

Application Number:	23/00479/FUL
Proposal:	Installation of seven No. kiosks and landscape bund required in connection with wider permitted development works.
Site:	Glossop Wastewater Treatment Works, Melandra Road, Mottram-in-Longendale
Applicant:	United Utilities
Recommendation:	Grant planning permission, subject to conditions.
Reason for Report:	A Speakers Panel decision is required because the application has been advertised as departure from the development plan.
Background Papers:	The planning application documents are background papers to the report. They are open to inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

1. SITE & SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 The application relates to development at Glossop Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW), this is an established facility located just within the Tameside administrative boundary. The facility is accessed from within the neighbouring borough, High Peak via Melandra Road. It is located in a rural setting adjacent to the River Etherow and is also located within the Green Belt.
- 1.2 The site is an operational WWTW, it comprises of a number of buildings, effluent tanks and processing ponds. The largest of the on site buildings stands at approximately 3 storeys in height, buildings are constructed from stone whereas operations structures are concrete. Access is restricted by a gated entrance from Melandra Road, there is a secure palisade fence to the boundary, levels within the site are relatively flat, but these rise considerably outside of the boundary to the north/ northwest where land is in agricultural use. The River Etherow bounds the site to the east and south. Large areas of woodland are found along boundaries, their collective presence greatly screens public views. Within the site, buildings are separated by open grassed areas, there is also an internal access road that serves all onsite building and structures.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This planning application seeks permission for the installation of equipment within the grounds of the existing WWTW. The proposed works form part of a larger development project where much of the works falls within the scope of permitted development. The works will provide new assets within the facility as well as upgrading and refurbishing of existing treatment infrastructure connected with the treatment of sewage.
- 2.2 The supporting statement states; *'As a sewerage undertaker, United Utilities is obligated to provide the appropriate facilities for the treatment and storage of wastewater to the required standard by the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Urban Wastewater Treatment Regulations 1994. The proposed works involve the installation of wastewater equipment necessary to deliver the EA Water Industry National Environmental Programme (WINEP) and to meet phosphorus, ammonia and Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) final effluent consent standards to achieve Water Framework Directive (WFD) 'good' status. The proposed scheme is also required to accommodate future population growth at Glossop WWTW based on the 2035 design horizon'.*

