

Application No: 20/4747M

Location: RADBROKE HALL, STOCKS LANE, OVER PEOVER, WA16 9EU

Proposal: Hybrid Application comprising of; a) Full application for the Demolition of Kilburn House, Lovelace House and Brooker House to create "Town Square" and landscaped areas and an extension to Furber House to create additional Food & Beverage / support space; facade upgrades to Turing House, Babbage House and Furber House; retrospective application for installation of generators, installation of roof mounted air handling units; creation of a new security lodge; removal of a visitor car park; creation of new public realm; internal highways improvements; landscaping and other associated works; and b) Outline planning permission (including matters of Access, Scale and Layout) for the erection of new office floorspace (Use Class B1a) including employee wellness facilities and associated works.

Applicant: Barclays Bank Plc

Expiry Date: 16-Feb-2021

## **SUMMARY:**

The principle of extensions and alterations to existing buildings and the replacement of other buildings on this employment site in the Green Belt is deemed appropriate given the nature of the proposed demolitions and subsequent extensions/new build elements are considered to largely constitute infilling on the existing site with no materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposal would contribute the creating a strong economy for Cheshire East by developing and modernising an existing site that is a major employer in the area.

Matters of highways are noted as a significant local concern for various reasons, mostly with regards to increases in traffic and construction vehicles using country lanes. The Council's Head of Strategic Infrastructure however, raises no objections on highways grounds subject to a financial contribution to the creation of a cycle lane on the A50, a development highlighted as a requirement by the Council's Local Transport Delivery Plan and a contribution to ensure the implementation of the Travel Plan. Conditions are also proposed.

The design of the proposals are deemed acceptable and although '*less than substantial*' harm to the heritage assets would be created, this harm would be at the lower end of the scale and it is deemed that the wider public benefits of the scheme outweigh this harm.

In consideration of environmental matters, no objections are raised from the relevant consultees with regards to; landscape, trees or ecology, subject to conditions where necessary.

There are no neighbouring amenity concerns given the countryside location of the site and that the majority of the built form is to be located towards the centre of the existing large site.

No concerns are raised in relation to public rights of way, flood risk and drainage or Manchester Airport, subject to conditions where deemed necessary.

As such, the application is recommended for APPROVAL subject to a S106 Agreement to secure a financial contribution towards off-site highways improvements and conditions.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVE subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement to provide a financial contribution towards off-site highways works and the monitoring of a staff Travel Plan**

## **DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT**

The application site is Radbroke Hall, which is located off Stocks Lane and accommodates a large employment site housing Barclays Bank plc.

The application site covers a total area of just over 5 hectares. The complex includes a number of office buildings, including the original Radbroke Hall which is a Grade II Listed Building which also contains a small amount of office accommodation. The site has a number of car parking areas and the site is set in extensive grounds with recreation areas, on site catering including a café and shop.

There are a large number of mature trees around and within the site which provides a parkland setting.

Radbroke Hall is described by the applicant as Radbroke Technology Centre and employs circa 4000 staff on the site. It accommodates the Technology Office, Architecture and Strategy, Technology Quality and Risk and the Global Infrastructure.

The site area subject of this planning application relates to various portions of the wider site.

## **PROPOSAL**

This is a hybrid application which seeks part full planning permission and part outline planning permission for different aspects of the overall development. The break-down is detailed below

### Full Planning Permission (Phase 1)

- Demolition of Kilburn House, Lovelace House and Brooker House
- Creation of a 'Town Square' and landscaped areas
- Extension to Furber House to creation of additional Food & beverage/support space
- Façade upgrades to; Turning House, Babbage House and Furber House
- Retrospective permission for installation of generators
- Installation of roof mounted air handling units
- Erection of a new security lodge
- Removal of visitor car park
- Creation of a new public realm
- Internal highway improvements
- Landscaping
- Associated works (for example; installation of lighting)

### Outline permission - including matters of Access, Scale and Layout (Phase 2)

- Erection of new office floor space, including the new office block referred to as 'New Kilburn' which will include employee wellness facilities
- Associated works (for example; installation of lighting)

## **RELEVANT HISTORY:**

Extensive history over the whole site below related to this proposal. Most notable (excluding adverts) include;

**20/4888S** – Screening Opinion - *EIA Screening Opinion for hybrid planning for new development* – EIA Not Required 15<sup>th</sup> February 2021

**20/4376M** – Full Planning - *Installation of an above ground external double skin bulk fuel tank for an internal generator within Babbage House on the existing campus* – Approved 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021

**18/1283M** – Full Planning - *Additional flexible office accommodation (Use Class B1a)* – Approved 17<sup>th</sup> May 2018

**17/3806M** – Full Planning - *Application seeking full planning permission for additional office accommodation (Use Class B1a) and an extension to existing car parking* – Approved 18-Oct-2017

**17/2974M** – Full Planning - *Application for temporary office accommodation (Use Class B1a) to be in use for a period of 3 years* - Approved 11-Aug-2017

**11/2729M** – Full Planning - *Installation of a car park surface and temporary use of land for car parking for a period of 3 years* - Not determined (Awaiting S106 Agreement)

**10/4870M** – Full Planning - *Erection of Two Replacement Gatehouses Including Associated Access Improvements and New Lighting* – Approved 4<sup>th</sup> February 2011

**01/2548P** – Full Planning - *Temporary Extension To Existing Car Park To Provide An Additional 329 Spaces* – Approved 7<sup>th</sup> January 2002

Note – 04/2837P sought to extend this temporary period, but this application was withdrawn

**97/1610P** – Full Planning - *Extension to Security Lodge* – Approved 31<sup>st</sup> October 1997

**97/1566P** – Full Planning - *Extension to Shop Sports And Social Building* – Approved 9<sup>th</sup> October 1997

**97/1521P** – Full Planning - *Additional Car Parking For 57 Spaces* – Approved 29<sup>th</sup> September 1997

**96/1965P** – Full Planning - *Extension to South & West Entrance Lobbies To Accommodate Security Turnstiles* – Approved 10<sup>th</sup> January 1997

**81806P** – Full Planning - *Additional Car Parking (340 Spaces), The Removal Of The Barrier Between The Car Parking Areas And The Widening Of The Access Road Onto The A50, Together With Associated Landscaping* – Approved 9<sup>th</sup> October 1995

**57519P** – Full Planning - *Car Parking For 500 Cars With Associated Landscaping* – Approved 20<sup>th</sup> April 1989

**51758P** – Full Planning - *Part Demolition, Conversion Of Part To Offices And Internal Alterations* – Approved 13<sup>th</sup> January 1988

