

Application No: 15/1683M

Location: LAND OPPOSITE, Lowerhouse Mill, ALBERT ROAD, BOLLINGTON

Proposal: Development of 38 new houses including 11 affordable houses, landscaping, landscape buffer zone, flood mitigation and ground works, roads, associated highways and infrastructure.

Applicant: Johnson Mulk, Prospect GB

Expiry Date: 10-Jul-2015

SUMMARY:

It is acknowledged that the Council is unable to robustly demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and that, accordingly, in the light of the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, it should favourably consider suitable planning applications for housing that can demonstrate that they meet the definition of sustainable development.

There is an environmental impact in the locality due to the development taking place on a green field, however, the proposal falls on land which is allocated for employment uses and appeals on this site and the land opposite have been allowed and development has been found to be acceptable.

It is considered that a scheme for housing would fall in line with policies contained within the NPPF. The principle of developing land, which is allocated for employment purposes has been established elsewhere and will help to contribute to both local housing needs, and the Council's five year housing supply. It is also considered that housing on the application site will also have a more positive impact on the local area than industrial development.

The proposal would satisfy the economic and social sustainability roles by providing for much needed housing adjoining an existing settlement where there is existing infrastructure and amenities. The proposal would provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing, and contributions to public open space. In addition, it would also provide appropriate levels of public open space both for existing and future residents.

The boost to housing supply is an important benefit – and this application achieves this in the context of a deliverable, sustainable housing land release, where it cannot be demonstrated that there is a need for the site to be safeguarded for employment purposes. Local concerns of residents are noted, particularly in respect of highway matters, but the impact is not considered to be severe under the NPPF test. In fact, the impact from a residential scheme would be less than that of a commercial one.

The design is considered to be appropriate too, is any impact on amenity. Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact upon highway safety, amenity, flood risk, drainage, landscape and ecology.

The scheme represents a sustainable form of development and that the planning balance weighs in favour of supporting the development subject to a legal agreement and conditions.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Full Planning Approval is sought for the construction of a residential housing development comprising a total of 32 units, comprising 19 detached dwellings, and 13 semi-detached dwellings. The application would also include 10 affordable dwellings.

All properties would be provided with off street parking spaces. The detached and semi detached properties would all have private gardens.

It should be noted that initially the scheme was submitted for 38 units, however, revised plans were submitted, which see the number of dwellings reduced from 38 to 32, an improved location of the area of formally equipped play (which would measure 633 sq. m), so as to link in with the area secured under application 14/3844M on the land opposite, and increased space separation distances between the dwellings.

SITE DESCRIPTION:

The application site consists of predominantly flat agricultural grassland surrounded by mature hedgerows. The central section of the site is, in part, characterised by elongated & rectangular mounds of top soil, scraped from the rest of the site several years ago.

To the south, it is bounded by industrial buildings, which form Slater Harrison. The road to the west of the site terminates at the Council's Household Waste Recycling Centre. To the north of the site is the River Dean, with open countryside beyond it.

The site area is 3.13 hectares.

Access to the site is taken from Albert Road.

It should be noted that residential development has been granted (subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement) on the land opposite (application 14/3844M) for 33 dwellings in January 2015. The closest residential properties to the application site lie on Woodlea Drive and are two storey detached properties.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

| | |
|----------|---|
| 09/3836M | Erection of 3 no detached industrial buildings divided into 16 no. small units with associated parking and landscaping (renewal of 06/2355p) – Approved 3 rd February 2010 |
| 06/2355P | Erection of 3no detached industrial buildings divided into 16no small units with associated parking and landscaping – Approved 27 th November 2006 |
| 05/0270P | Renewal of application 99/2296P for industrial development (B2 usage) – Approved 29 th March 2005 |
| 99/2296P | Industrial development (B2 usage) revised scheme – Refused 10 th January 2000 – Appeal Allowed 21 st July 2000 |

NATIONAL & LOCAL POLICY

National Policy:

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Of particular relevance are paragraphs:

- 14 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- 50 Wide choice of quality homes
- 56-68 Requiring good design
- 69-78 Promoting healthy communities

Development Plan:

The Development Plan for this area is the 2004 Macclesfield Local Plan, which allocates the whole site under policy E4. This policy allows for general industry (Class B2), warehousing (Class B8), high technology (Class B1b), and light industry (Class B1c) usage.

The relevant Macclesfield Local Plan Saved Policies are considered to be: -

Built Environment

- BE1– Design Guidance
- BE2 – Historic Fabric

Development Control

- DC1 – New Build
- DC3 – Amenity
- DC5 – Natural Surveillance
- DC6 – Circulation and Access
- DC8 – Landscaping
- DC9 – Tree Protection
- DC35 – Materials and Finishes
- DC36 – Road Layouts and Circulation
- DC37 – Landscaping
- DC38 – Space Light and Privacy
- DC40 – Children’s Play Provision and Amenity Space
- DC41 – Infill Housing Development
- DC63 – Contaminated Land

Employment

- E1 – Retention of existing and proposed employment sites
- E4 – General Industrial Development

Transport

T2 – Integrated Transport Policy

Environment

NE11 – Protection and enhancement of nature conservation interests

NE17 – Nature Conservation in Major Developments

Housing

H1 – Phasing policy

H2 – Environmental Quality in Housing Developments

H5 – Windfall Housing

H13 – Protecting Residential Areas

Recreation and Tourism

RT5 – Open Space

Implementation

IMP1 – Development Sites

IMP2 – Transport Measures

The saved Local Plan policies are consistent with the NPPF and should be given full weight.