- 2.3 The application seeks permission for the erection of seven kiosks in addition to a landscaping bund. The location of the kiosks are shown against works falling within the scope of permitted development in the accompanying plans. The kiosks would be located throughout the site alongside established site infrastructure. The kiosks are flat roofed structures, they would be constructed from glass reinforced plastic (GRP) and be olive green in colour. The application describes the structures as follows:
- TSR Motor Control Centre (MCC) Kiosk, 5.36m (L) x 3.64m (W) x 4.30m (H)
 - Tertiary Treatment MCC Kiosk, 10.16m (L) x 3.64m (W) x 4.30m (H)
 - Secondary Ferric Dosing Kiosk, 11.10m (L) x 4.05m (W) x 3.851m (H)
 - Sodium Hydroxide Dosing Kiosk, 11.10m (L) x 4.05m (W) x 3.851m (H)
 - DNO Kiosk, 5.00m (L) x 2.50m (W) x 3.30m (H)
 - LV Distribution MCC Kiosk, 10.16m (L) x 3.64m (W) x 3.30m (H)
 - Primary Ferric Dosing Kiosk, 11.10m (L) x 4.05m (W) x 3.851m (H)
 - Landscaping bund, 63m (L) x 23m (W) x 1.5m (H) with 1:3 sloping sides resulting in total volume of 1500m³
- 2.4 A landscape bund will be formed from re-used spoil on the southern part of the site. The estimated volume will be approximately 1,500 cubic metres. The maximum dimensions of the bund will be 23m width, 63m length and 1.5m height. The slope gradient will be 1 in 3.
- 2.5 Glossop WWTW, and therefore the land subject to these works, is owned by United Utilities and constitutes operational land. Under Section 263 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 operational land means, in relation to statutory undertakers, land which is used for the purpose of carrying out their undertaking, and land in which an interest is held for that purpose. As such, the majority of works required to deliver the improvements to the WWTW are classed as permitted development under Schedule 2 Part 13 Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO). This part of the GPDO enables development to be carried out by or on behalf of sewerage undertakers within their operational land without the need for a planning application to be submitted. Amongst other provisions, this includes below ground development, the erection of kiosks under 29 cubic metres and structures under 15m in height.
- 2.6 The applicant has stated that the following works will be undertaken as permitted development as part of the comprehensive refurbishment of the site:
- Dirty Backwash Tank, 7.00mDIA x 7.50m (H)
 - Dirty Backwash PS Slab, 6.1m (L) x 5.0m (W) x 0.45m (D)
 - Clean Backwash Tank, 5.70mDIA x 7.50m (H)
 - Washwater Kiosk, 3.50m (L) x 2.10m (W) x 3.0m (H)
 - TSR Slab, 19.95m (L) x 14.00m (W) x 0.5m (D)
 - TSR Filters, 3.00mDIA x 4.50m (H)
 - TSR Feed PS, 6.30mDIA x 6.00m (D)
 - TSR Feed PS Valve Slab, 7.35m (L) x 6.30m (W) x 0.45m (D)
 - Blind Trench, 11.10m (L) x 1.40m (W) x 1.585m (D)
 - Water Booster Set, 3.50m (L) x 1.80m (W) x 2.438m (H)
 - Surface Water PS, 3.30mDIA x 4.60m (D)
 - Surface Water PS Valve Slab, 4.80m (L) x 3.30m (W) x 0.45m (D)
 - MH1 Final Effluent, 2.60m (L) x 2.60m (W) x 2.55m (D)
 - Interception Chamber, 2.10mDIA x 3.20m (D)
 - Dilution Kiosk, 3.0m (L) x 1.0m (W), 2.473m (H)
 - Safety shower, 1.615m (L) x 1.45m (W) x 3.94m (H)
 - Potable Water Valve Chamber, 2.0mDIA x 1.7m (D)
 - Metering Kiosk, 2.50m (L) x 1.20m (W) x 3.50m (H)
 - Surface Water PS Valve Slab, 4.80m (L) x 3.30m (W) x 0.45m (D)

- Surface Water PS, 3.30mDIA x 4.60m (D)
- Blind Trench, 11.10m (L) x 1.40m (W) x 1.585m (D)
- Service Water Booster Set Kiosk, 2.0m (L) x 1.0m (W) x 2.33m (H)
- Safety shower, 1.615m (L) x 1.45m (W) x 3.94m (H)
- Potable Water Valve Chamber, 2.0mDIA x 1.7m (D)

2.7 Within the supporting statement, the applicant has presented a case that the proposals falls within the exception test of paragraph 149 (g) of the National Planning Policy Framework, in that it is limited infilling of a previously developed site that would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. In addition, they also note that engineering works are not inappropriate in the Green Belt as referenced within paragraph 150. Notwithstanding this, they have also stated that there are 'very special circumstances' which warrant approval of the development proposals.

2.8 The application has been supported with the following information:

- Full plans package
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
- Great Crested Newt Survey
- Badger Survey
- Arboricultural Impact Assessments and full trees surveys
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Landscape and Biodiversity Proposals Plan
- Planning Statement

3. **PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 None of relevance.

4. **PLANNING POLICY**

National Planning Policy Framework

4.1 Paragraph 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.

4.2 Paragraph 11 states that planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay (as per section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). However, where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protects areas or assets of particular importance, provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

4.3 Paragraph 12 of the NPPF clarifies that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

Development Plan

- 4.4 The adopted development plan is the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004) and the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document (2012).

Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004)

4.5 Part 1 Policies

- 1.3: Creating a Cleaner and Greener Environment;
- 1.10: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment;
- 1.13 Meeting obligations on Minerals, Waste and Energy.

