

Application No: 20/2717M

Location: Alderley House, Alderley Park, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4TF

Proposal: Residential development with landscaping and access on land previously granted Outline Approval under 15/5401M. (Resubmission of 19/2200M)

Applicant: Andrew McMurtrie, PH Alderley Park (Alderley House) LLP

Expiry Date: 30-Sep-2020

SUMMARY

This application relates to one of the remaining undeveloped residential parcels in the southern campus area of Alderley Park. The principle of the development has been established by the outline approval, and it is considered that the proposals are appropriate development in the Green Belt and in line with the general policies in the Development plan, NPPF and the Alderley Park Development Framework. The previous scheme was considered unacceptable however because of its form: the impact of the frontage garages and the relationship with the adjacent Listed Building, the Tenants Hall.

This revised application addresses these principle concerns, by deleting the garages from the frontage of the site, reducing the gaps between properties giving a closer relationship to these frontage properties and allows for the moving of the properties further off the boundary with the Listed Building.

Whilst there are still some slight amenity concerns, regarding the relationship of the development to the adjacent approved commercial uses (which is now improved by increasing the gap), and the Tree Officer feels that whilst accepting there will be no direct impact on adjacent trees, the development of the car park site will lead to some social proximity issues from trees casting shade over the rear gardens of properties in this location, neither in themselves would warrant a reason for refusal on their own.

The development has a neutral impact on Highways and Ecology and environmental matters such as amenity, air quality, and contaminated land. Impacts on Flood Risk again can be readily addressed.

The main issue as discussed above is one of design, landscape setting and impact on the setting of a listed building. The proposals, in their revised form are now, on balance, considered acceptable and as such the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to S106 Agreement and conditions

SITE DESCRIPTION

This application relates to two sites on the main approach road in Alderley Park, leading to the Mereside complex, from the main Congleton Road (A34) entrance. The site is on the northern edge of the area referred to as the southern (residential) quarter. The two sites are separated by an access road running south into an area being developed by PH Homes.

The first, and larger site on the western side, was formerly occupied by Alderley House, a substantial office building which fronted the main access. This building was demolished some time ago, and the site is now cleared, surrounded by hoardings advertising the development to the rear. There is a grassed area to the site frontage with some trees, including one of significance. To the rear are a number of substantial 3 storey town houses known as Cedar Square, now nearing completion. To the west is a complex of original historical Alderley Park buildings, including the Tenants Hall a Grade II Listed Building which has planning permission for conversion to a public house and restaurant. Work has now started on the extension and conversion.

The second, smaller site lies to the east, and sits behind an area of landscaping which falls outside the site boundary. The site was formerly a car park and is currently used as a contractor's compound. The landscaping to the front consists of several trees and a shrub bed along the site frontage. To the side and rear of the site is the edge of an extensive area of woodland which extends to the south and east.

The whole of Alderley Park lies entirely within the North Cheshire Green Belt, but is a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt. All the areas subject to this site are defined as being previously developed land in the Local Plan and Development framework.

PROPOSAL

This application is a re-submission of a similar application reported to Northern Planning Committee on the 12 February 2020.

The application seeks full planning permission for a total of 12 dwellings, 7 on the Alderley House site, and 5 on the car parking area. All the properties are detached, with the Alderley House site being a mixture of 3 storey (central and end units) and 2 storey properties, and the car park site units all being 2 storey.

The properties on the Alderley House site have a traditional appearance with a stucco rendered finish, designed to read as one continuous block, but divided into multiple units. The properties are set back from the site frontage with an area of landscaping and parking off an access road. In addition to the frontage parking, there is a second access road to the rear providing access to additional parking/garages.

The properties on the car park site also have a rendered appearance and pick up some of the more classical design features on the entrances and at roof level in the central property

so they use a similar design “language” to the other site rather than a contrasting one. A frontage access provides curtilage parking, with attached garages for 3 out of the 5 units.