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version (CELP)

The following are considered relevant material considerations as indications of the emerging strategy:

- MP1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- PG6: Spatial Distribution of Development;
- SE1: Design;
- SE2: Efficient Use of Land;
- SE3: Biodiversity and geodiversity;
- SE4: The Landscape;
- SE5: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland;
- SE6: Green Infrastructure;
- SE9: Energy Efficient Development;
- SE12: Pollution, Land contamination and land instability;
- SE13: Flood risk and water management;
- EG3: Existing employment sites;
- IN1: Infrastructure
- IN2: Developer Contributions:
- SC4: Residential Mix
- SC5: Affordable Homes
- SD1: Sustainable Development in Cheshire East;
- SD2: Sustainable Development Principles; and
- CO1: Travel Plans and Transport Assessments.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

The following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) have been adopted and are a material consideration in planning decisions (within the identified former Local Authority areas):-

Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing (Feb 2011)

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Relevant legislation also includes the EC Habitats Directive and the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994

North West Sustainability Checklist

SPG on Section 106 Agreements (Macclesfield Borough Council)

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

HIGHWAYS:

The Strategic Highways Engineer raises no objections to the proposals.

There is one point of access to the site. The technical designs of the access points are acceptable and visibility has been provided at the junction. The parking provision for the residential units within the site meets current standards.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

No objection subject to conditions relating to hours of operation, dust control, floor floating, pile driving and contaminated land.

A noise impact assessment has been carried out to gauge the impact between the commercial/industrial uses. The EHO had concerns of the proximity of the houses and gardens to odour sources and recommends bunding (with a fence on top of a mound) to the southern boundary.

This site is within 250m of a known landfill site or area of ground that has the potential to create ground gas. The application is for new residential properties which are a sensitive end use and could be affected by any contamination present. A gas risk assessment has been undertaken and the results provided. Although the report shows that there are not significant quantities of gas present on the application site, further gas risk assessment is required as currently the monitoring is insufficient. The Contaminated Land Officer should be contacted prior to scoping out the Phase II site investigation works. The gas monitoring boreholes currently on site are very shallow (1m in depth), therefore in order to provide a thorough assessment of the site, further deeper boreholes are required. Further monitoring rounds are also required, in line with best practice guidance. A robust soil sampling strategy is also required, as so far no information has been provided in this regard. As such, and in accordance with the NPPF, the Contaminated Land Officer recommends that a condition can be attached to ensure that a Phase II investigation is submitted for approval and any recommended remediation is carried out on site.

UNITED UTILITIES:

No objection subject to a condition relating to the submission of a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters for the entire site.

HOUSING:

The Housing Strategy and Needs Manager Supports the Scheme as there is an urgent demand for Affordable Housing in Macclesfield and Bollington.

The Housing Strategy and Needs Manager commented on the proposal for 38 units and comments are awaited on the revised plans.

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY:

The Public Rights of Way Officer raises no objections to the proposed development. The Public Right of Way Officer advises that the site lies adjacent to public footpath No. 47 Bollington. It appears unlikely, however, that the proposal would affect the public right of way, although the PROW Unit would expect the planning department to add an advice note to any planning consent to ensure that developers are aware of their obligations

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY (EA):

Raised no objections in principle to the proposed development, subject to the following conditions and informatives:

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment and the mitigation measures detailed within the FRA.

1. *Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the development to the existing (greenfield) rate of 5.0 litres/second.*
2. *Provision of compensatory flood storage.*
3. *Finished floor levels to be set at a minimum height of 0.6m above the agreed 100year climate change flood level.*

While the outline design of a compensatory flood storage scheme has been sufficiently explained within the FRA and the principle established, it is considered necessary for additional detail design information to be provided for approval. Because of the fundamental nature of the compensatory works to the development scheme as a whole it is considered necessary for this information to be submitted and approved at the earliest opportunity, prior to development commencement. Failure to do so may lead to unacceptable increases to flood risk elsewhere. The EA requests that the following condition is therefore attached:

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a detailed design for compensatory flood storage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The EA have reviewed the Preliminary Risk Assessment with respect to potential risks to controlled waters from land contamination. The site is situated in a sensitive location with respect to controlled waters. The report provided indicates that the site has potentially been subject to significant previous contaminative land, which may be potential sources of

contamination to Controlled Waters in the vicinity of the site. An off-site historic landfill has been identified adjacent to the northern site boundary in close proximity to the site and industrial use has been identified adjacent to the southern site boundary. Planning permission should only be granted with a condition which requires a scheme of foul and surface water to be submitted to prevent pollution of the water environment and controlled waters.

THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION AND CAPITAL STRATEGY MANAGER:

This development will generate 7 primary and 6 secondary aged pupils.

The primary schools within a 2 mile radius of the site are forecast to have a shortfall of 25 places by 2019, and therefore a contribution will be required for those pupils generated by this development. $7 \times 11919 \times 0.91 = \text{£}75,924$.

There is forecast to be 130 surplus places in the local secondary schools and therefore, no sum is required for Secondary school places.

GREENSPACES:

The Green Spaces Officer initially raised concerns with the location of formal equipped play area, however, the revised plan shows this to be in a far more favourable location now.

A commuted sum for offsite Recreation Open Space provision will be required. The amount for 32 family units would be £32,000. Further comments are awaited from the Green Spaces Officer to the revised scheme.

REPRESENTATIONS

The planning application was originally advertised by the Council through neighbour notification letters that were sent to all adjoining land owners and by the erection of a site notice.

Approximately 7 letters of objection have been received from local households. The objections are summarised as follows: -

Access/traffic

Housing traffic demand is very different to employment demand and will contribute massively to peak traffic levels. Peak times are the biggest issue with Albert Road and must not be increased further or gridlock will occur. Not a good state of affairs when the unmanned fire station is located on the road and the firemen need to get to the fire station before the engine can leave.