**51729P** – Listed Building Consent - *Part Demolition, Conversion Of Part To Offices And Internal Alterations* – Approved 13<sup>th</sup> January 1988

**47223P** – Reserved Matters - *New Offices Ancillary Development and Car Parking* – Approved 8<sup>th</sup> December 1986

**43134P** – Outline Planning - *Erection of New Office & Ancilliary Buildings & Demolition Of Temporary Wooden Office Buildings To Increase Staff From 1500 To 2000 Over A Phased Period* – Approved 23<sup>rd</sup> May 1986

**43819P** – Full Planning - *Change Of Use And Part Demolition Of Existing Building* – Approved 6<sup>th</sup> February 1986

**28053P** – Listed Building Consent - *Extension to Staff Restaurant Kitchen* – Approved 9<sup>th</sup> October 1981

**5/23899P** – Listed Building Consent - *Extension to Existing West Core Staircase & C/O/U From Storage To Computer Research On 3rd Floor* – Approved 10<sup>th</sup> September 1980

**23788P** – Listed Building Consent - *Redevelop Existing to Form New Store For Stationary & Office Development* – Approved 10<sup>th</sup> September 1980

### **ADOPTED PLANNING POLICY:**

The Cheshire East Development Plan policies relevant to this application, currently comprises of; the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) and the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan. More specifically;

#### Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2017 (CELPS)

MP1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, PG1 – Overall Development Strategy, PG2 – Settlement Hierarchy, PG3 - Green Belt, PG6 – Open Countryside, PG7 – Spatial Distribution of Development, SD1 - Sustainable Development in Cheshire East, SD2 - Sustainable Development Principles, IN1 – Infrastructure, EG1 – Economic Prosperity, EG2 – Rural Economy, EG3 - Existing and allocated employment sites, SE1 – Design, SE2 - Efficient use of land, SE3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity, SE4 – The Landscape, SE5 - Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland, SE7 – The Historic Environment, SE12 – Pollution, Land Contamination and Land instability, SE13 – Flood Risk and Water Management, CO1 - Sustainable Travel and Transport and CO4 - Travel Plans and Transport Assessments

#### Saved policies of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP)

GC1 – Green Belt (New Buildings), GC4 – Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, RT8 – Access to the Countryside, DC3 – Amenity, DC6 - Circulation and Access, DC8 – Landscaping, DC9 - Tree Protection, DC10 – Landscaping and Tree Protection, DC13 & DC14 – Noise, DC15 & DC16 – Provision of facilities, DC17, DC19 & DC20 – Water resources, DC38 – Spacing, Light and Privacy and NE11 – Nature Conservation

### **Other Material Considerations**

#### National Planning Policy Framework (2019 update) (NPPF)

The relevant chapters of the NPPF to the application proposals include;

Achieving sustainable development (pages 5-8), Decision making (pages 13-14), Building a strong, competitive economy (pages 23-25), promoting sustainable transport (pages 30-33), achieving well designed places (pages 38-40), protecting Green Belt land (pages 40-44), Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (pages 49-54), Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (54-58)

#### National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Draft Ollerton with Marthall Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 7 stage) \*

Draft Over Peover Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 18 stage) \*

LCD1 – Local Character and Design, LCD2 – New development, LCD3 – Extensions and remodelling, ENV1 – Biodiversity, ENV2 – Trees, Hedgerows and Watercourses, ENV3 – Access to the countryside, INF1 – Infrastructure, INF3 – Surface Water Management, INF4 – Traffic Improvements, INF5 – Sustainable Transport, HA1 – Heritage Assets and ECON1 – Rural Economy

*\*Planning applications are decided in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is for the decision maker in each case to determine what is a material consideration and what weight to give to it.*

*Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a post-examination draft neighbourhood development plan (Regulation 18), so far as material to the application.*

**CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)**

**Head of Strategic Infrastructure (Highways)** - No objections, subject to a financial contribution of £100,000 to go towards providing a cycle route along the A50 from Knutsford to Barclays Technology Centre and £6000 to enable the monitoring of a required Travel Plan. The following conditions are also proposed; Prior submission/approval of Construction Management Plan (CMP) and that no increase in on site parking is permitted

**Environmental Protection** – No objections, subject to a number of conditions including; the provision of low emission gas boilers, the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, submission/approval of a Phase II contaminated land report, submission/approval of a contaminated land verification report, submission/approval of a soil verification report and that works should stop if contamination is identified. A number of informatives are also proposed

**Public Rights of Way (PROW) Officer** - No objections, subject to the following conditions; the submission/approval of a Public Rights of Way Management Scheme; that the line of the PROW be marked out on the development site prior to commencement and during development; the pre-commencement and post-completion condition surveys are undertaken. Improvements to existing walking, cycling and equestrian facilities are also suggested. Informatives are proposed to remind the applicant of their responsibilities.

**Environment Agency** – Proposals fall outside of EA's remit

**Local Lead Flood Risk Authority (LLFA) Officer** – No objections, subject to the following conditions; the submission/approval of an overall detailed strategy/design limiting surface water run-off and an associated management/maintenance plan and that development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA, Outline Drainage Strategy and SUDS strategy

**United Utilities** - No objections, subject to the following conditions; submission/approval of a surface water drainage scheme, foul and surface water should be drained on separate systems and the submission/approval of a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan.

**Manchester Airport** – No objections, subject to a number of conditions including; During construction, robust measures to be taken to prevent birds being attracted to the site – no pools of water should occur; robust measures should be taken to prevent birds being attracted to the site – no pools or ponds should be created without permission – no feeding of gulls, geese or waterfowl; all exterior lighting should be capped at the horizontal with no upward light spillage.

**Cheshire Gardens Trust** – *‘We do not object to this application which seeks to provide improved facilities and an enhanced work environment for this established business campus, but we have concerns regarding landscape design and noise which may cause some harm to the significance of these irreplaceable heritage assets’*

**Cadent Gas Ltd** - No comments received at time of report

**Peover Superior Parish Council** (*Majority of application site falls within this parish*) – Object to the proposal on the following grounds;

### Highways

#### *Traffic*

The proposal would result in an increase in traffic. No enforceable limit of number of employees and floor area increase is proposed. Suggest a limit on employees be imposed. Existing traffic generation should not be taken as a baseline as efforts have been made to reduce existing traffic levels. Previous approval for a car park was subject to a Travel Plan, but this was not complied with. Notwithstanding, Travel Plans are not necessarily successful – 94% of staff currently travel by car. Enforceable strategy required.