The application has been revised from the previous application in two main ways:

1. The frontage garages have been deleted from the proposals.
2. The properties on the Alderley House site have been moved closer together, and further off the boundary with the Listed Building, the Tenants Hall.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Alderley Park has been the subject of a significant number of planning applications in recent years, including a series of applications associated with the residential development of the southern campus, redevelopment of the Parklands office block (soon to be occupied by Royal London), a new leisure complex and more minor developments in the Mereside area. Of particular relevance to this application are:

15/5401M Full planning permission for the demolition of a number of specified buildings; and outline planning permission with all matters reserved for a mixed-use development comprising the following: • Up to 38,000 sqm of laboratory, offices and light manufacturing floorspace (Use Class B1); • Up to 1,500 sqm of retail, café, restaurant, public house and / or crèche floorspace (Use Classes A1, A3, A4 and D1); • Up to 275 residential dwelling-houses, where up to 60 units could be for retirement / care (Use Classes C2 and C3); • Up to a 100 bed hotel (Use Class C1); • Sport and recreational facilities including an indoor sports centre of up to a 2,000 sqm (Use Class D2); • Up to 14,000 sqm of multi-storey car parking providing up to 534 spaces (sui generis); • A waste transfer station of up to 900 sqm of (sui generis); • Public realm and landscaping; • Other associated infrastructure – APPROVED June 2016

This application covered the whole of the Alderley Park Site, and granted outline approval for residential development on the site subject to this application.

As referenced above in the proposal section there was a previous application on this site:

19/2200M Reserved matters application including details of access, layout, landscaping, appearance and scale for a residential development comprising 12 new dwellings, new internal roads, boundary treatments and associated landscaping and infrastructure. Alderley House and Car Park Sites, Alderley Park, Congleton Road, Nether Alderley, SK10 4TF - REFUSED February 2020

Adjacent to the site are the following recent planning approvals:

To the northeast beyond an area of woodland:

18/0403M Reserved matters application following outline approval 15/5401M for detail of access, layout, scale, landscaping and appearance for a residential development comprising 50 residential dwellings in addition to new internal roads, boundary treatments and associated landscaping and infrastructure - LAND AT HEATHERLEY WOODS, ALDERLEY PARK, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4T -

APPROVED 2018 Bellway Homes

To the south:

16/5853M Reserved matters application including details of access, layout, landscaping, appearance and scale for a residential development comprising 73 new dwellings in addition to selective demolition and the renovation and extension of the Gardener's Cottage as a dwelling, new internal roads, boundary treatments and associated landscaping and infrastructure. An environmental statement was submitted with the outline application. - Alderley Park, Congleton Road, Nether Alderley, Macclesfield, Cheshire - APPROVED 2017 PH Properties

Finally to the west:

17/5386M Reserved matters application relating to outline approval 15/5401M for the extension and change of use of Blocks 113 and 114 (Tenants' Hall) from conference centre (D1/Sui Generis) to restaurant/gastropub (A3/A4) including selective demolition to facilitate conversion; the extension and change of use of Block 112 (former Stanley Arms) from public house (A4) to farm shop (A1) and guest rooms (C1) above including selective demolition to facilitate conversion; change of use of block 119 (former Dovecote) from storage area (Sui Generis) to private dining room for restaurant/gastropub use (A3/A4); creation of a new building comprising guest rooms (C1); and creation of car parking, landscaping, boundary treatments and other associated works. UPPER HISTORIC COURTYARD, ALDERLEY PARK, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, MACCLESFIELD, CHESHIRE, SK10 4TF APPROVED 2018

19/3214M Reserved Matters application for the extension and change of use of Blocks 113 and 114 (Tenants' Hall from conference centre (Use Class C1/ Sui Generis) to a restaurant/ gastropub (Use Class A3/A4) including car parking, landscaping, boundary treatments and other associated works UPPER HISTORIC COURTYARD, ALDERLEY PARK, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, MACCLESFIELD, CHESHIRE, SK10 4TF ONGOING

To accompany the application subject to this report, an application has been made to discharge conditions applied at outline. This is particularly relevant to ecological and environmental matters:

19/2982D Discharge of conditions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, 39 & 43 of 15/5401M - Alderley House & car park sites, Alderley Park, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4TF - ONGOING

POLICIES

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – 2010-2030

- PG 2 Settlement Hierarchy
- PG 3 Green Belt
- SD1 Sustainable development in Cheshire East
- SD2 Sustainable development principles
- SC 5 Affordable Homes

SE 1 Design
SE 3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
SE 4 The Landscape
SE 5 Trees, Hedgerows and woodland
SE7 Heritage
SE 9 Energy Efficient Development
SE13 Flood Risk and Water Management
CO 1 Sustainable Travel and Transport

LPS 61 Alderley Park Opportunity Site

Macclesfield Local Plan (Saved policies)

NE 3 Landscape Conservation
NE11 Nature Conservation
GC 1 Green Belt – New Buildings
GC 4 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt
DC3 Design – Amenity
DC8 Design – Landscaping
DC9 Design – tree protection
DC13 Design – Noise

Other Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework

Alderley Park Development Framework

Alderley Park Design Principles – Addendum Revision A (Approved as part of the outline approval 15/5401M)

The EC Habitats Directive 1992

Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010

Circular 6/2005 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System

National Planning Practice Guidance

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

United Utilities – No objections are raised, but recommend two conditions, one relating to surface water drainage and separate systems for foul and surface water.