4.6 Part 2 Policies

- OL1: Protection of the green Belt
- OL2: Existing buildings in the Green Belt
- OL10: Landscape Quality and Character
- C1: Townscape and Urban Form
- T1: Highway Improvement and Traffic Management
- N4: Trees and Woodland
- N5: Trees within Development Sites
- N7: Protected Species
- MW12: Control of Pollution
- MW15: Protection of Water Resources
- U1: Utilities Infrastructure

Places for Everyone

- 4.7 The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document was published in August 2021. It was submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2022 and inspectors have been appointed to carry out an independent examination. It is a joint plan covering nine of the ten Greater Manchester districts, including Tameside, and is intended to provide the overarching framework to strategically manage growth across the boroughs.
- 4.8 Paragraph 48 in the NPPF sets out what needs to be taken into account when considering the weight given to emerging plans. It states that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater weight may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections (the less significant, the greater the weight that may be given); and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).
- 4.9 Places for Everyone has been published and submitted, where examination is on-going. The inspectors have recently issued examination document IN36, which is a 'part one' post hearing note. IN36 states that subject to a number of action points contained therein, the inspectors are satisfied at this stage of the examination that a schedule of proposed main modifications are necessary to make the plan sound and would be effective in that regard. In addition, the inspectors have indicated their position on the proposed allocations and Green Belt additions. Other than consideration of final issues on five specific allocations, or a significant change in national policy, no further action points are likely to be issued before the main modifications are consulted on.
- 4.10 The plan is a material consideration and to date, very limited weight has been given to the policies within it, primarily due to the number of outstanding objections received as a result of previous consultations. However, following the above, it is now reasonable to give a greater degree of weight to the plan, being reasonable within the context of national planning policy.

- 4.11 Places for Everyone cannot be given full weight in planning decisions, as it does not form part of the adopted plan for Tameside. But given the stage reached, it is reasonable to give elements of the plan substantial weight, subject to the inspector's caveat that this is without prejudice to their final conclusions following consideration of responses to consultation on the main modifications later in the examination.
- 4.12 To clarify, IN36 gives a clear steer as to the wording required to make the plan sound. Substantial weight should therefore be applied to the text of the plan as amended by the schedule of main modifications, and not the published version of Places for Everyone.

Other Considerations

- 4.13 The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a persons rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the Convention of the same Act which sets out his/her rights in respect for private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposed development would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles in respect of the human rights of surrounding residents/occupiers.
- 4.14 The application has been considered in accordance with the Tameside One Equality Scheme (2018-22), which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and good relations between people in a diverse community. In this case the proposed development is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

5. PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT

- 5.1 In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement the application has been advertised as departure from the development Plan by display of a site notice; and advertisement in the local press

6. SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES

- 6.1 In response to the publicity carried out, no public comments have been received.

7. RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

- 7.1 Canal & River Trust – No objections confirm that they do not wish to comment.
- 7.2 Coal Authority – No objections, confirm that the site is not within a high-risk coal mining referral areas.
- 7.3 Contaminated Land – Based on the information currently known about the site, no objection to the development proposals. Note that the applicant proposed more detailed ground investigation prior to commencement of development. Recommend that condition is applied to secure this.
- 7.4 Environmental Health – No objections raised, recommend that construction-working hours are conditioned.
- 7.5 Environment Agency – No objections, request a condition that should any contamination be found on site then a this is reported and a suitable remediation strategy undertaken. Also advise that they do not anticipate a requirement for compensatory surface water storage to be necessary as the proposed development is in flood zone 2.

- 7.6 Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) – No objections, not that there an area of scrub would be lost within the southern area of the site, the proposals include replacement tree and scrub planting which should be adequate compensation for the losses if managed appropriately in the long term. Also agree with the recommendations within the protected species reports. Recommend a condition requiring the submission landscape ecological management plan (LEMP) and construction environment management plans (CEMP)
- 7.7 High Peak Borough Council – No comments received.
- 7.8 Local Highway Authority (LHA) – No objections, the proposal would not have an impact upon the highway network.
- 7.9 Lead Local Flood Authority – Recommend that a drainage condition is applied for the treatment of surface water.
- 7.10 Tree Officer – Proposed development is acceptable from an arboricultural perspective, the proposed landscaping will have a positive impact on the amenity of the site.
- 7.11 United Utilities – No comments received.