The access to the site can only be described as potentially dangerous with traffic congestion at various and frequent times of the day both on Albert Road and Moss Brow. The safety of school children, parents, runners, walkers and cyclists, not to mention, the maximum possible access for the fire station in any emergency situation needs taking into account.

The parking on Albert road on the bend near the Mill adjacent no 11 Ridley Road is causing increased difficulty in safely pulling out of Ridley Road and an increased traffic flow would make this problem worse.

Flood risk

This land floods regularly. Last time the river flooded, it flooded it removed all evidence of the Sandmartins, which nested in the banks. It is crucial that the Sandmartins be allowed to return to this long established site even if the wildlife officer could find no evidence of the nests, which had been washed away in the floods. They have nested here every year since records began.

Are the properties in the flood plain, as they are clearly only meters away from the source of the flood plain, ie the stream? After a heavy nights rain, the stream had risen to within 6 inches of the bridge, (a rise of approximately 24 inches,) so what we wonder after three days heavy rain residents are sure this matter is under consideration and the implications it may have on existing flood plain levels and to unsuspecting purchasers of new houses on what neighbours earlier property searches suggests is a flood plain.

There is in several places along the stream banks evidence of flood debris well above the bridge height.

The area is a precious habitat that supports badgers, water voles, bats, barn owls, kingfishers and sand martins. Changes to the river made elsewhere in Bollington have already affected detrimentally the nesting sites for sand martins so further changes that put this and other species at risk must not be made.

Loss of employment land

The applicant claims that the site has not been developed and as such should be removed from employment land. The situation is that in an economic downturn employment land will not be developed but will be saved for the future. Also, with development of several key employment sites within Bollington (Kay Metzeler and the canal side timber site) it is debatable if there is enough employment land in Bollington.

The new draft Cheshire East Plan makes particular reference to the importance of employment land and states that 27 hectares are needed to keep pace with growth in the economy. This beautiful green field was previously designated as employment land and should be retained as such if it is to be developed at all. At least then its new use will remain in keeping with the location's industrial heritage.

In keeping

It appears that the style and layout of the proposed development is not in keeping with that of what is a settled and harmonious area.

Other matters raised

This site should be reviewed as part of the imminent Neighbourhood Plan and any decision should await this review.

These house are being built adjacent to the refuse/recycling tip. One resident is sure that any future residents will complain of noise, smell, and traffic at the weekend

The area under consideration is quite a unique flood plain been of some fertile grassland, wooded and natural river formation, and all the bugs, birds etc. that live there, and of course the amount of daily visits to the net work of footpaths that grace this area, used and enjoyed by numerous dog walkers, naturists, walkers and visitors alike. One proposal is to preserve this area in perpetuity for the people of Bollington, and visitors, as a park in similar fashion to the Bollin Valley.

One resident puts forward that the prevailing economic demand and conditions of the time of the original planning no longer exist.

It is generally agreed that Lowerhouse is an area of architectural and historic significance (Greg Mill, workers cottages, school and library etc.) and notwithstanding the development in question, it is only a matter of time before it is elevated to conservation status (to be included in the local plan). To put up a modern housing estate in this location will be an insult to the concept of this status. This point is especially pertinent now that the importance of Bollington's industrial Heritage has been confirmed by Cheshire East Council.

New occupants will need healthcare and the children will need schooling. Do the Bollington Health Centre, the 4 primary schools and Tytherington High School have sufficient extra capacity to accommodate new patients and pupils? If not, the proposal should be rejected.

Any conditions applied to the other side of the road should be applied including those included by the planning inspector when the appeal occurred.

Following the submission of revised plans, further neighbour consultation letters have been posted. At the time of preparing the committee report, no further comments had been received from residents.

VIEWS OF THE TOWN COUNCIL

Bollington Town Council recommends the application for refusal on the following grounds: -

1. Potential flooding and compounded drainage issues for surface and foul water.

The Town council's view is that this land should be left to fulfil its important purpose as a flood plain and at the very least no permission be given until the issue of effective mitigation measures have been fully resolved on the application site and the adjacent site.

2. Traffic flows.

It is simplistic to use the argument that the 38 new houses on the proposed site will generate less traffic than the employment approved in the 1970's but not implemented. Since this application was granted we have seen very large increases in car ownership. Bollington has also seen vastly increased use of cars not least on school runs.

It is the Town Council's and the local community's view that no permission should be granted for this proposed development until there has been a full analysis of traffic impact taking into account the impact of the 34 homes approved under 14/3844M.

The Council and the community are also concerned that the proposed development threatens the long term sustainability of Bollington's Recycling Centre which is a major resource for the Bollington Community and its surrounding residents. The proximity to the Household Waste Site could give rise to pressure from the new residents to close the site.

3. Loss of Employment Land

The land is currently designated for employment purposes and is a logical continuation of the employment opportunities provided by Lowerhouse Mill and the adjacent units. It has been stated many times by the Town Council to Cheshire East that employment land in Bollington is being replaced by housing. The latest supplementary work for Cheshire East's Local Plan resubmission has identified an increased need for employment land of 27 hectares and the continued loss of such land in Bollington undermines Bollington's position as a sustainable working community. It should also be noted that National Planning Policy recommends that in flood prone areas development for employment is preferred rather than housing.

In terms of the history of this site and the apparent lack of demand for employment, the Town Council's view is that such marketing has not been active enough, particularly over the last 5 years. Bollington Town Council has evidence of local companies being unable to find suitable sites in Bollington to relocate or expand into and are left with no choice but to move outside Bollington. Bollington's only business park is the Bailey Business Park. This is relatively small and fully occupied. We are currently in the process of visiting all our 360 local businesses as part of our Neighbourhood Plan process to understand their needs for growth and the above message is coming through, for example from our local Joinery business, our brewery and our tyre depot all of which have already, or may in future be forced to relocate.