Head of Strategic Infrastructure – No objections.

Environmental Protection – No objections subject to conditions/informative relating to construction works, pile foundations and dust

Flood Risk – No objections subject to a condition requiring approval of the overall detailed strategy / design limiting the surface water runoff generated by the proposed development.

Cheshire Gardens Trust – Object on the grounds that it will erode the historic parkland and is contrary to the approved Alderley Park Design Principles. They go on to say:

“We object to this application which proposes the development of housing on an existing car park, thereby extending development into the woodland and beyond the development boundary defined in the approved outline application 15/5041M. It is contrary to the approved Alderley Park Design Principles which established a framework and hierarchy for development. If permitted it would further erode the character and significance of the historic parkland at Alderley Park, contrary to Cheshire East Local Plan Policy SE 4 The Landscape.”

Nether Alderley Parish Council – “Whilst the Parish Council have no objection to the proposed 12 dwellings and note the various comments the Planning Officer gave when refusing the original application. We concur that any development should not detract from the adjacent historic buildings i.e. Tenants Hall, Dove Cote, The Old Courtyard etc. There is no special requirement for this development to be a "Statement Development" but simply a continuation of the existing buildings nearby. Therefore, we would suggest the 12 dwellings be constructed in soft coloured brick to complement surrounding materials and not the Stucco rusticated render proposed. This would continue the ribbon development along the road and the style of material used in this area of the park.

The Parish Council note and appreciate that the garaging and some visitor parking has been readdressed within this resubmission. “

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

None received

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principal of Development/Green Belt

As mentioned above, the whole of Alderley Park falls within the Green Belt, but as set out in the policy section above, the built up areas of the site, which include the application site, are covered by policies LPS 61 Alderley Park Opportunity Site in the Cheshire East Local Plan, and Saved Policy GC 4 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt of the Macclesfield Local Plan. The Alderley Park Development Framework, which builds on the LPS policy, clearly identifies the site as Previously Developed Land, which under policy LPS 61 allows for the construction of new buildings (Criteria 3) so long as the meet the criteria set out at 1. Which reads:

Criteria 1. Development shall be:

- i. For human health science research and development, technologies and processes; or
- ii. For residential (around 200 to 300 new homes) or other high value land uses demonstrated to be necessary for the delivery of the life science park and not prejudicial to its longer term growth; or
- iii. For uses complimentary to the life science park and not prejudicial to its establishment or growth for this purpose.”

Outline approval has already been granted for this site and the 12 units are accounted for in the originally approved 275 units. The Section 106 agreed at the outline stage would ensure that profits are put back into the science park. It is proposed this is replicated for the current full planning application.

Criteria 2 is that the development shall be in accordance with the Alderley Park Development Framework. In this document the site is clearly shown as “Potential residential” in the indicative masterplan.

Criteria 3. States that construction of new buildings for uses in criterion 1 above shall be restricted to the Previously Developed Land (PDL) which is the case here.

Criteria 4 states that development would not have a greater impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than existing development. This is examined further below.

Criteria 5 is primarily concerned with impact on Listed Buildings or other heritage impacts which again is considered further in this report, and is a significant issue here.

These policies are reflected in the NPPF which at Paragraphs 143-147 considers development in the Green Belt. Whilst the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate development – which is by definition harmful, there are exceptions listed at Para 145 including:

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

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

In summary then the proposed development of this site can be considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt, on condition that it does not have a greater impact on openness than existing development. In this case it needs to be seen in the context of the built form as was at Alderley Park, as the proposed development of the main site is on an area which was previously occupied by Alderley House, a substantial office building, and was always envisaged to be developed with residential accommodation. The car park site was not shown as being developed in the Local Plan or Development Framework but was clearly marked as previously developed land. As such whilst looked at in isolation any development on this land would have a greater impact on openness, it needs to be looked at in the overall context of all the adjoining sites in the southern quarter and as the overall volume of development (which was fixed at the outline stage) is less than that it replaces, the overall impact on openness is less.