As part of Neighbourhood Plan formulation – traffic volume and speeding were a notable concern. Survey commissioned which identified that a Traffic Management Plan to mitigation the harm costed as £1.8 million.

Suggest a contribution is made by the developer, to be secured via a S106 Agreement, towards the village’s Traffic Management Plan.

Proposals include provision of an ‘events lawn’. Lack of information provided regarding this and concerned about possible knock-on traffic impacts.

#### *Congestion*

Notable at access and exist points of site at peak times, causing tailbacks/bottlenecks  
Suggest funding be secured via a S106 Agreement, to provide a roundabout on the A50 to reduce congestion

#### *Parking*

Welcome ANPR Traffic Management system but concerned unauthorised traffic will have to turn and result in further chaos/congestion.

Concerned about parking spillage beyond the boundary of the site. Currently insufficient parking provision and not been made clear how unauthorised parking on adjacent site will now be accommodated within the site.

### *Sustainability*

Not convinced that the proposed measures by Arups would be sufficient to reduce the reliance upon single-occupancy car use. More robust measures should be proposed (CO1 of CELPS). Travel strategy proposed similar to previously proposed strategies which have been shown not to be effective.

Suggest a Travel Plan is controlled via S106 Agreement with a set-out phased reduction in car journeys

### *Construction traffic*

Will cause problems in the village which will be natural route. Request the following; a) that construction management be restricted to main roads and must not pass through the village b) Parish Council should be involved in discharge of Construction Management Plan c) length of construction period should be curtailed.

**Ollerton and Marthall Parish Council** (*Minority of application site falls partly within this parish*) – Object for the following reasons;

### Highways

#### *Traffic and Congestion*

Likely that increased traffic will exacerbate issues as the parish's existing accident hotspot - Ollerton Crossroads and no consideration of this impact has been made within the submission.

#### *Construction traffic*

Also have concerns about construction traffic passing through the village

### **OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:**

Neighbouring units were notified, a site notice was erected, and the proposals were advertised in a local newspaper. At the time of consideration, consultation responses had been received from 18 interested individuals and two adjacent Parish Council's. The main concerns raised include;

### Principle/Green Belt

Is additional office space necessary as it has been shown during Covid-19 that many of the staff can work from home? / no assessment of occupancy demand in light of recent, more common, working from home practices.

Location of the site in rural locations adds very little to local economy



Impact upon openness of height of new building proposed; inappropriate development and no Very Special Circumstances

### Sustainability of location

Not sustainable

### Highways

Additional traffic generation concerns in a wider context & suggest need for Transport Assessment; doubtful that sufficient car sharing will take place, concerned about impact of construction vehicles – should not be permitted to use country lanes (Parish Council's would like input and see it controlled by S106); would like to see introduction of traffic calming measures (mitigation detailed in neighbourhood plan); current speeding concerns; impact of increased traffic upon walkers, cyclists, runners and riders; level of parking provision is insufficient; proposal likely to result in the employment of more staff with no control over staff numbers, therefore parking and traffic issues, site proposes to operation 24 hours a day – no recognition of additional impact of this on local communities.

Sceptical about measures proposed to reduce car reliance. No incentives for staff. Needs appropriate monitoring and enforcement.

Suggest a Travel Plan is controlled via S106 Agreement. Previous attempts to adhere Travel Plans have not been successful.

### Landscape/Design

Visual impact of increase in height of buildings on site; scale, mass and bulk of building to replace Kilburn House inappropriate and incongruous in its setting

### Amenity

Increased traffic resulting in increased air pollution

### Other matters

Not clear how it is proposed that the 'events lawn' would be used, possibly resulting in greater traffic concerns

## **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Green Belt**

The entirety of the site lies within the Green Belt and relates to a 'Major Developed Site in the Green Belt' as defined by saved Policy GC4 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP).

The principal acceptability of the proposals in Green Belt terms is subsequently considered against the following policies of the Cheshire East Council Development Plan; Policy PG3 (Green Belt) of the CELPS and saved policies GC1 (Green Belt – New Development) and GC4 (Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt) of the MBLP. The Green Belt paragraphs within the NPPF are also a material planning consideration.

The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering planning applications Local Planning Authorities (LPA's) should ensure that substantial weight is given to the Green Belt harm. 'Very Special Circumstances' (VSC's) will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

An LPA should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, there are several exceptions listed in policy.

Saved Policy GC1 of the MBLP refers to one such exception being development within 'Major Developed Sites' which is in accordance with Policy GC4, also of the MBLP. Saved Policy GC4 further lists a number of requirements.

The requirements of saved Policy GC4 include that development on such sites will be granted for infilling or re-development provided that it would have not greater impact on openness or the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, would not exceed the height of the existing buildings, would not lead to a major increase in the developed portion of the site.

It is noted that GC1 and GC4 refer to policies which were not saved either upon the adoption of the CELPS or earlier and while not given full weight as a result they are still of relevance

Policy PG3 of the CELPS is the more up-to-date Green Belt policy and as such carries greater weight. An exception to inappropriate development within Policy PG3 supports development that comprises of *'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.'*

The above policies are reflected in Paragraph 145 of the NPPF which states:

*A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:*

- 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*

The application proposals are therefore deemed to initially fall within this exception so an assessment of whether the development would have a greater impact on openness and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt is required.

The existing floor space of the buildings on site equates to 43,486m<sup>2</sup>. The floor space measured externally of the buildings to be demolished as part of Phase 1 of the development would be 9562m<sup>2</sup>. Post demolition, therefore, the total floor space on the wider site would equate to 33,924m<sup>2</sup>.

The floor space of the proposed new development comprises of 15,466m<sup>2</sup>. As such, the proposal would result in an increase in the amount of floor space on the site in the event of approval of this application of 5904m<sup>2</sup> taking it from 43,486m<sup>2</sup> to 49,390m<sup>2</sup>. In the context of the wider site, this would equate to an overall increase in floor space of 13.6%.

The height and spread of development are also a consideration. The new office block proposed 'New Kilburn' (Phase 2), is proposed to be taller than the existing Kilburn House. However, again in the wider context this increase is not significant. A taller tower would be demolished immediately adjacent to the proposed new office build and the site is located largely centrally within the wider Radbroke campus.

With regards to the proposed extensions, all of these would represent subordinate additions to the buildings to which they would adjoin, and none would exceed the heights of the associated buildings.

In consideration of the spread of the proposed built form, most of the development proposed is the construction of the new office block, 'New Kilburn'. This would mostly be positioned on the footprint of the existing Kilburn House and would sit between two other office blocks. The other development proposed around the site would either be located amongst other built form and/or be relatively minor in scale.