4. Vital Heritage Issues

Lowerhouse is the repository of the legacy of the Greg family centred on the work of Samuel Greg between 1832 and 1847 and subsequently by his brother Robert and younger Greg family members who donated Bollington the recreation ground and the Greg Fountain, scene of the first Well Dressing Bollington in 2005. Lowerhouse Mill currently stands out in the landscape in this area.

An estate of modern houses backing up against the Mill, which is a listed building, will severely diminish the buildings stature and position in the Neighbourhood.

Many people will know that the Civic Society for a number of years has advocated a Conservation Area at Lowerhouse to protect the important Greg legacy in architecture and history.

Cheshire East have commissioned Arup to provide a report which is designed to assess issues such as the Green Belt and cultural heritage and legacy in Cheshire East. That report recognises the need to re-invigorate the importance of heritage and legacy in Cheshire East and specifically recognises the importance of Bollington's industrial heritage in that context.

The Town Council objects to this application on the grounds that it will demean and diminish the impact of that heritage in Bollington.

5. Bollington is in the midst of creating a Neighbourhood plan.

Cheshire East Council has approved Bollington's Neighbourhood Plan declaration and is supporting us with consultancy time from Cheshire Community Action and expert planning advice. Bollington Town Council has a group of 42 committed community volunteers, a steering group and five active sub groups and are well into the process of consulting everyone 16 years and over in Bollington regarding their views on how Bollington should develop over the next 15 years. This includes where development should take place and what that should be.

Bollington Town Council understand that Bollington cannot stand still but in accordance with the ethos of neighbourhood planning Bollington Town Council feel that developments such as that proposed should be part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. Bollington's plan process will be robust, professional and inclusive of the views of all parties including developers.

Bollington understands Cheshire East's housing growth needs and Bollington will continue to play its part. However, Bollington already have over 200 homes being built or in the pipeline all of which have been built on former employment sites. Bollington Town Council feels that very soon Bollington will be looking at employment growth and the best land for employment will have gone.

The Town Council recommends that Cheshire East refuses or defers this application until Bollingtons Neighbourhood Plan can provide proper evidence of employment need, housing affordability and our land allocation process within the Plan can balance these needs with the needs for open space, protecting Bollington's heritage and Bollington's future as a sustainable town rather than a dormitory of Macclesfield.

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The following detailed reports were submitted with the application:-

- Design & Access Statement;
- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report;
- Transport Assessment;
- Planning Statement;
- Geotechnical, Contaminated, Ecology, Flood Risk Desk Top Report
- Noise Assessment;
- TPO Report

OFFICER APPRAISAL

The key issues are:

- Principle of the Development;
- Loss of land allocated for Employment purposes;
- Affordable Housing;
- Impact on open space;
- Design, Layout and Visual impact;
- Landscape/Trees;
- Highways;
- Residential Amenity;
- Nature Conservation;
- Flood risk
- Environmental Health; and
- Other Material consideration or matters raised by third parties.

Principle of the Development

The site lies within the settlement boundary of Bollington and within a Predominantly Residential Area where policies within the Local Plan indicate that there is a presumption in favour of development.

Para 14 of The Framework indicates that there is a presumption in favour of development except where policies indicate that development ought to be restricted.

Policy H5 within the Local Plan seeks to direct residential development to sustainable locations – this policy accords with guidance within the NPPF and therefore carries full weight. The site constitutes a sustainable location as it is located within the settlement boundary of Bollington and by virtue of its proximity to shops and services within Bollington.

It is considered that this development on this site would make effective use of the land and make a contribution to the Council's 5 year land supply.

The site is allocated as an existing employment area where policy E4 (which normally permits Use Classes B2, B8, B1b and B1c) applies. Furthermore, Policy E1 seeks to normally retain both existing and proposed employment areas for employment purposes to provide a choice of employment land in the Borough. As such, there is a presumption that the site will be retained for employment purposes. This proposal therefore constitutes a departure from the Development Plan. Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In this case, there are a number of relevant material considerations when considering the proposed loss of employment land. These are:

- Replacement of a potentially unneighbourly use to nearby residents, including those on the land opposite which has recently been considered acceptable for residential development.

- HGV's associated with the allocated use would be removed from the highway.
- The site is vacant and is unlikely to come forward for employment development.
- The proposed scheme provides a good mix of housing types 30% of which is offered to be affordable.
- Some on-site public open space would be provided.
- Provision of family-sized homes in Bollington.
- The site is in a relatively sustainable location. The site has good access to the major road network (Wellington Road) and a bus service. Shops and schools are in walking distance.

Consequently, although contrary to the Development Plan, it is acknowledged that there are significant material considerations that indicate that the principle of a residential development on this site is acceptable in this location and that a case to retain employment land would not be sustainable. This is looked at in more detail below.

Permission should only be withheld where any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as noted above.

Loss of Employment land

The application site is designated for employment uses within the Local Plan.

Policy E1 seeks to retain employment land for employment purposes. However, Paragraph 22 of The Framework states that:

“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”

The land at Albert Road has been allocated for employment use since 1997 and despite obtaining consent; it has never come forward for development. The Employment Land Review considers this site in Appendix E1 (page E1-123). It notes that the site has zero prominence, has been actively marketed for rent or for sale, has access constraints and flooding constraints. Other barriers to delivery of employment development include market conditions and the size of the market.