The NPPF advises that substantial weight must be given to the harm to the Green Belt. Any other harm additional to that of inappropriateness must also be considered. The proposal, due to its scale and nature, will have no significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and cause no other harm to the purposes of Green Belt (NPPF para. 143).

In conclusion then, the development is considered to constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt and to comply with the majority of the principles in the Development Plan (design and heritage will be addressed later in the report), and therefore there are no objections in principle to the site being developed for residential purposes.

Highways

The proposals provide safe access and the parking provision is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with the parking standards in the CELPS. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure also raises no objections to the proposal .

Landscape and visual Impact

The landscape scheme shown on the submitted plan, and outlined in the Design and Access Statement is better than the scheme that was submitted with application 19/2200M. The main improvement being the omission of the pavilion garages from the Alderley House frontage. These garages have been relocated to the rear of the properties as recommended. The frontage parking areas are now screened by hedges and some additional trees are proposed to enhance the roadside parkland belt.

The Alderley House landscape proposals are formal in character:

- The existing mature Sweet Chestnut on the site frontage is retained and six additional semi-mature trees are proposed within a formal lawn.
- A low retaining wall alongside the front access drive plus new Yew hedges screen the parking areas
- Estate railings, clipped hedges and feature topiary divide the front gardens.
- Pleached trees on the western and eastern boundaries improve screening and 'book-end' the development.
- Brick walls softened by ornamental shrubs enclose rear gardens

The car park site landscape proposals are more informal in character:

- The existing mixed shrubbery on the site frontage is retained. A new 1.8m high Holly hedge plus six semi-mature parkland trees within meadow grassland are proposed.
- Estate railings and hedges divide the front gardens and native species hedges enclose the small rear gardens.
- The historic woodland would be managed. The woodland edge would be cleared of self-seeded trees and overgrown laurel to form a parkland transition area with veteran trees plus new specimen trees within meadow grassland with spring bulbs (all subject to TPO consent).

The hard landscape proposals for both areas include granite kerbs, granite sett thresholds and block paving paths and driveways.

The landscape proposals are appropriate and would provide an attractive setting for the development but full hard and soft details and boundary treatments would be required by condition.

If the application is approved it is recommended landscape conditions so that the following information is submitted for approval:

- Existing and proposed levels and cross sections

- A detailed Landscape Proposals Plan
- Full hard and soft landscape details
- Boundary treatment details

Plus

- The landscape implementation and 5 year replacement condition
- And a long-term Landscape Management Plan for the historic woodland, the woodland edge area and the roadside parkland belt.

The latter (woodland management) however is covered by a condition on the outline for the whole site so would not be needed here.

Trees/Woodland

Policy SE 5 of the CELPS outlines that development proposals which will result in the loss of, or threat to, the continued health and life expectancy of trees, hedgerows or woodlands (including veteran trees or ancient semi-natural woodland), that provide a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity, landscape character or historic character of the surrounding area, will not normally be permitted, except where there are clear overriding reasons for allowing the development and there are no suitable alternatives.

A woodland (Rookery Wood) lies to the south east of the site and is afforded protection by the Cheshire East Borough Council (Nether Alderley - Alderley Park No. 3) Tree Preservation Order 2108 (W2)

This application is supported by an Arboricultural Report, Preliminary Tree Assessment Drawing and Tree Protection – Arboricultural Method Statement .

As part of a pre-application consultation a request was made for a Tree Shadow Assessment to assess the impact of shading from the adjacent protected woodland on the proposed development and in particular private residential amenities. A Tree Shadow Study (Arboshadow) has been included with the application.

A draft Woodland Management Plan (the principles of which have been agreed with the owners of the woodland) is also included as part of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

A separate application for works to protected trees (App19/2827T) was also received by the Council on 12th June 2019 which includes details of proposed tree works and the Arboricultural Report referred to above. Determination of the tree work application cannot be considered prior to determination of the planning application as trees are a material consideration.

Alderley House site

The Alderley House site contains one High (A) category tree, three Moderate (B) category trees, three low (C) category trees and two individual trees and one group identified as unsuitable for long term retention (U) category. None of the trees are formally protected by a Tree Preservation Order or lie within a designated Conservation Area.