For the above reasons, although post-demolition, additional development is sought on site, compared to the existing situation, in the context of the existing built form on site, the sensitive position on site where the new development is sought and the screening provided by mature trees, the additional development is not deemed to have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including the land within it. The application proposals are therefore deemed to represent appropriate development in the Green Belt.

## **Economy**

Policy EG2 of the CELPS refers to the rural economy, more specifically commercial proposals outside of Principal Towns, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres, which the application proposals do, they fall within what is defined by PG2 of the CELPS as 'Other settlements and Rural Areas'.

Policy EG2 states that in such locations, development which; provides opportunities for local rural employment that supports the vitality of rural settlements, encourages the retention and expansion of existing businesses, encourages the creation and expansion of sustainable farming and food production businesses (amongst others), will be supported. Draft Policy ECON1 of the Draft Over Peover NP is largely reflective of this.

The application proposals support the expansion of an existing business. As such, Policy EG2 states that the development subsequently needs to meet a number of requirements. These include;

- Meets sustainable development objectives of the plan
- Supports the rural economy and could not be reasonably be expected to located within a designated centre by reason of their products sold
- would not undermine strategic employment allocations
- is supported by adequate infrastructure

- is consistent in scale with its location and surrounding buildings
- would not harm residential amenity
- is well sited and designed
- does not conflict with other policies of the development plan

In response, the proposal would contribute the creating a strong economy for Cheshire East by developing and modernising an existing site that is a major employer in the area.

The site indirectly supports the local economy with staff utilising nearby facilities and the employment site is established. It would not undermine strategic employment allocations given the nature of the proposed development relatively modest increase in floor space proposed. The development would be consistent in scale with its location and surrounding buildings, would not harm residential amenity (expanded upon later in this report) and is well sited and designed. Whether the proposal is supported by adequate infrastructure is considered in the Highways section of this report as is an assessment against all other relevant policies of the development plan.

## **Highways**

Policy CO1 of the CELPS refers to sustainable travel and transport. The policy expects development to reduce the need to travel by; guiding development to sustainable and accessible locations; ensuring development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport within its design; encourages more flexible working; support improvements to communication technology and support measures that reduce the level of trips made by single occupancy vehicles. It also states that development will improve pedestrian facilities so that walking is attractive for shorter journeys and improve cyclist facilities so that cycling is attractive.

Policy CO2 refers to enabling business growth through transport infrastructure. It states that the Council will support transport infrastructure that will mitigate the potential impact of development proposals including; supporting measures to improve walking, cycling and sustainable travel environment on routes relieved of traffic and by supporting schemes outlined within the Transport Delivery Plan.

The crux of Saved Policy DC6 of the MBLP is that development should provide safe and convenient access provision for vehicles, pedestrians, special needs groups, and service/emergency vehicles and to provide safe and convenient facilities for the servicing of businesses.

Draft Policy INF5 of the Draft Over Peover NP states that proposals to provide or enhance facilities for pedestrian facilities and cyclists will be supported and will proposals to promote better integration between different modes of transport including links to Knutsford (amongst other settlements).

It is important to note in regard to the highways impact of the site that the applicant has advised that there are no increases in staff numbers proposed as part of this application and also that the existing number of car parking spaces would be retained and not increased.

This point has been met with some scepticism by some of the local Parish Council's for a variety of reasons including that given the amount of additional floorspace proposed, its hard to imagine that this would not, in turn, result in an uplift in staff numbers. It has been detailed that this is in addition to the fact that staff numbers on site have steadily been increasing in recent years even with the

presence of conditioned staff travel plan's which have had the aim of reducing the number of staff arriving by car.

In light of this concern, the applicant was asked to provide a response. This is detailed below;

*'The current daily (Pre-COVID) occupancy of Radbroke is around 3,700 people.*

*Barclays will only open its offices to more colleagues when it is safe to do so, in line with government guidance.*

*After Phase 1, daily occupancy is anticipated to be circa 2,700.*

*Following Phase 2, daily occupancy is anticipated to return to current daily levels. In order to confirm commitment to this, Barclays would be happy to share parking and vehicle movement data with Cheshire East Council. If necessary, Barclays would be happy to accept a Planning Condition requiring the collation and sharing of this data following the completion of the development to inform future iterations of the Travel Plan.*

*The proposals, in tandem with new flexible working patterns will facilitate a more adaptable campus, which will result in no net uplift in day-to-day occupancy. This, combined with a modern, technology-led Travel Plan will ensure that the traffic impact of the site upon the surrounding area will be reduced. The proposed travel planning measures can be reviewed within Section 7 of the submitted Travel Plan. This should be read in conjunction with the Transport Statement that has also been submitted.'*

These matters are explored further within the below sections.

### Access and Car Parking

The Stocks Lane access would continue to be used as the main access to the site catering for both staff, visitors, deliveries and the shuttle buses. Access to the staff car parking areas is controlled by a barrier and the Council's Head of Strategic Infrastructure (HSI) advises that sufficient space is provided to stack vehicles on the approach. Visitor car parking and bus drop off is located in the front of the site as you enter from Stocks Lane.

One of the problems with existing car parking arrangements is that it is difficult to find empty spaces in various car parks despite their being 2,446 car parking spaces on the site.

The applicant proposes to implement a car park management system with Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) number plate recognition that would ensure that access to parking spaces is only permitted to those vehicles that have been booked in advance. Car Parks will be named and signage introduced to locate the car parks and the pre-booked system would control the number of vehicles in each car park.

It is proposed that staff travel to the site by car would only be allowed when a pre-booked space was available and there would be a facility to allow temporary parking for vehicles to park if there are difficulties at the barrier. This is all set out within the Staff Travel Plan submitted with this application.

The Council's HSI advises that there are good cycle facilities provided within the site, 40 covered cycle parking spaces are available with showering and changing facilities.

The application site has had a travel plan for a considerable length of time that the Council's HSI advises has had 'limited' success in reducing the level of car trips to and from the site with the number of staff on the site increasing.

The site wide travel plan for Barclays has been updated in this application and a range of measures has been proposed in the plan to reduce car travel to the site and also improve the sustainable mode choices for travelling to the Radbroke Hall site. This travel plans sets out an initial target for there to be a no net increase in the average daily car movements to the site in Phase 1 (the elements subject to full planning permission). This is based upon the current baseline survey of trips. It is detailed that subsequent targets for Phase 2 would be reviewed and agreed with the Council.