This would suggest that the site is not a prominent site in an attractive location for business as well as having some constraints to its development. The ‘Market Attractiveness’ section (completed by Colliers CRE) of the site pro-forma in the Employment Land Review suggests that residential use would seem a logical use for the site.

The employment land recently lost at Tytherington Business Park was intended for a completely different market sector (serviced offices) and it is not considered that the loss of that employment land increases the likelihood of the land at Albert Road being developed.

The following is a list of large employment sites in the former Macclesfield Borough where employment land is available:

- Tytherington Business Park
- Lyme Green Retail and Business Park
- Hurdsfield Industrial Estate
- Adlington Park
- Poynton Industrial Estate
- South Macclesfield Development Area
- Stanley Green Industrial Estate, Handforth

This equates to there being approx 30 years worth of supply of employment land in the immediate areas of Macclesfield, Tytherington and Bollington based on historic take-up rates from 1996 and although the latest review of the Cheshire East Local Plan Submission Version states that more employment land is required in Cheshire East as a whole, this needs to be of the right type, and in good accessible locations.

In the context of NPPF paragraph 22, on the evidence to date, it would be difficult to argue that there is a reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment purposes and therefore be protected for such use.

Housing Land Supply

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that Council's identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements.

This calculation of Five year Housing supply has two components – the housing requirement – and then the supply of housing sites that will help meet it. In the absence of an adopted Local Plan the National Planning Practice Guidance indicates that information provided in the latest full assessment of housing needs should be considered as the benchmark for the housing requirement.

Following the suspension of the Examination into the Local Plan Strategy and the Inspectors interim views that the previous objectively assessed need (OAN) was 'too low' further evidential work has now taken place and a fresh calculation made.

Taking account of the suggested rate of economic growth and following the methodology of the NPPG, the new calculation suggests that need for housing stands at 36,000 homes over the period 2010 – 2030. Although yet to be fully examined this equates to some 1800 dwellings per year.

The 5 year supply target would amount to 9,000 dwellings without the addition of any buffer or allowance for backlog. The scale of the shortfall at this level will reinforce the suggestion that

the Council should employ a buffer of 20% in its calculations – to take account ‘persistent under delivery’ of housing plus an allowance for the backlog.

While the definitive methodology for buffers and backlog will be resolved via the development plan process this would amount to an identified deliverable supply of around 11,300 dwellings. This total exceeds the total deliverable supply that the Council is currently able to identify – and accordingly it remains unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land.

The above policy context must also be weighed in the planning balance taking account of the sustainability objectives as detailed below.

Bollington is one of thirteen Local Service Centres identified in the emerging CELP. If this application were to be approved, it would relieve pressure on other edge of settlement sites and the Green Belt as part of the provision of housing and strengthen the Councils 5 year land supply position.

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

Affordable Housing

This application includes 10 affordable units, which should equate to 6 to be provided as rented and 4 to be provided as intermediate tenure.

The site falls within the Adlington, Prestbury and Bollington sub-area for the purposes of the SHMA update 2013. This showed a net requirement for 15 affordable homes per annum for the period 2013/14 – 2017/18. Broken down this is a requirement for 1x 1bd, 11x 2bd and 1x 4+bd general needs units and 2x 1bd older persons accommodation. In addition to this, information taken from Cheshire Homechoice shows there are currently 86 applicants, these applicants require 40x 1bd, 26x 2bd and 16x 3bd units.

The Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing (IPS) states that in areas with a population of more than 3,000 the Council will negotiate for the provision of an appropriate element of the total dwelling provision to be for affordable housing on all unidentified ‘windfall’ sites of 15 dwellings or more or than 0.4 hectare in size. The general minimum proportion of affordable housing for any site will normally be 30%, in accordance with the recommendation of the 2010 Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The preferred tenure split for affordable housing identified in the SHMA 2010 was 65% social rented and 35% intermediate tenure.

The IPS outlines that in order to ensure full integration with open-market homes the affordable units should not be segregated in discrete or peripheral areas and therefore should be pepper-potted within the development. The external design, comprising elevation, detail and materials should be compatible with open-market homes on the development. The IPS also requires that the affordable housing should be provided no later than occupation of 50% of the open market dwellings (unless the development is phased with a high degree of pepper-potting, in which case the affordable housing can be provided no later than occupation of 80% of the market dwellings).

Furthermore the affordable homes should be constructed in accordance with Homes and Communities Agency Design and Quality Standards (2007) and should achieve at least Level

3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (2007) or whatever standards the HCA are applying to their grant funding programme at the time.

Comments are awaited from the Housing Strategy and Needs Manager and these will follow in an update report.

Open Space

Public Open Space (POS)

The POS requirement at a rate of 40sqm per dwelling will be 1,280sqm of play and amenity open space.

It is noted from the application that it is proposed to provide this on site as part of the development. Although formal comments are awaited from the Greenspaces Officer, it is understood that the architect has liaised with the Greenspaces Officer and the proposals are generally acceptable. A detailed design scheme for the POS will be required. As will a S106 agreement.

If insufficient POS is provided on site, a commuted sum for offsite provision will be required.

Clarification has been sought from the applicant as to how the applicant proposes the onsite open space to be managed. It is a requirement that the open spaces be provided in perpetuity and measures taken to ensure this. The council may consider accepting transfer of the open spaces with the required 15 year commuted sum for maintenance. This matter will need to be agreed prior to the completion of a S106 agreement. If the applicant intends to retain the POS provision then a landscape management plan will need submitting prior to consent.

Recreation Open Space (ROS)

A commuted sum for offsite ROS provision will be required. The amount for 32 family units would be £32,000. A more accurate commuted sum figure can be calculated once further comments have been received from the Green Spaces Officer.