8. ANALYSIS

- 8.1 Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.2 Paragraph 219 of the NPPF confirms that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 8.3 The NPPF states that a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be at the heart of every application decision. For decisions on planning applications this means:
- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
 - where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting planning permission unless:-
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or
 - specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

9. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 9.1 WWTW are an essential part of the water management infrastructure, the safe treatment of waste water being a significant environmental benefit. The proposed development is required in order that the WWTW can meet more stringent environmental controls, modern water quality targets and provide for the water treatment needs of a larger population in the future. The need for the proposed development is clear and, as such, accords with UDP policy U1.
- 9.2 The application site is located within Green Belt land within the administrative boundary of Tameside. The water treatment works is an established development having occupied the site for many years, waste water is treated within the site before it outfalls into the River

Etherow. The application involves development within the established curtilage of the site, structures would be constructed amongst existing infrastructure.

- 9.3 Paragraph 147 of the NPPF concerns new development in the Green Belt, and is clear that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- 9.4 When considering any planning application, the NPPF advises, in paragraph 144, that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' 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.
- 9.5 Policy OL2 (Existing Buildings in the Green Belt) is therefore the presiding policy, which in general permits developments subject to acceptable design being secured and the impact upon openness and the purpose of Green Belt not being conflicted.
- 9.6 Paragraphs 149-150 of the NPPF list exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- 9.7 The applicant presents a case that the development falls within the exception of paragraph 149 (g) limited infilling or complete redevelopment of a previously developed site in addition to paragraph 150 (engineering operation). They state that the installations requiring planning permission are small in scale within the context of the existing WWTW site and are unlikely to be visible from visual receptors beyond the site. The proposed development, including the proposed kiosks and 1.5m high landscape bund, is unlikely to result in a noticeable change to these views or the perceived openness across the WWTW site to that which is presently experienced.
- 9.8 As an operational WWTW, the site is dominated by the existing infrastructure, which includes various settling tanks, substations, filter beds, storage buildings, and road infrastructure. In the context of the current site, the 7 kiosks which require planning permission would not be readily discernible against a backdrop of existing equipment. The proposed bund would be located close to the southern boundary but could not be viewed easily from outside the site. The requirement to connect to the existing water treatment infrastructure dictates the location, realistically there is no alternative site outside of the Green Belt where the infrastructure could be accommodated. It is recognised that the proposed works are essential to achieve compliance with modern water quality standards and the demands and future needs of a growing local population. Whilst the application is a departure from the adopted development plan, the impact upon openness of the Green Belt would not be greater than that of the established characteristics of the existing development, as per paragraph 149(g) of the NPPF. Any associated impact would be minor and very localised, this would be outweighed by the overall benefits associated with proposals.

10. DESIGN, LAYOUT AND LANDSCAPING

- 10.1 Policy OL10 (Landscape Quality and Character) seeks to conserve and enhance the landscape quality, it requires that any development within the countryside or river valleys are designed to be sympathetic with their surroundings with high standards of siting, design, materials and landscaping. Policy OL15 (openness and Appearance of River Valleys) seeks to protect the appearance of the Etherow Valley, it also advocates screening unsightly development.
- 10.2 The WWTW is located within the base of the Etherow Valley, which is part of the Greater Manchester Green Belt, which separates the settlements of Broadbottom/Mottram (to the

west) and Gamesley/Glossop (to the east). The valley is steeply sloping and largely undeveloped, exceptions being occasional properties along Melandra Road to the northeast of the site, and within the hamlet of 'The Hague' to the northwest. Land use is a mix of agricultural uses, horse paddocks and woodland the latter of which largely surrounds the site.