It is important that monitoring of the plan takes place and that it is just not the applicant monitoring their own plan. This is a point raised by a large number of the objectors to the scheme. As such, a contribution of £6,000 is required to facilitate Cheshire East Council to undertake external monitoring of the plan. This would be secured through a S106 Agreement. The implementation of the Staff Travel plan shall be conditioned. A further condition requiring the submission of an updated Staff Travel Plan to be submitted with the Reserved Matters of the development is also proposed. It is proposed that one of the requirements of the travel plan would be a requirement to provide parking and vehicle movement data with Cheshire East Council.

To improve the connectivity of Radbroke Hall, the Council's Local Transport Delivery Plan includes proposals to provide a cycle route along the A50 from Knutsford to Barclays Technology Centre. The Travel Plan is an important part of this application and the ability for staff/visitors to be able to cycle and walk in safety to the site would enhance the use of these sustainable modes. The Council's HSI therefore advises that a contribution of £100,000 is required to contribute towards the provision of this facility in order to improve the accessibility of the site and also compliment the measures identified in the Travel Plan to reduce the number of car borne trips to the site. This would be secured through a S106 Agreement.

### Highway Impact of the Development

Radbroke Hall is a large site that employs a high number of staff and the Council's HSI advises that managing the traffic generation of the site on the local highway network has been a historic issue.

However, it needs to be recognised that the applicant has suggested that there will be no increases in staff numbers as part of the development, no further parking spaces are subsequently proposed and that sustainable travel initiatives are being pursued to reduce the reliance on car trips to the site and that it is being addressed in this planning application by introducing new travel plan measures. The Council's HSI recommends that it be conditioned to ensure that there are no increases in the number of parking spaces on site.

For a combination of these reasons, the Council's HSI advises that there would be no material increase in traffic movements from the site. In these circumstances, the HSI advises that there can be no objection to the application in regard to traffic impact.

The internal layout and designation of the car parking is supported as is the applicant's intention to increase the level of sustainable trips made to the site.

Two local Parish Councils have requested that the construction traffic be restricted to main roads and must not pass through certain villages. In response, the Council's HSI has advised that they cannot insist which routes should be used in a Construction Management Plan because these are all public roads. As there are many routes that link to the site that are unsuitable for HGV vehicles, the Council's HSI agrees that a CMP condition is required. The requirements of the condition should advise of intended routes so these can be agreed with the Council's Highways Team.

Subject to a S106 contribution of £106,000 and the above-mentioned conditions, the Council's HSI advises that there are no highway objections raised to the application.

Peover Superior Parish Council, within which the majority of the application site is located, have requested a contribution towards an identified village's Traffic Management Plan. In addition, they have proposed that funding be secured via a S106 Agreement, to provide a roundabout on the A50 to reduce congestion. The provision of traffic calming measures has also been proposed by another Parish Council. In response, the Council's HSI has advised that if there was going to be intensification of the site by increasing staff and parking, then a contribution towards such schemes could be justified as would the possible requirement be to provide a Transport Assessment (TA). However, this is not the case and implementation of the cycle route and close monitoring of the Travel Plan are considered sufficient.

As such, the proposal is deemed to adhere with the requirements of policies CO1 and CO2 of the CELPS and Policy DC6 of the MBLP.

## **Heritage and Design**

Policy SE1 (Design) of the CELPS advises that proposals should achieve a high standard of design and; wherever possible, enhance the built environment. It should also respect the pattern, character and form of the surroundings.

Policy SD2 of the CELPS states that development should contribute positively to an areas character and identity, creating or re-enforcing local distinctiveness in terms of; height, scale, form, grouping, choice of materials, design features, massing and impact upon the streetscene. These policies are supplemented by the Cheshire East Design Guide SPD.

Draft Policy LCD1 of the Draft Over Peover NP states that new buildings, features and materials should be characteristic of the settlement and demonstrate consideration of the Cheshire East Design Guide SPD.

There are two, Grade II listed structures within the site. The comprise of Radbroke Hall itself and the Rose Garden and Pavillions at Radbroke Hall. The impact of the development upon the setting of these heritage assets is a material planning consideration.

Policy SE7 of the CELPS states that *'All new development should seek to avoid harm to heritage assets and make a positive contribution to the character of Cheshire East's historic and built environment, including the setting of assets and where appropriate, the wider historic environment.'* Draft Neighbourhood Plan policy HA1 follows similar principles.

The Council's Urban Design and Heritage Officer has advised that he does not object to the principle of the proposal in heritage terms as there is much to commend in terms of creating a more legible and

green context for the historic buildings, free of certain buildings and parking, and the creation of better quality landscape and public realm at the heart of the site.

However, the Officer advises that the proposal would result in *'less than substantial harm'*. This is due to the impact of the additional scale, mass and bulk created by the new office block (New Kilburn) proposed in Phase 2 compared to the office building it would replace. More specifically, its forward projection and its increase in height compared to the existing office in this location, when viewed from the closest heritage asset.

The Cheshire Garden's Trust concur with the assessment of impacts of proposed development on the heritage assets. However, the Trust are concerned that the landscape design of the proposed 'kitchen garden', which provides a new green space, a transition between the rose garden and proposed landscape corridors, is a missed opportunity and as presented, may cause some harm to the significance of the garden.

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that;

*'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'*

Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that;

*'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

The Council's Heritage Officer has advised that the *'less than substantial harm'* is at the lower end of the scale when considered in the wider context of what is proposed, more specifically, the potential enhancements to the assets and their setting as a result of the demolition.

In consideration of the public benefits, these are deemed to include; supporting a local employer to deliver an improved office space; create a better working environment for the existing staff assisting with job retention and, as a result of demolition, create a small increase in green space on site.

Given that the degree of harm is at the lower end of less than substantial, it is deemed that the benefits derived from supporting this existing rural business outweigh the harm in this instance.

In design terms, conditions are proposed requiring the prior submission/approval of material details, including hard landscaping. In addition, specialist control will be required within any construction management regime to ensure that the construction works (including construction traffic) do not adversely impact upon the listed buildings (through vibration, vehicle strike or other damage for example).

Subject to these conditions, the proposals are therefore deemed acceptable in consideration of the heritage and design policies of the development plan and NPPF.

## **Landscape**



Policy SD2 of the CELPS states that development will be expected to respect and, where possible, enhance the landscape character of the area.

Policy SE4 of the CELPS specifically relates to landscape considerations. It states that all development should conserve the landscape character and quality and where possible, enhance and effectively manage the historic, natural and man-made features that contribute to local distinctiveness.

Draft Policy LCD2 of the Draft Over Peover NP states that as part of new development, certain local landscape features should be retained and enhanced, where applicable.