All moderate and low category trees are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposed development and associated storage areas. The three (U) category trees are to

be removed irrespective of the development proposals. The one remaining High (A) category tree, a Sweet Chestnut (T6) is to be retained.

The proposed tree removals will have a slight adverse impact within the immediate area, but are not considered to have a significant wider impact. A detailed Tree Protection Plan and method statement have been submitted which include provision for temporary storage/site cabins and installation of drainage.

Overall, the proposals are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the recommendations detailed in BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations

Car Park Site

The proposed dwellings are sited wholly within the hard standing of the former car park. Consequently due to the sub grade and compacted nature of the underlying soils, any impact on the rooting environment of adjacent protected trees is considered negligible. The Assessment identifies 13 trees that are proposed for removal to accommodate the development and one Group (G3). Nine trees are located outside the protected woodland and are low (C) category specimens which have a negligible contribution to the wider amenity of the area. The four remaining trees and Group identified for removal, stand on the edge of the protected woodland to the south of the site. One tree has been assessed as Moderate (B) category and three trees and the group as low (C) category. The moderate category tree, a Silver Birch (T25) is located on a raised bed, has a slight lean. The low category trees and the linear group (G3), the latter comprising of Cherry root suckers, Sycamore saplings and planted Cherry Laurel provide little long term benefit to the woodland. The removal of these trees is considered reasonable and in accordance with good woodland management.

Para 7.3 of the Assessment refers to an animation of proposed shadow positions from the woodland with specific regard to units 8-12. In addition a Daylight and Sunlight Study (Brentwood Lighting Design) provides assessment for Interior Spaces and sunlight assessment for the rear gardens of Plots 8-12 have been provided using accepted methodology (BRE 2011 Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice).

The results reveal that average Internal Daylight Factor is achieved for 5 plots facing the woodland. With regard to the garden sunlight assessment, a minimum target of 2 hours sunlight in the garden of Plot 10 with over 50% of the garden area was achieved (21st March) and up to 4 hours 45 mins sunlight achieved with Plots 8 and 12.

It should be noted that these figures represent a time of year when the trees are not in leaf and consequently sunlight will be more restricted when trees are in full leaf during the summer.

The shadow assessment referred to in the AIA provides a screen grab showing details of shade at mid summer (21st June) on the five plots. At 9.50am, 11.40 and 13.15 pm. The assessment shows shading of the plots is primarily in the morning early afternoon, with shade passing the gardens by mid-late afternoon. It should be noted that the assessment

has been taken when shadows will be at their shortest and before and after 21st June shadows from trees will become longer.

The issue of shading from trees has been discussed at length with the applicant with suggestions to improve the design by moving the plots northward to provide increased distances from the woodland edge, however moving plots forward would conflict with other design concepts including ensuring that the buildings are subservient to Alderley House.

This issue is consequently a matter of planning balance between the competing design philosophies.

Woodland Management

Although the woodland is located outside the site edged red draft Woodland Management Proposals are attached as Appendix 1 to the AIA and are broadly in accordance with previous discussions on site. The proposals should be part of a long term plan of operations for management of at least 10 years. Should planning consent be granted, conditions relating to tree Protection and Construction Specification / Method Statement are recommended.

Building design/layout/impact on adjacent listed building

This is perhaps the main issue, and one that has been discussed extensively with the applicant. The previous application (19/2200M) referenced above was refused by the Northern Planning Committee in February 2020 for the following reason:

“The proposed development, by virtue of it’s form and design, has an unacceptable appearance on this important frontage site, and is harmful to the setting of the Tenants Hall a Grade II Listed Building, contrary to Criteria 5 of Policy LPS 61, SE1 (Design), SE7 (Historic Environment) of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, and the approved Alderley Park Design Principles.”

The Council’s Design and Conservation Officer advises that the application has been improved compared with the development that was previously submitted and refused. The removal of frontage garaging and associated access clearly improves the presentation of the development and its relationship with the forecourt area of the Tenant’s Hall, which is grade II listed. The design rationale and heritage justification to create high status neo-classical architecture in the location of the former Alderley House, (where the previous country house stood) is appreciated, to attempt to complete the grouping but there is still a degree of tension in the design, namely that there are a number of detached houses with linked ground floor sections and individual entrances to each house, which would be improved at least by gluing the buildings together into a single whole. Overall however, with the benefit of adequate design controls it can be seen how this aspect of the proposals would be considered acceptable given the unfortunate office building that was previously on this part of the site, with associated impacts on heritage assets.