- 10.3 The site currently has a limited and enclosed visual envelope primarily as a result of the tree cover around and within the existing WWTW and that along the river. The planning statement has included a detailed analysis of the baseline landscape characteristics and the visual impact attributed to the development from surrounding receptors, which include several designated public right of way (PRoW). The conclusion of the assessment is supported in that the site is largely screened albeit for limited long views taken from elevated positions within the valley.
- 10.4 The proposed kiosks requiring planning permission are part of a wider package of works, which largely fall within the scope of permitted development. The seven kiosks will be located across the northern and southern areas of the site, this would be either side of the main filter beds. The kiosks would be constructed on existing areas of amenity grass. Any soil that is removed to facilitate their installation would be kept on site to form the landscape bund. The kiosks are rectangular in shape, the largest being typical in appearance to that of a steel shipping container, they would all be painted dark green in colour. To mitigate the impact of the works the new tree and shrub planting within the site, a 1.5m bund would also be created within the southern area, this would be planted to screen views and also provide complementary tree cover to that which existing along the corridor of the Etherow.
- 10.5 The existing WWTW has been a feature at the site since the mid-20th century. It is considered that the proposed works are sympathetic, are no larger than necessary and would not materially harm the local landscape. Appropriate use of landscaping and colour finish serves to minimise the visual impact and protect and enhance the landscape character of the valley, from which there would remain limited views. The proposals would serve to conserve and preserve its landscape in accordance with policies OL10 and OL15 as well as the provisions of the NPPF.

11. HIGHWAYS

- 11.1 No alterations are required to the site's access arrangements throughout the construction and operational period. The existing entrance is located off Melandra Road which runs north and exists at Brookfield with the High Peak administrative boundary. The site is currently served with large areas for vehicle parking and manoeuvring, an internal estate road also provide access around all of the onsite treatment infrastructure.
- 11.2 The application identifies that the construction period would generate an average of 30 two way trips (60 movements (to and from site) every day. Construction traffic is largely attributed to the permitted development element of the development. The kiosks themselves would be delivered pre-assembled to the site via HGV. Once completed, traffic levels would return to existing, there is no anticipated significant uplift in employment at the site.
- 11.3 The LHA has reviewed the proposals and are satisfied with the access proposals, the development is not deemed to be detrimental to highway safety. The proposals would be in accordance with policy T1 and paragraph 111 of the NPPF.

12. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

- 12.1 The closest residential properties are located at an elevated level on Hague Road, approximately 160m west from the entrance of the WWTW. Other residential properties are also located 190m away on Melandra Road and on the other side of the River Etherow.

- 12.2 The supporting statement anticipates that the main civil works will take approximately 24 months to complete, this would include 6 months of testing and commissioning. The kiosks would be installed between December 2023 and April 2024. It is anticipated that construction activities would take place between 08:00 to 18:00hrs Monday to Friday and on occasional days 08:00 to 13:00hrs on Saturday. There would be no working on Sundays or bank holidays, where this would be in line with recommendations from Environmental Health. A construction environmental management plan would be adhered to at all times to ensure best practice measures are followed and appropriate controls are in force to mitigate construction impacts.
- 12.3 The self-contained nature of the site coupled with the control of working practices would ensure disturbance is kept to a minimum. Subject to these controls, it is not considered that the works would give rise to conditions, which would result in disturbance to existing residents within the vicinity.

13. NOISE, DUST & ODOUR

- 13.1 Paragraph 185 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollution and the cumulative effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment should be taken into account. UDP policy MW12: Control of Pollution seeks to ensure that sources of potential pollution are appropriately controlled, it advises on the use of conditions to safeguard the interests of amenity and environmental quality.
- 13.2 The proposed development is necessary to upgrade the existing WWTW to meet modern water quality standards and to meet the needs of a growing local population. There is not a history of any environmental issues associated with site, particularly with reference to complaints on matters such as odour and noise. Recent visits undertaken by officers confirm that the existing WWTW is well managed, where the site's enclosed nature dictates that processes are well screened from public view and there is very little to distinguish the activities which are taking place.
- 13.3 The planned investment in the site will improve efficiencies with the water treatment process, it is not envisaged that there would be any increase in noise or odour issues at the site. The treatment of the raw material has benefits for the local population, the environment and wildlife, which is material to the planning assessment. The kiosks themselves which require planning permission would be manufactured off site, they are largely electrical housing installations and by this nature do not directly perform any function which could give rise to undue disturbance. Observations of the current operations confirm that there are no nuisance factors, the main issues relevant to noise is likely to be attributed to the construction process. The nearest sensitive receptors are houses approximately 160m away and their amenity would be appropriately protected. A condition is recommended to submit a construction environmental management plan would ensure that best practices are observed to keep noise and disturbance to a minimum.