The demolition of Kilburn House, Lovelace House and Brooker House will open up large parts of the site, allowing views west to east with the demolition of Lovelace House and increasing the gross external area (GEA), this is illustrated on the submitted Soft Landscape Plan Phase 1.

The Council's Landscape Officer advises that the Phase 1 works (full planning permission elements), are acceptable with regards to the hard landscaping, but the soft landscaping detail (planting) would need to be conditioned in the event of approval.

Matters of landscape are not sought for approval for the Phase 2 works (Outline planning permission elements). These matters would be subject to a further application. However, in principle, the Council's Landscape Officer raises no objections to Phase 2.

As such, subject to a soft landscaping scheme being conditioned for the phase 1 works, and an associated landscape implementation condition being included, it is considered that the proposal would adhere with policies SD2 and SE4 of the CELPS.

## **Trees**

Policy SE5 of the CELPS states that development which will result in the loss of, or threat to, the continued health and life expectancy of trees, hedgerows or woodlands, that provide a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity, landscape character or historic character of the surrounding area, will not normally be permitted. Draft Policy ENV2 of the Draft Over Peover NP is broadly similar.

Draft Policy LCD2 of the Draft Over Peover NP states that as part of new development, certain local landscape features should be retained and enhanced, where applicable, including; mature trees and vegetation.

Radbroke Hall is located within a Parkland setting which is screened from the perimeter boundaries and surrounding roads by existing established tree cover. More recent tree plantings surround the parking areas and buildings of the Barclay Technology Centre. Woodland and tree cover to the perimeter of the site are recorded on the National Forest Inventory and also the Priority Habitat Inventory for Deciduous Woodland (not within the site edged red for development). The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no trees afforded protection from a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

The application has been supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement by Greenman Environmental Management (July 2020, Issue 3).

Further tree information was received as addendums and a later, updated Tree Removal Plan and associated schedule was received.

This most recent information identifies that overall, pruning works & crown raising is proposed to a number of the trees around the development site and 4 individual trees and 10 groups of trees are sought for complete removal, including a group of x55 Pine trees (WG79), set-in some 24 metres from the southern site boundary.

The Council's Tree Officer has advised that aside from the impact to WG79, the majority of the removals will be of semi-mature and early mature plantings of moderate and lower quality trees.

As part of the application, a softscape planting schedule has been provided which shows the provision of the planting of 161 new trees. This mitigation would appear to sufficiently account for the loss, but a condition is proposed below to ensure that this be the case.

The Council's Tree Officer has advised that should the application be deemed acceptable, it would be essential to secure the following; a finalised tree removals and retention plan, tree protection plan, arb method statement, existing and proposed levels information, and engineer designed surface locations and specification. It would be essential for all tree losses to be mitigated for as part of a comprehensive landscape.

Subject to these conditions, the application proposals are deemed to adhere with the relevant tree policies of the development plan.

## **Ecology**

Policy SE3 of the CELPS states that developments that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on a site with legally protected species or priority habitats (to name a few), will not be permitted except where the reason for or benefits of the proposed development outweigh the impact of the development.

Saved Policy NE11 of the MBLP is consistent in so far as it states that development which would not adversely affect nature conservation interests will not normally be permitted. Draft Policy ENV1 of the Draft Over Peover NP is broadly similar.

The application is supported by an ecological appraisal. The acceptability of the various elements of the development in ecology terms is considered below;

### Great Crested Newts (GCN)

The surveys submitted in support of this application recorded the presence of this protected species at three ponds within 250m of the proposed development.

The application site, however, offers limited habitat for great crested newts and the proposed development would not result in the fragmentation or isolation of great crested newt habitat.

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that 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' (RAMS).

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that provided these measures are implemented, the proposed development would be 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.

#### Common toad

This priority species was recorded at a pond some distance from the proposed works. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that this species is not reasonably likely to be significantly affected by the proposed development.

#### Reptiles, Kingfisher, badger, water vole and otter

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that these species are not reasonably likely to be present or affected by the proposed development.

#### Bats (buildings)

Evidence of bat activity in the form of a minor roost of relatively common bat species has been recorded within the buildings subject to this application. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that the usage of the building by bats is likely to be limited to single or small numbers of animals using the buildings for relatively short periods of time and there is no evidence to suggest a significant maternity roost is present. The Nature Conservation Officer advises that the loss/disturbance of the roosts associated with the buildings on this site, in the absence of mitigation, is likely to have a low impact upon on bats at the local level and a low impact upon the conservation status of the species as a whole.

The submitted report recommends the installation of bat boxes as a means of compensating for the loss of the roost and also recommends measures to reduce the risk posed to any bats that may be present when the works are completed.

#### *EC Habitats Directive Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 ODPM Circular 06/2005*

The UK implemented the EC Directive in the Conservation (natural habitats etc) regulations which contain two layers of protection:

- A licensing system administered by Natural England which repeats the above tests
- A requirement on local planning authorities ("lplas") to have regard to the directive's requirements.
- The Habitat Regulations 2010 require local authorities to have regard to three tests when considering applications that affect a European Protected Species. In broad terms the tests are that:

- The proposed development is in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment
- There is no satisfactory alternative
- There is no detriment to the maintenance of the species population at favourable conservation status in its natural range

Current case law instructs that if it is considered clear or very likely that the requirements of the directive cannot be met because there is a satisfactory alternative, or because there are no conceivable “other imperative reasons of overriding public interest”, then planning permission should be refused. Conversely, if it seems that the requirements are likely to be met, then there would be no impediment to planning permission be granted. If it is unclear whether the requirements would be met or not, a balanced view taking into account the particular circumstances of the application should be taken.

### *Overriding Public Interest*

The provision of mitigation would assist with the continued presence of Bats

### *Alternatives*

There is an alternative scenario that needs to be assessed, this are:

- No development on the site

Without any development, specialist mitigation for Bats would not be provided which would be of benefit to the species.

The Council’s Nature Conservation Officer advises that if planning consent is granted the proposed mitigation/compensation is acceptable and is likely to maintain the favourable conservation status of the species of bat concerned, subject to it being conditioned.

### Roosting Bats (trees)

The submitted assessment identifies two trees (T5 and T12) with low bat roost potential that would be felled as part of the proposed development. A further tree (T23) with low bat roost potential that may also be lost to facilitate the landscape of Babbage House was also recorded. The Council’s Nature Conservation Officer advises that due to the low potential of the trees lost to the proposed development, roosting bats are not reasonably likely to be affected.