There were some concerns regarding the position of the proposed frontage access points, and the size of the internal access roads, which have been discussed with the applicant. The access points are as existing, and moving them could impact on existing trees and the access roads are the size shown to meet the requirements for manoeuvring vehicles in these areas. The form the access roads take however can be dealt with as part of the

landscaping condition where for example a dropped kerb arrangement could be used rather than a full swept kerb junction to reduce it's impact and help reduce vehicle speeds.

Finally the issue of the car park site is discussed and the Design & Conservation officer goes on to state:

“Whilst I appreciate the policy anomalies in relation to the car park element of the site, and the commentary in the heritage assessment, this was historically an undeveloped part of the gardens/ parkland, with historic maps showing it on the periphery of park/woodland to the east of Alderley House. It is only relatively recently (within the last 50 or so years) that it has been hardened for use as car parking, within the life of the science park. There would clearly be heritage benefit in not further developing this land and returning it to its historic purpose as part of the designed parkland. The park is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) and therefore the further development of this land for housing would lead to some harm to the NDHA and its setting, notwithstanding its present hardened state (the heritage assessment considers the impact to be neutral). The application should therefore be assessed against the NPPF and policies SE1, SE4 and SE7 of the CELPS where a balanced consideration should be taken having regard to impacts and benefits. Consequently, although the design of these units is considered to have improved from the previous scheme the concern re: principle remains. This land would be better restored to parkland to better showcase the new development on the Alderley House part of the site and create a more logical distinction between the buildings and the historic landscape.”

He also notes and draws attention to the objection from the Cheshire Gardens Trust given the impacts upon the historic park and garden.

Whilst these comments are understood, the fact remains, as set out in the principle of development section above, this car parking area is within the area of previously developed land and as such it is not considered that there can be a policy objection to its development and as such has to be looked at in terms of its impact. Whilst reversion to parkland would bring some benefits, and some harm to the character of the site has been identified, on balance considering the policies as a whole it is not considered that refusal could be sustained on this basis. It is also important to highlight that this was not considered to be one of the main issues with the previous application, and was not included in the reason for refusal.

If it is considered that there is harm, albeit less than substantial harm, to this non designated heritage asset and in accordance with Paragraph 196 of the NPPF this needs to be looked at against the public benefits of the scheme. As these are limited, this does weigh against the scheme, however this is not given significant weight in the balance. Members may recall greater weight was applied in the previous application when there was considered to be harm to the setting of the Listed Building, a heritage asset.

For completeness and to be consistent with the previous application the Alderley Park Design Principles – Addendum Revision A are again considered below:

Alderley House Design Guidance:

Layout

1. The layout should take regard to the key contextual landscapes of the arboretum to the south and the expansive park land to the north.

Whilst the development does form a continuous frontage on both sites, in a similar way to the previous scheme, there is a greater off set to the Listed Building to the west and more planting has been shown to the site “edges” helping to create a greener character and link to land to the rear.

2. The layout should take care to keep a form benefitting its character, the setting and proximity of the historical courtyard.

There is now a greater off set to the Listed Building, and whilst a rendered appearance is proposed it is not considered that this significantly conflicts with the materials of the Tenants Hall.

3. The layout should carefully consider parking strategies, so as to minimise the impact of the car on the public realm.

Whilst parking is still proposed on the frontage, the garages have been deleted from the scheme, a significant improvement. Landscaping as proposed will help to reduce the impact of this frontage parking. Parking is also provided to the rear of properties.

Scale

1. Any new buildings should aim to be more sympathetic to the historic context of the site, the scale and massing should respond to the neighbouring historical courtyard therefore reducing in height and massing towards the western edge should be encouraged.

The closest building has been moved further away from the boundary with the Listed Building and it is not now considered there is a significant impact.

2. The replacement Alderley house should present itself as a focal building in the character area, whilst respecting the sensitivity and historic relationship that the site has had with the Tenants Hall.

Whilst ideally the development would comprise one building, rather than the detached properties as proposed, as discussed above the changes now proposed do improve the relationship and are considered acceptable.

Landscape

1. The landscape should accommodate both public and private uses.

2. The landscape should connect the new buildings to the historic parkland and arboretum in a geometrical form as did the original park house.