14. TREES AND ECOLOGY

- 14.1 The majority of the site's trees are located along the periphery with the River Etherow, and are sited within linear groups. The trees comprise broadleaved and coniferous specimens of varying maturity, collectively they form a valued addition to the landscape.
- 14.2 All peripheral trees would be retained, the development would result in the loss of some trees within surveyed group 11, this tree group is located within the south-western area of the site and are not publically visible from outside of the site boundary. The 1.5m bund will be planted

with native tree species, which will provide both visual ecological benefits. Subject to conditions relevant to landscaping and tree protection measures there are no issues from an arboricultural perspective and the development adheres to the provisions of UDP policies N4 and N5.

15. DRAINAGE

- 15.1 Processed water from the WWTW discharges into the River Etherow. The River Etherow is a main river and is one of the principal tributaries of the River Goyt, which is assessed to have a 'poor' overall status under the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The applicant states that the purpose of the works is to improve the condition of the watercourse with regard to sewage discharge, this is identified as a significant environmental benefit. A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) accompanies the application.
- 15.2 Section 14 of the NPPF is concerned with effective drainage, flood risk management and maintenance of water quality. The site is within flood zone 2, having a medium probability of flooding. The development must be assigned a Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification in accordance with the NPPF. A WWTW is classed as essential infrastructure, where works connected with such development are deemed to be acceptable within this flood zone.
- 15.3 The FRA has identified the following mitigation for the development to flood risk:
- Raising electrics and critical infrastructure 300 mm above the 1% fluvial flood level;
 - A flood response plan including subscription to flood alerts; and
 - A surface water drainage system that would account for additional runoff from the proposed work within the WwTW for 1% Annual Exceedance Probability event including climate change of increased rainfall of 25% as well as a sensitivity test of the upper end of the 2050 epoch (40%).

The mitigation would be a proportionate response. It is proposed that all surface water would be captured and attenuated within the WWTW, the site would therefore be effectively drained in accordance with Section 14 of the NPPF.

16. GROUND CONDITIONS

- 16.1 A review of historical maps confirms that the site was undeveloped agricultural land until the 1940s. Prior to this, there had been a sewage works located to the north of the site. Further development of the sewage works occurred in the 1950s/1960s and numerous sludge beds, settling tanks, electrical substations, tanks and filter beds are located in the proposed development area during this period. This layout does not appear to alter significantly to the present day although, some features are no longer present.
- 16.2 Consultation with the Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) confirms there could be onsite sources of contamination associated with previous processes in addition to potential ground gas. The applicant is aware, and their planning statement confirms that further ground investigation is required which would subsequently inform a remediation strategy. EPU confirm they are supportive of this approach, no objections are raised subject to the recommended conditions.
- 16.3 A coal mining assessment has accompanied the application and raised no issues of concern. Consultation with the Coal Authority confirms that the site is not within a high risk referral area and consequently no objections are raised. There are no land stability concerns raised with the development proposals.

17. CONCLUSION

- 17.1 The proposed development comprises upgrade works and the installation of new equipment at the existing WWTW and an extension to the existing works in order that modern water quality standards can be met to accommodate the needs of a growing local population.
- 17.2 The site is within Green Belt. The WWTW is an established feature within the landscape and provides essential social, economic and environmental infrastructure. The kiosks and associated landscaping bund would form modest addition in the context of the existing infrastructure, the impact upon openness would be minimal, it would also be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal associated with better treatment of sewage. Consequently the proposals comply sufficiently with paragraph 149(g) of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the plans and specifications as approved unless required by any other conditions in this permission.

