with policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 together with the NPPF.

Economic Benefits

The application makes the case that the proposals will contribute to job creation through the construction of the development and expenditure by the new resident population, and its contribution to the size and depth of the local labour force. It is suggested that an average of 1.5 jobs will be created directly and maintained by each property built; these jobs are those created by the developer and through the construction process. On this basis the development could deliver in the region on 159 direct jobs. Estimates also suggest that each dwelling constructed leads to up to four indirect jobs in the wider economy, for example this could be in manufacturing and services, as new people move to an area, those people use the local shops, which may need to recruit extra staff or greater patronage on the local buses which in turn may need to recruit more staff. The indirect jobs arising from the development could therefore be in the region of 424 new employment opportunities. Furthermore, once completed the development could attract skilled and well educated people therefore benefitting local employers.

Members are advised that the above is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application noting that the NPPF in seeking to build a strong, competitive economy confirms that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development (para 85). In response to this it is acknowledged that new housebuilding in the Borough, and the contribution of this sector to the local economy, is currently constrained by the very significant shortfall in the five-year housing land supply. Whilst the above figures quoted by the applicant have not been verified, it is evident that the development will contribute to the economy in the areas identified.

Other Matters

A condition should be imposed to secure the submission and approval of a glint and glare assessment of the PV panels to ensure that they do not cause harm to aviation safety due to the proximity of Manchester airport and the associated flight paths. This will ensure compliance with policy SIE5 which seeks to safeguard the operational integrity and safety of Manchester Airport.

In response to objections not already addressed in the report above, it is noted that local residents appear to use the application site for recreational purposes such as dog walking. It is acknowledged that access into the site is not controlled at all and therefore the public can, and apparently do, make use of it. It should however be noted that the site has no lawful planning use for recreation and simply comprises a vacant, derelict and unmanaged parcel of land. As such the recreational benefits of the site should not be elevated to anything other than that of informal use. It should also be noted that the application that is before Members covers only a small element of this wider site with the remaining land being subject to the proposals for the creation of an urban park. If approved and implemented these proposals would secure authorised public access to the wider site in a setting that is significantly superior to that which currently exists. Until such a time as that park is delivered and even if the residential development is constructed, access to the wider site via the adopted highway from Hopes Carr and Orchard Street will remain.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

Returning to para 11d of the NPPF, Members are reminded that planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As the policies which are the most important for the determining the application are out of date (these are the housing delivery policies of the Core Strategy in this instance given

that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply) this means granting planning permission unless:

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect the adjacent Conservation Area provide 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 the 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 relation to para 11d (i), it has been established in the report above that there will be no harm to the adjacent Conservation Area. As such, the application of policies in the Framework that protect this adjacent heritage asset do not provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed.

In relation to para 11d (ii) the adverse impacts of granting planning permission need to be weighed against the benefits. In order to assist Members, the adverse impacts and benefits arising from the proposed development when assessed against the Development Plan and NPPF are set out below.

The adverse impacts are limited to the failure to make provision for children's play and formal recreation, the funding of additional school places generated as a result of the proposed development and the lack of amenity space provision, soft landscaping and replacement tree planting within the site.

As set out in the report above, the size and scale of the development in terms of its site coverage precludes the provision of on site play for children. To secure this would result in the footprint of the development being reduced and in turn the level of housing delivered. The FVA submitted with the application confirms that the development will not be viable if contributions to children's play, formal recreation and education are made; put simply if they are required then the development will not proceed. Notwithstanding this, given the large scale of the development and most likely longer timescale for construction, it is considered appropriate to secure a late stage review of viability once the development is nearing completion through a Section 106 agreement. Should the development be more profitable than forecast then this may secure some contribution in this respect by way of a commuted sum payment.

In relation to amenity space provision, whilst some apartments will benefit from external space others will not. Noting that the further provision of terraces or communal gardens would impact on housing delivery, this under provision needs to be balanced against the urgent need to deliver more homes. Noting the location of the site within the town centre where there is often not the space to make provision without impacting on the numbers of dwellings proposed and the expectations of future occupiers about such provision given the location vs access to services, shops, restaurants and public transport, it is not considered that the lack of amenity space will result in an unduly harmful impact.

The site coverage of the development also impacts on the ability to secure replacement tree planting within the site and any meaningful areas of landscaping.

Having regard to the character of built development within Hopes Carr it is not considered that this will cause particular harm.

Weighed against the adverse impacts, Members must also consider the benefits that will arise from the proposed development. These include:

- The partial redevelopment of this wider vacant and derelict site thus assisting in the regeneration of this part of the town centre.
- The delivery of 106 dwellings at time of very significant housing undersupply and which will assist in addressing housing need.
- A development that is in keeping with the character of the area and will preserve the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.
- A development that will protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and those of the future occupiers of the development in terms of visual intrusion, privacy, daylight and sunlight.
- A development that will not give rise to unacceptable levels of pollution, mitigates against the pollution found within the application site and ensures that future occupiers will not suffer from the adverse impacts of pollution.
- The erection of a development in a sustainable and accessible location that will cause no harm to highway safety and delivers a safe, practical access together with a sufficient level of parking provision.
- A development that is accessible to all in terms of its internal and external layout.
- A development that causes no harm to protected species and delivers net gains to biodiversity.
- A development that is constructed and occupied such that it delivers reductions to carbon emissions.
- A development that will not give rise to flooding and incorporates a sustainable drainage strategy.
- A development that protects the future occupiers against fire risk.
- A development that will assist in the reduction of crime in the area, which is resilient to crime and provides for a safe and secure environment for its future occupiers.
- A development that will deliver economic benefits to the locality through its construction and occupation.

Material also to the consideration of the application is the compliance of the development in relation to policy H3 and the NPPF with regard to affordable housing. Noting also that there is the potential for affordable housing provision by a commuted sum payment through a late stage review of viability.

In weighing the adverse impacts against the benefits, it is concluded that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission do not significantly or 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(ii), particular regard has been paid to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land and securing well-designed places. The presumption in favour of sustainable development therefore applies and planning permission should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the following:

- a “Loading Only” Traffic Regulation Order contribution (£7500 with RPI indexation);
- compensation for consequent loss of SMBC on-street parking bays;
- offsite biodiversity net gain contribution of £23,716 if not provided within the adjacent site;
- a late stage viability review in respect of affordable housing, education and public open space provision and management; and
- a monitoring and management fee.