Whilst the trees may not be of any value, their contribution to the parkland is important. The outline permission, within the characterisation study, showed the value of the woodland buffers and the contribution they made to the site. As a minimum these features should be retained and it is felt this level of screening and planting would be important to ensure the domestic presence of this type of housing doesn't impact on the parkland. As discussed above this has been improved by the landscaping now proposed.

3. Parking for any commercial vehicles should be placed in the existing car park to the north east.

The parameters however do not say this site can't be developed, and the principle is again discussed above.

4. Any new proposal should be designed with consideration of how car parking and servicing of this are can be adequately provided for without impacting upon the public realm and parkland setting.

This is now considered acceptable.

For completeness the other matters considered in the guidance are satisfied.

In conclusion, whilst the scheme proposed has its faults, a development comprising a single focal building would be preferred to individual houses, and reversion of the car parking site to parkland, the scheme overall is now considered a big improvement on the original scheme and as such on balance the building design, layout and impact on the setting of the Listed Building meets the overall policy objectives, and is considered acceptable.

Amenity

There are two issues here, the proximity to the approved commercial uses in the Tenants Hall, and relationship to the development to the rear.

The proposed end unit (Plot 1) would be adjacent to the car park, and more significantly servicing area for the approved pub/restaurant. There was a concern with the previous application that there could be amenity issues associated with this relationship, but as noted above however the building has now been moved further off this boundary which will assist.. Environmental Protection have raised no issues with this relationship, and it is not considered that an objection on amenity grounds could not be sustained as a result of these factors.

The development to the rear is all 3 stories in height, and at a slightly higher level than the frontage site subject to this application. However given the separation distances, over 27m at the closest point, it is not considered that there are any significant overlooking/privacy issues.

Ecology

Policy SE3 of the CELPS requires all development to positively contribute to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity and should not negatively affect these interests. A number of conditions were attached to the outline planning permission at this site, but which remain relevant to the current application, and are subject to the current discharge of conditions application referenced above:

Condition 30 Lighting Assessment

The submitted ecological assessment refers to results of a lighting assessment. This condition is dealt with under discharge of conditions application 19/2982d.

Condition 39 an updated protected species survey where required.

An updated protected species assessment has been submitted as required by this condition.

A number of ponds are located within 250m of the proposed development. Great Crested Newts have been recorded at a pond located 100m from the proposed development. The application site however offers limited habitat for great crested newts and does not support any features likely to be utilised by newts for shelter and protection and the proposed development would not result in the fragmentation or isolation of great crested newt habitat.

The potential impacts of the proposed development are limited to the low risk of any newts that venture onto the site being killed or injured during the construction process. In order to

address this risk the applicant's ecological consultant has recommended a suite of 'reasonable avoidance measures'.

It is advised that provided these measures are implemented the proposed development would be highly unlikely to result in a breach of the Habitat Regulations. Consequently, it is not necessary for the Council to have regard to the Habitat Regulations during the determination of this application.

If planning consent is granted a condition is recommended to ensure the development proceeds in strict accordance with the Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance measures submitted.

No evidence of badger activity was recorded, however as new setts can be constructed in a short timescale and the adjacent woodland has the potential to support a sett the submitted protected species report recommends that an updated badger survey is undertaken prior to the commencement of development. This matter may be dealt with by condition.

Condition 42 No development within ancient woodland, no loss of semi-natural habitat from within the Local Wildlife Site

Previously proposed units 8 – 12 had a gate provided to allow access to the Local Wildlife Site. These gates have now been removed from the revised submitted plans.

In order to protect the Local Wildlife Site there should be no construction related activity within its boundary. Whilst the red line of the application does not encroach into the Local Wildlife site there is the risk of impacts occurring during the construction phase due to the movement of machinery and the storage of material etc.

The application must therefore be supported by proposals for the safeguarding of the Local Wildlife Site during the construction phase. These proposals should include the erection of protective fencing around the boundary of the Local Wildlife Site for the duration of the construction phase. An appropriate condition is recommended.

Condition 43 Residential reserved matters application to be supported by proposals for the incorporation of features suitable for swifts, house sparrow and roosting bats.

Revised proposals for the provision of features for roosting bats and nesting birds have been included with the updated protected species strategy (ref 10489_RO3b). These are now acceptable and will contribute positively to biodiversity.

Flood Risk/Drainage

Whilst no detailed drainage scheme has yet been submitted, it is considered that drainage issues at Alderley Park are now fully understood and a scheme should be readily achievable. Conditions are recommended by both UU and the Flood Risk Team.