### Lighting

Based upon the submitted Light Obtrusion Statement, the Council’s Nature Conservation Officer advises that it appears unlikely that lighting associated with the proposed development would result in a significant adverse impact upon foraging and commuting bats. However, the Council’s Nature Conservation Officer recommends that if planning permission is granted a condition should be attached requiring any additional lighting to be agreed with the LPA.

### Hedgerows

Native hedgerows are a priority habitat and so a material consideration. The proposed development will result in the loss of a section of existing hedgerow.

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that if this loss of hedgerow is considered unavoidable then compensatory hedgerow planting must be provided to address its loss. The submitted biodiversity metric shows a net gain for biodiversity in respect hedgerows. This is reflected by the submitted landscape plans. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that if the loss of the existing hedgerows is considered unavoidable, then adequate compensatory planting is proposed.

### Bluebells

The 2019 phase one survey report recorded the presence of blue bells associated with the hedgerows and woodlands on site. Native bluebells are a priority species and hence a material consideration.

Following discussions between the Council's Nature Conservation Officer and the applicant's Ecologist it has been identified that it is likely that native bluebells are present in the southern section of woodland and so would be affected by the proposed development.

In order to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development the applicant has proposed that native bluebells be translocated to retained areas of woodland. Additional native bluebell planting is also proposed as part of the landscaping scheme for the site.

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that if the loss of bluebells from the southern section of woodland is considered unavoidable, the submitted method statement is sufficient to minimise the impacts of the proposed development upon this species, subject to a condition to ensure its implementation.

### SUDS

Paragraph 6.3 of the submitted SUDS strategy suggests the possibility of utilising the existing ponds on site are part of the SUDS for the site. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that in order to safeguard the nature conservation value of the existing ponds, a condition should be imposed in the event of approval to ensure that these ponds should not be used as attenuation ponds as part of the SUDs for the site. The Council's Flood Risk Officer has advised that it would not result in any flood risk concerns.

### Nesting Birds

If planning consent is granted, the Council's Nature Conservation Officer recommends that a condition would be required to safeguard nesting birds.

### Biodiversity net gain

In accordance with CELPS Policy SE3(5), all development proposals must seek to lead to an overall enhancement for biodiversity. In order to assess the overall loss/gains of biodiversity

resulting from the proposed development the applicant has submitted an assessment undertaken in accordance with the Defra Biodiversity 'Metric' version 2.

This assessment shows that the proposed development would result in a net gain for biodiversity.

In order to ensure that the proposed development delivers the level of biodiversity net gain, the Woodland Planting shown on the submitted planting diagram, must be all suitable native species. The submitted planting list has now been amended to reflect this. However, it is noted that it lacks the level of detail required as sought by the Council's Landscape Officer. As such, in the event of approval, as advised in the landscaping section of this report, a condition is proposed for a detailed landscaping plan to be submitted (and implemented) which takes account of the habitat creation detailed in the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.

This planning application also provides an opportunity to incorporate features to increase the biodiversity value of the final development in accordance with CELPS Policy SE3.

The Council's Nature Conservation Officer therefore recommends that the applicant submits an ecological enhancement strategy prior to the determination of the application or if planning permission is granted a condition should be attached which requires the submission of an ecological enhancement strategy.

An update on this matter will be provided to committee. However, a condition is proposed at this time.

#### Other matters

In addition to the above, the Council's Nature Conservation Officer recommends conditions to ensure the delivery of the submitted landscaping and the submission and implementation of a 30-year habitat and landscape management plan.

Subject to the above-mentioned suggested conditions, the application proposals are deemed to adhere with the requirements of Policy SE3 of the CELPS, Policy NE11 of the MBLP and draft policy ENV1 of the draft OPNP.

#### **Amenity**

Policy DC3 of the MBLP states that development should not significantly injure the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential property or sensitive uses due to (amongst other considerations); loss of privacy, sunlight and daylight, an overbearing impact and environmental considerations. Policy SE1 of the CELPS states that development should ensure an appropriate level of privacy for new and existing residential properties. Draft Policy LCD3 of the Draft Over Peover NP states that extensions and re-modelling of existing buildings should avoid any unacceptable overbearing impact upon neighbouring properties and privacy should be respected.

The closest neighbouring dwellings to the application proposals would be over 60 metres away and as such, no concerns are deemed to be raised by the application proposals in relation to; privacy, light or an overbearing impact.

In consideration of environmental amenity (noise, air and land pollution), the Council's Environmental Protection Team have advised that they have no objections, subject to a number of conditions including; the provision of low emission gas boilers, the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, submission/approval of a Phase II contaminated land report, submission/approval of a contaminated land verification report, submission/approval of a soil verification report and that works should stop if contamination is identified.

Subject to the above conditions, minus the gas boiler condition, which is not considered to be enforceable, the proposal would therefore adhere with the amenity policies of the development plan.

### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

Policy SE13 of the CELPS relates to flood risk and water management. It states that all development must integrate measures for sustainable water management to reduce flood risk, avoid an adverse impact on water quality and quantity within the borough and provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity, health and recreation in line with national guidance. Draft Policy INF3 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan follows similar principles.

According to the Environment Agency flood risk maps, the whole of the application site falls within a Flood Zone 1 (FZ1). FZ1 is the lowest of the flood risk categories and means that the land has less than a 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding. It relates to all areas outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3, Flood Zones of a higher probability of flooding.

Given the scale of the application site, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

The Environment Agency have reviewed the proposals and advised they have no comments to make as the development falls outside the scope of their remit.

The Council's LLFA Officer has reviewed the proposals and advised that they have no objections, subject to the following conditions; the submission/approval of an overall detailed strategy/design limiting surface water run-off and an associated management/maintenance plan and that development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA, Outline Drainage Strategy and SUDS strategy.

In consideration of drainage, United Utilities have advised that they have no objections, subject to the following conditions; submission/approval of a surface water drainage scheme, foul and surface water should be drained on separate systems and the submission/approval of a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan.

### **Public Rights of Way (PROW)**

The development, if granted consent, may affect Public Footpath Ollerton Numbers; 9, 26, 11 and 27 and Peover Superior No. 27, as recorded on the Definitive Map and Statement, the legal record of Public Rights of Way.

The proposed development would have an indirect effect on the Public Right of Way, which constitutes a material consideration.

The Council's PROW Officer has reviewed the proposed development and raises no objections to the proposed development subject to a condition requiring; the submission/approval of a Public Rights of Way Management Scheme; that the line of the PROW be marked out on the development site prior to commencement and during development; the pre-commencement and post-completion condition surveys are undertaken. Informatives are also proposed to remind the applicant of their responsibilities.