The commuted sum will be used to make additions, improvements and enhancements to existing Recreation and Outdoor Sport (pitches, courts and greens) provision in Bollington. The commuted sum will be used at Bollington Recreation Ground and/or Bollington Cross. The spend period will be 15 years.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Requiring good design and character and appearance of the area:

The main public view would be from Albert Road from car borne residents who would be visiting the Council's Household Waste Recycling Centre, or residents/visitors to the recently approved site opposite and on foot by people accessing the local footpath network. The site would also be visible at long range view from residents on Woodlea Drive, however, this will not be the case once the recent permission on the land to the rear of Woodlea Drive is implemented for residential development.

The dwellings are proposed to be constructed in reconstituted stone with grey roof tiles and white upvc windows. It would be preferable for high quality materials to be used such as natural stone and slates, or possible man made slates on the roof. The materials can be conditioned, should planning permission be granted. The dwellings would be two-storey. The design of dwellings is considered to be appropriate to the local area.

Highways access, parking, servicing and highway safety:

There is one point of access to the site which would serve the 32 dwellings. The technical designs of the access points are acceptable and visibility has been provided to a satisfactory standard. The parking provision for the residential units within the site meets current standards.

Albert Road joins the B5090 Wellington Road and is a straight road of reasonable standard, it does also serve two primary schools that causes considerable on-street parking at school times in both the morning and afternoon. There are other existing industrial premises served from Albert Road. It is also noted that consent has been granted for the 34 dwellings at Lowerhouses close to the proposal site without highway objection. The Strategic Highways Manager notes the comments on highway/traffic matters from local residents referring to traffic delays on Albert Road. There is also complaint regarding the nature of the road and its ability to carry two-way traffic and also a lack of footways.

In regard to the traffic implications of the development, a development of 32 units is not considered a major development in highway terms and is likely to generate some 22 two way trips in the peak hours along Albert Road and Moss Brow. It has to borne in mind that the industrial consent for the site would have produced a similar level of traffic on the road network but also have included an element of HGV's. All of the development trips to and from the site would not use Albert Road, a proportion of trips will be via Moss Brow.

The access road, which concludes at the Council's Household Waste Recycling Centre measures 5.5m for the short section which would be accessed by traffic generated by the proposed development. This is suitable to cater for two-way traffic, as identified by "Manual for streets". The private drive in the NE corner will need a bin collection between the last property and the "adoptable" road to minimise walk distances for residents and refuse operatives.

It should be noted that the appeal decisions for industrial development on the application site have not found the access arrangements for industrial vehicles to the site to be inadequate.

In summary, there has been an acceptance that the land in this proposal can be developed for industrial use and this is material factor in the assessment of this application. From a highway point of view, it would be preferable if this site was residential as it would not have the HGV element of vehicle trips on the local road network. It is accepted that at peak school times there is considerable on-street parking associated with the two primary schools, although this problem is confined to relatively short times in the morning and afternoon. The problem with parent parking occurs outside most schools and planning applications are not normally refused on all roads that have schools located on them. Considering this particular application, the quantum of development does not produce a severe impact on the road network even if all trips were routed along Albert Road. The traffic associated with the site will

be distributed on two routes and also only a percentage of development traffic will travel during the peak school time, the Strategic Highways Manager cannot therefore recommend that there is a highway reason to refuse this application especially when industrial development has previously been approved on the site.

Residential Amenity

Policy DC3 seeks to prevent development which would cause a significant injury to amenity through issues such as overbearing impact, loss of light and loss of privacy. Policy H13 seeks to retain existing high standards of amenity. Policy DC41 seeks to prevent the overlooking of existing private gardens in a housing redevelopment. Policy DC38 sets out the standards for space, light and privacy in new housing development.

The site is located adjacent to the River Dean and fields. The main relationship with existing buildings is that at Slater Harrison. The revised plans have turned these dwellings around, so that the side gables face the industrial buildings and this relationship is acceptable.

With regard to the inward levels of amenity provided to the occupiers of the proposed new dwellings. It is considered that this broadly satisfies the amenity standards of the local plan. However, the distance between plots 15 and 16 and plots 6 and 7 and plots 21 and 24 are substandard. The applicants' agent has been asked to address this and subject to an alteration here, it is considered that the internal relationships would be acceptable.

Arboricultural Implications

The application was initially supported by an Arboricultural Method Statement but not an Arboricultural Implication Assessment. The Arboricultural Method Statement indicates which trees are proposed to be retained and removed. Trees T2, T3 and T4 would be retained and T5 would be felled. The proposed losses are considered to be acceptable.

An updated tree survey and implication assessment was submitted in response to initial comments received from the Arboricultural Officer, these provide more detailed information relating to the protection of trees. The access arrangements are now considered acceptable with regards to the impact on trees.

An assessment of the hedge status with regard to the Hedgerow Regulations is still required and these details should be provided in an update report.

Ecological Implications

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer has considered the ecological issues associated with the proposed development.

Grassland habitats

The majority of grassland habitats on site are of limited nature conservation value. There are however two areas of grassland located near to the River Dane which are more diverse and worthy of retention as part of the proposed development. The submitted landscape plan refers to river margins being planted up. In order to safeguard the existing nature conservation value of the river corridor, the Nature Conservation Officer has advised that the

landscape proposals should state that the river margins would be safeguarded and managed appropriately. An area of 2758 sq m has been defined for amenity and species rich grassland to be maintained and managed adjacent to the River Dean

If planning consent is granted, the Nature Conservation Officer recommends that conditions be attached to ensure no development takes place within 8m of the top of the bank of the River Dane, and that a method statement be submitted for safeguarding of the river corridor during the construction process. In addition, a condition requiring the submission of a habitat management plan would be required.