Air Quality

Conditions attached at the outline stage are applicable here, and will be repeated as part of this full planning application.

Contaminated Land

The Contaminated Land team has no objection to the above application subject to the following comments with regard to contaminated land:

- Residential properties are a sensitive end use and could be affected by any contamination present or brought onto the site.
- Further information has now been received on the site.
 - o Supplementary Investigation and Geoenvironmental Appraisal of Former Alderley House Frontage and Car Park, ID Geoenvironmental Limited, Letter Report, Ref. 4917-G-LR001–Rev C, dated July 2020.
 - o Hazardous Ground Gas Risk Assessment of Former Alderley House Frontage and Car Park, ID Geoenvironmental Limited, Letter Report Ref. 4917-G-LR002-Rev A, dated July 2020.
 - o Remediation Strategy for land at Former Alderley House Frontage and Car Park, ID Geoenvironmental Limited, Report Ref. 4917-G-R003-Rev A, dated July 2020.
 - o Hazardous Gas Protection Measures Verification Implementation Plan for Former Alderley House Frontage and Car Park, ID Geoenvironmental Limited, Report Ref. 4917-G-R004 dated August 2020.
- The reports submitted in support of the application recommend remedial measures including hotspot removal, importation of clean fill and gas protection measures to all properties. Environmental Protection are in agreement with the proposed remedial approach and would note that verification of all measures should be submitted prior to occupation.

As such, and in accordance with the NPPF, two conditions and an informative are recommended.

CONCLUSIONS

This application relates to one of the remaining undeveloped residential parcels in the southern campus area of Alderley Park. The principle of the development has been established by the outline approval, and it is considered that the proposals are appropriate development in the Green Belt and in line with the general policies in the Development plan, NPPF and the Alderley Park Development Framework. The previous scheme was considered unacceptable however because of its form: the impact of the frontage garages and the relationship with the adjacent Listed Building, the Tenants Hall.

This revised application addresses these principle concerns, by deleting the garages from the frontage of the site, reducing the gaps between properties giving a closer relationship to these frontage properties and allows for the moving of the properties further off the boundary with the Listed Building.

Whilst there are still some slight amenity concerns, regarding the relationship of the development to the adjacent approved commercial uses (which is now improved by increasing the gap), and the Tree Officer feels that whilst accepting there will be no direct impact on adjacent trees, the development of the car park site will lead to some social

proximity issues from trees casting shade over the rear gardens of properties in this location, neither in themselves would warrant a reason for refusal on their own.

The development has a neutral impact on Highways and Ecology and environmental matters such as amenity, air quality, and contaminated land. Impacts on Flood Risk again can be readily addressed.

The main issue as discussed above is one of design, landscape setting and impact on the setting of a listed building. The proposals, in their revised form are now, on balance, considered acceptable and as such the application is recommended for approval.

SECTION 106

In line with the previously approved site-wide outline application a section 106 agreement will accompany the application and is required to secure the following:

- Profits to be re invested in life science development
- 15% affordable housing to be provided on site under the established Life Science Employee Housing Scheme or an updated Scheme that could be extended to other Alderley Park employees.

The wording can be copied across for the outline consent and pro rata applied to this smaller scheme.

CIL REGULATIONS

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, it is 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; a) Directly related to the development; and b) Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It is considered that the contributions required as part of the application are justified meet the Council's requirement for policy compliance. All elements are necessary, directly relate to the development and are fair and reasonable in relation to the scale and kind of development. The non-financial requirements ensure that the development will be delivered in full. On this basis the scheme is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to Secure:

- Profits to be re invested in life science development
- 15% affordable housing to be provided on site under the established Life Science Employee Housing Scheme or an updated Scheme that could be extended to other Alderley Park employees.

And the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year consent

2. Approved Plans
3. Materials to be submitted
4. Landscaping including details of the internal access roads/junctions.
5. Implementation of landscaping
6. Tree Protection and Construction Specification / Method Statement
7. Development to be in accordance with the Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance measures
8. Updated badger survey
9. Method statement for the safeguarding of the LWS/ancient woodland
10. Surface water drainage strategy
11. Separate drainage systems for foul and surface water
12. Travel information pack
13. Electrical vehicle infrastructure
14. Contaminated land verification report
15. Measures to deal with unexpected contamination
16. Levels to be submitted

In order to give proper effect to the Committee's intentions and without changing the substance of the decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman (or in his absence the Vice Chairman) 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