The Council's PROW Officer has advised that the development presents an opportunity to deliver and improve walking, cycling and equestrian facilities for transport and leisure purposes. This is supported by Draft Policy ENV3 of the Draft Over Peover NP. It is considered that the contribution required by Highways towards a cycle lane provision on the A50 assists in realizing this opportunity.

It is recommended these be included in the event of approval.

### **Manchester Airport**

The Safeguarding Authority for Manchester Airport has assessed this proposal and its potential to conflict aerodrome Safeguarding criteria.

Manchester Airport have advised that they have no objections to the proposed development, subject to a number of conditions including; During construction, robust measures to be taken to prevent birds being attracted to the site – no pools of water should occur; robust measures should be taken to prevent birds being attracted to the site – no pools or ponds should be created without permission – no feeding of gulls, geese or waterfowl; all exterior lighting should be capped at the horizontal with no upward light spillage.

As the proposed conditions in relation to birds are relatively vague, it is proposed, in the event of approval, to require that an Environmental Construction Management Plan (CEMP), include a section setting out measures to address these specific concerns. The proposed lighting condition shall also be included in the event of approval.

### **Levy (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;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

A financial contribution of £100,000 is necessary to improve the accessibility of the site and also compliment the measures identified in the Travel Plan to reduce the number of car borne trips to the site.

The financial contribution of £6,000 is deemed necessary to ensure measures proposed in the Travel Plan to reduce the number of car borne trips to the site are implemented.



The requirements are therefore considered to be necessary, fair and reasonable in relation to the development. The S106 recommendation is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

### **Other matters**

Concerns have been raised about the uncertainty of the proposed 'Events Lawn'. In response, the agent has advised that this space would be to provide flexible spaces varying in size for staff events, outdoor meetings or presentations, informal gatherings or social events. *'Barclays are not planning to host large public events such as concerts in the space. It is largely to be used for staff with potential some public use on open days etc.'*

The part of the scheme forms part of Phase 1 of the development. If/when Phase 2 is implemented, the new office block would be built over this space. No specific concerns with regards to how this space will be used are raised.

### **Conclusions**

The principle of extensions and alterations to existing buildings and the replacement of other buildings on this employment site in the Green Belt is deemed appropriate given the nature of the proposed demolitions and subsequent extensions/new build elements are considered to largely constitute infilling on the existing site with no materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposal would contribute the creating a strong economy for Cheshire East by developing and modernising an existing site that is a major employer in the area.

Matters of highways are noted as a significant local concern for various reasons, mostly with regards to increases in traffic and construction vehicles using country lanes. The Council's Head of Strategic Infrastructure however, raises no objections on highways grounds subject to a financial contribution to the creation of a cycle lane of the A50, a development highlighted as a requirement by the Council's Local Transport Delivery Plan and a contribution to ensure the implementation of the Travel Plan. Conditions are also proposed.

The design of the proposals are deemed acceptable and although *'less than substantial'* harm to the heritage assets would be created, this harm would be at the lower end of the scale and it is deemed that the wider public benefits of the scheme outweigh this harm.

In consideration of environmental matters, no objections are raised from the relevant consultees with regards to; landscape, trees or ecology, subject to conditions where necessary.

There are no neighbouring amenity concerns given the countryside location of the site and that the majority of the built form is to be located towards the centre of the existing large site.

No concerns are raised in relation to public rights of way, flood risk and drainage or Manchester Airport, subject to conditions where deemed necessary.

As such, the application is recommended for APPROVAL subject to a S106 Agreement to secure a financial contribution towards off-site highways improvements and conditions.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**APPROVE subject to a S106 Agreement to secure;**

| <b>S106</b>                                | <b>Amount</b> | <b>Triggers</b>       |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|
| Highways – Off-site improvement works      | £100,000      | Prior to commencement |
| Highways – Monitoring of Staff Travel Plan | £6,000        | Prior to commencement |

**And the following conditions;**

1. Time (Phase 1)
2. Time (Phase 2)
3. Submission of reserved matters (Phase 2)
4. Reserved Matters application made within 3 years (Phase 2)
5. Plans (For each phase, including phasing plan)
6. Travel Plan – Implementation (Phase 1)
7. Updated Staff Travel Plan to be submitted with Reserved Matters (Phase 2)
8. Prior Submission/approval of CEMP to include a) appropriate routes for construction (Highways) b) measures to prevent bird attraction (Manchester Airport) and c) measures to ensure that the construction works (including construction traffic) do not adversely impact upon the listed buildings (Heritage) (Each Phase)
9. No increase in Parking Spaces hereby approved
10. Submission/approval of facing, roofing and hard surfacing materials (Phase 1)
11. Submission of facing, roofing and hard surfacing materials with Reserved Matters (Phase 2)
12. Submission/approval of an updated soft landscaping scheme and planting plan to include; a) the habitat creation detailed in the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and b) Tree loss mitigation (Phase 1)
13. Landscape implementation (Phase 1)
14. Submission/approval of levels details (Phase 1)
15. Submission/approval of a finalised tree removals and retention plan (Phase 1)
16. Submission/approval of a tree protection plan (Phase 1)
17. Submission/approval of an arboricultural method statement (Phase 1)
18. Submission/approval of an engineer designed surface locations and specification (Phase 1)
19. Implementation of Great Crested Newt Method statement
20. Implementation of Bat Mitigation
21. Implementation of Bluebell mitigation statement
22. Submission/approval of external lighting details (Each Phase)
23. Existing ponds excluded from SUDS
24. Nesting birds (Each Phase)
25. Prior submission/approval of details showing the incorporation of features to enhance the biodiversity value of the completed development
26. Submission/approval of a 30 year habitat management plan
27. Provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure
28. Submission/approval of a Phase II contaminated land report
29. Submission/approval of a contaminated land verification report

- 30. Submission/approval of a soil verification report**
- 31. Works should stop if contamination is identified**
- 32. Submission/approval of an overall detailed strategy/design limiting surface water run-off and an associated management/maintenance plan**
- 33. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA, Outline Drainage Strategy and SUDS strategy**
- 34. Submission/approval of a surface water drainage scheme (Phase 1)**
- 35. Surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted with Reserved Matters (Phase 2)**
- 36. Foul and surface water - drained on separate systems**
- 37. Submission/approval of a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan (Phase 1)**
- 38. Sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan shall be submitted with Reserved Matters (Phase 2)**
- 39. Submission/approval of a Public Rights of Way Management Scheme**
- 40. Line of the PROW be marked out**
- 41. Submission/approval of pre-commencement and post-completion PROW condition surveys**

*In order to give proper effect to the Strategic Planning Board's intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice Chairman) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice.*