Roosting bats and trees

A single tree has been identified on site that has significant potential to support roosting bats. It appears that this tree would be retained as part of the proposed development, consequently the proposed development is unlikely to affect roosting bats.

Hedgerows

Hedgerows are a priority habitat and hence a material consideration. The proposed development will result in the loss of a section of hedgerow to facilitate the proposed site entrance. Replacement compensatory hedgerow planting should be provided as part of the proposed development. This could potentially be provided around the flood alleviation area. It is considered that this replacement planting can be secured under a landscape condition.

Badgers

As with other previous surveys undertaken on this site evidence of badger activity was present on site, but there is no evidence of a sett being present. As the status of badgers on a site can change within a short timescale if planning consent is granted a condition should be attached requiring a further badger survey to be undertaken and submitted to the LPA prior to the commencement of the development.

River Bollin Corridor

The submitted plans include an 8m buffer adjacent to the River Bollin to allow the EA to undertake maintenance works. In order to safeguard the nature conservation of the river it must be ensured that this area is retained as semi-natural habitat free from any development.

If planning consent is granted the Nature Conservation Officer advises that two conditions would be required to safeguard the river corridor, firstly that the 8m buffer is retained as semi natural habitat and secondly that proposals are submitted for the safeguarding of this corridor during the construction phase.

Barn owls and Common Toad

The habitats associated with the river corridor have been identified as offering high quality foraging habitat for barn owls. Common Toad, a priority species, has also been recorded on site. The Nature Conservation Officer advises that the retention of the river corridor habitats described above, and the proposals within the submitted ecological report for the provision of two amphibian hibernacula, would assist in mitigating the potential impact of the development upon both barn owls and common toad.

Himalayan Balsam

This non-native invasive species has been recorded on the application site. If planning consent is granted, the Nature Conservation Officer advises that a condition should be attached requiring the submission of proposals for the eradication of this species.

Breeding birds

If planning consent is granted standard conditions will be required to safeguard breeding birds and to ensure some additional provision is made for roosting bats and breeding birds as part of the proposed development:

Conditions

If planning consent is granted the Nature Conservation Officer advises that the following conditions should be attached:

- Retention of 8m buffer zone of semi-natural habitat adjacent to the river Bollin
- Submission of proposals for the safeguarding of the river and associated 8m buffer during construction phase
- Submission of proposals for the eradication of Himalayan balsam from the application site
- Pre-commencement badger survey
- Submission of proposals for the provision of two amphibian hibernacula

Environmental Health

Whilst other legislation exists to restrict the noise impact from construction and demolition activities, this is not adequate to control all construction noise, which may have a detrimental impact on residential amenity in the area. Therefore, a condition is suggested to control hours of demolition and construction works in the interest of residential amenity. A condition is also suggested in the event that piled foundations are used. A condition to control dust from the construction is suggested to reduce the impacts of dust disturbance from the site on the local environment. Details of waste and refuse provision would also be conditioned.

Due to the proximity of the proposed residential development to industrial buildings at Slater Harrison on the southern aspect of the site a noise impact assessment was requested to gauge any impact from the commercial/industrial uses. It is recommended that a fence on top of a bund will address any issues.

Whilst this scheme itself is of a relatively small scale, and as such would not require an air quality impact assessment, there is a need for the Local Planning Authority to consider the cumulative impact of a large number of developments in a particular area. In particular, the impact of transport related emissions on Local Air Quality. The transport statement submitted with the scheme makes reference to the accessibility of public transport, walking and cycling routes. The accessibility of low or zero emission transport options has the potential to mitigate the impacts of transport related emissions, however it is felt appropriate to ensure that uptake of these options is maximised through the development and implementation of a suitable travel plan.

In addition, modern Ultra Low Emission Vehicle technology (such as all electric vehicles) are expected to increase in use over the coming years (the Government expects most new

vehicles in the UK will be ultra low emission). As such it is considered appropriate to create infrastructure to allow home charging of electric vehicles in new, modern properties.

Land Contamination

This site is within 250m of a known landfill site or area of ground that has the potential to create gas. The application is for new residential properties which are a sensitive end use and could be affected by any contamination present. The Report submitted in support of the application recommends that further investigation is required to address the potential for ground gas risks. The Council's Contaminated Land officer has no objection to the application subject to the imposition of a condition to require an additional site investigation survey and any subsequent remediation required.

Drainage Matters

A water supply can be provided and a separate metered supply to each unit will be required. United Utilities suggest that conditions are attached to ensure that no development is commenced until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters for the entire site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Flood Risk

It is noted that the Environment Agency has assessed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and comment that if the suggested measures included within the FRA are undertaken, that the proposed development will meet the requirements of the NPPF.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) demonstrates that compensatory flood storage will be provided, to mitigate for the flood plain taken by the proposed development such that river flooding will not be increased elsewhere. The proposed buildings are to be set with finished floor levels to be at a minimum height of 0.6m above the agreed 100year climate change flood level.

While the outline design of a compensatory flood storage scheme has been sufficiently explained within the FRA and the principle established, it is considered necessary for additional detail design information to be provided for approval. Because of the fundamental nature of the compensatory works to the development scheme as a whole it is considered necessary for this information to be submitted and approved at the earliest opportunity, prior to development commencement. Failure to do so may lead to unacceptable increases to flood risk elsewhere.

ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY

With regard to the economic role of sustainable development, the proposed development will help to maintain a flexible and responsive supply of land for housing as well as bringing direct and indirect economic benefits to Bollington, including additional trade for local shops and businesses, jobs in construction and economic benefits to the construction industry supply chain.

Responses to issues raised by third parties:

The comments provided by consultees, the Town Council and residents in relation to infrastructure issues, highways issues, flood risk and wildlife issues, housing need and affordable housing, design and built environment issues and loss of employment land are noted and covered under the headings above.

It should be noted that application 06/2021P was refused on the grounds of insufficient information being provided in order to assess the impact of the proposed development (at that time 12 no. industrial and storage units) having regard to the risk of flooding from the development. It is considered that the FRA submitted complies with the NPPF and the statutory body responsible for flood risk, the Environment Agency, has raised no objections. It is therefore considered that a refusal on the grounds of flooding could not be justified. In addition, it should be noted that the flood mitigation for the residential development on the opposite side of the road has been agreed with the EA and Cheshire East's Flood Risk Team. The site has been considered for Conservation Area status previously and it was not considered appropriate for designation.

Bollington is in the early formative stages of the Neighbourhood Planning process. There is clearly local interest in this and informal meetings have been held. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan could potentially reallocate the site for an alternative use, perhaps redraw the settlement boundary and reintroduce open countryside policy/local green space allocation, it could not return the site to Green Belt as that is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan process. The Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been drafted and therefore, is some time away from examination and therefore can offer no demonstrable intent that has been tested in any way through the formal consultation process.

The impact of the traffic, which would result from the development is considered to be less than that which would be associated with employment use of the land and it is considered that the removal of commercial vehicles from the local area would actually provide a benefit to the local residents. The Strategic Highways Manager raises no objections to the scheme and considers the access arrangement to be acceptable.

The request for the area around Lowerhouse to become a Conservation Area has been previously considered and rejected because the land was at that time designated employment land. This factor has not changed. Under the prevailing Macclesfield Borough Local Plan the site is allocated for Employment purposes and therefore, it would not be justified to refuse development on the basis that it could be reallocated at some time in the future via the Local Plan process.

Heads of Terms for a Legal Agreement:

- **30% Affordable Housing** (i.e. 10 units as proposed);
- A contribution of **£75,924** is required towards primary education;
- Provision of **£32,000.00** towards Public Open Space.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations

LEVY (CIL) REGULATIONS

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, it is now necessary for planning applications with legal agreements to consider the issue of whether the requirements within the S106 satisfy the following:

- a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) Directly related to the development; and
- c) Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The provision of affordable housing is necessary, fair and reasonable to provide sufficient affordable housing in the area, and to comply with National Planning Policy.

The commuted sum in lieu for recreation / outdoor sport is necessary, fair and reasonable, as the proposed development will provide 32 dwellings, the occupiers of which will use local facilities, and there is a necessity to provide facilities. The contribution is in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The development would result in increased demand for both primary school places in and around Bollington, where there is very limited spare capacity. In order to increase capacity of the school(s) which would support the proposed development, a contribution towards school education is required. This is considered to be necessary and fair and reasonable in relation to the development.

All elements are necessary, directly relate to the development and are fair and reasonable in relation to the scale and kind of development.

On this basis the S106 contributions associated with the scheme is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a **presumption in favour** of sustainable development. Paragraph 14 of NPPF states that decision takers should be approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and

- Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole

As such Members should only be considering a refusal of planning permission if the disbenefits of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of approval.

During the application process, negotiations have taken place between officers and the developer, which has resulted in the submission of a revised layout plan, which has improved space separation distances and the amount of public open space on site. Comments are awaited from The Housing Strategy and Needs Manager and Greenspaces officer.

It is acknowledged that local residents have repeatedly sought to resist development on this site. Appeals on this site and the land opposite have been rejected and employment development has been allowed. It is considered that a scheme for housing would fall in line with policies contained within the NPPF. The principle of developing land which is allocated for employment purposes has been established elsewhere and recently on the land opposite (for 33 dwellings) and will help to contribute to both local housing needs, and the Council's five year housing supply. It is also considered that housing on the application site will also have a more positive impact on the local area than industrial development.

In order to give proper effect to the Board's/Committee's intentions and without changing the substance of the decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation), in consultation with the Chair (or in her absence the Vice Chair) of Northern Planning Committee, to correct any technical slip or omission in the wording of the resolution, between approval of the minutes and issue of the decision notice.

Application for Full Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

1. A03FP_1 - Commencement of development (3 years)
2. A01AP - Development in accord with approved plans
3. A01GR - Removal of permitted development rights
4. A02HA - Construction of access
5. A01LS_1 - Landscaping - submission of details
6. A04LS_1 - Landscaping (implementation)
7. A06NC - Protection for breeding birds
8. A16LS - Submission of landscape management plan
9. A23MC - Details of ground levels to be submitted
10. Nesting bird mitigation measures
11. Boundary Treatment
12. Noise mound / fence details to be submitted
13. Construction Hours of Operation
14. Should any contamination be found, a remediation strategy shall be submitted to the EA

15. Features for roosting bats to be incorporated into housing
16. Method statement for the safeguarding of the river corridor and associated habitats during the construction process.
17. Submission of 10 year habitat management plan including proposals for the eradication of Himalayan Balsam
18. Submission of updated badger survey prior to commencement of development.
19. Pile foundations
20. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure
21. Dust control
22. Contaminated Land
23. In accordance with Flood Risk Assessment
24. Finished floor levels of habitable dwellings shall be set 600 mm above the modelled 1 in 100 annual probability (plus a 30% allowance for climate change) flood level.
25. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the detailed design, implementation, maintenance and management of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted
26. A scheme for the management of overland flow from surcharging of the site's surface water drainage system during extreme rainfall events
27. Detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage methods to be submitted
28. Environment Agency
29. Surface water must drain separate from the foul and no surface water will be permitted to discharge directly or indirectly into existing public sewerage systems.