Site Location Plan 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00001

Site Layout Plan - Sheet 1 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00002

Site Layout Plan - Sheet 2 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00003

Primary and Secondary Ferric Dosing Kiosks Plan and Elevations Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00004

LV Distribution MCC Kiosk Plan and Elevations Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00005

Tertiary Treatment MCC Kiosk Plan and Elevations Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00006

TSR MCC Kiosk Plan and Elevations Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00007

DNO Kiosk Plan and Elevations Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00008

Sodium Hydroxide Dosing Kiosk Plan and Elevations Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-I-00009

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) Lite Report Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-I-00001

GCN eDNA Survey Summary Report Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-I-00002

Badger Survey Summary Report CONFIDENTIAL ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-I-00003

Tree Removal, Retention and Protection Plan Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-L-00002

Landscape and Biodiversity Proposals Plan Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-97-DR-L-00003

Tree Constraints Report Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-I-00005

Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-I-00006

Flood Risk Assessment Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-I-00007

Initial Conceptual Site Model Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-G-00005

Initial Conceptual Site Model (CSM) Appendix C – Groundsure Reports Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-G-00006

Initial Conceptual Site Model (CSM) Appendix D – Coal Mining Report Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-G-00007

Initial Conceptual Site Model (CSM) Appendix E – Mining Review Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-G-00008

Initial Conceptual Site Model (CSM) Appendix F – Historical Ground Investigation Reports Ref 80061943-01-C2V-GLOSS-99-RP-G-00009

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and in accordance with policies of the adopted TMBC UDP.

- 3) During demolition/construction no work (including vehicle and plant movements, deliveries, loading and unloading) shall take place outside the hours of 07:30 and 18:00 Mondays to Fridays, and 08:00 and 13:00 Saturdays. No work shall take place on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity in accordance with Policy H10 of the adopted Tameside Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4) A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:
 - a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
 - b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
 - c) Aims and objectives of management.
 - d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
 - e) Prescriptions for management actions.
 - f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
 - g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
 - h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism{s} by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity in accordance with policy N7: Protected Species.

- 5) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.
 - a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
 - b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
 - c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
 - d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
 - e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
 - f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.

- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity to ensure sufficient protection is afforded to wildlife in accordance with policy N7: Protected Species.

- 6) No development, other than site clearance and site compound set up, shall commence until a remediation strategy, detailing the works and measures required to address any unacceptable risks posed by contamination at the site to human health, buildings and the environment has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The scheme shall be implemented and verified as approved and shall include all of the following components unless the LPA dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing:
 - 1. A Preliminary Risk Assessment which has identified: - All previous and current uses of the site and surrounding area. - All potential contaminants associated with those uses. - A conceptual site model identifying all potential sources, pathways, receptors and pollutant linkages.
 - 2. A site investigation strategy, based on the Preliminary Risk Assessment in (1) detailing all investigations including sampling, analysis and monitoring that will be undertaken at the site in order to enable the nature and extent of any contamination to be determined and a detailed assessment of the risks posed to be carried out. The strategy shall be approved in writing by the LPA prior to any investigation works commencing at the site.
 - 3. The findings of the site investigation and detailed risk assessments referred to in point (2) including all relevant soil / water analysis and ground gas / groundwater monitoring data.
 - 4. Based on the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in point (3) an options appraisal and remediation strategy setting out full details of the remediation works and measures required to address any unacceptable risks posed by contamination and how they are to be implemented.
 - 5. A verification plan detailing the information that will be obtained in order to demonstrate the works and measures set out in the remediation strategy in (4) will be fully implemented including any requirements for long term monitoring and maintenance.

Reason: To ensure any unacceptable risks posed by contamination are appropriately addressed and the site is suitable for its proposed use in accordance with paragraph 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7) Upon completion of any approved remediation scheme(s), and prior to use, a verification / completion report demonstrating all remedial works and measures detailed in the scheme(s) have been fully implemented shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The report shall also include full details of the arrangements for any long term monitoring and maintenance as identified in the approved verification plan. The long term monitoring and maintenance shall be undertaken as approved. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is encountered, then the Local Planning Authority (LPA) shall be informed and no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA, shall be undertaken at the site until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be appropriately addressed and the remedial works verified has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the LPA. The remediation strategy shall be fully implemented and verified as approved. The discharge of this planning condition will be given in writing by the LPA on

completion of the development and once all information specified within this condition and any other requested information has been provided to the satisfaction of the LPA and use of the development shall not commence until this time unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To ensure any unacceptable risks posed by contamination are appropriately addressed and the site is suitable for its proposed use in accordance with paragraph 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework.