

## **Application Number 17/00513/REM**

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Reserved matters approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 114 dwellings (following the granting of outline planning permission ref. 15/00704/OUT.)</b>
<b>Site</b>	<b>Former Oldham batteries site, Edward Street, Denton</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Wainhomes (North West) Ltd, Warrington</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Refuse</b>
<b>Reason for report</b>	<b>A Speakers Panel decision is required because the application constitutes a major development.</b>

## **REPORT**

### **1. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks approval for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of development following the granting of outline planning permission in September 2015 under reference 15/00704/OUT for a development of up to 150 houses.
- 1.2 The applicant has provided the following documents in support of the planning application:
  - Drainage Statement
  - Noise Assessment
  - Planning and Design and Access Statement
- 1.3 Alongside this application, there is an additional parcel of land to the eastern side of Edward Street which also benefits from outline planning permission for up to 56 dwellings (15/00081/OUT) which is subject to a separate reserved matters application (17/00514/REM). This application is also on the agenda as the next item.

### **2. SITE & SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 This application site measures approximately 4ha and comprises land at the former Oldham Batteries site which closed in 2002. In overall terms the site is located within Denton Town Centre (as shown on the 2004 UDP proposals map) and positioned between the A6017 Ashton Road to the east, L/CPL Andrew Breeze Way to the north, Edward Street to the west and number of terraced residential streets to the south which include Patterson Street and Gresham Street.
- 2.2 The application site has been cleared and comprises vacant, derelict land that is hoarded off pending redevelopment with the outline planning permission making provision for a new access to the site from Edward Street.
- 2.3 The site is located in close proximity of the primary shopping area within Denton Town Centre and therefore has excellent access to a wide range of shops, services and public transport. In planning policy terms, the site forms part of a wider Development Opportunity Area allocation under policy E2 (11) within the 2004 UDP.

### **3. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 15/00704/OUT - Outline proposal for residential development of up to 150 houses, including means of access, car parking and associated works.(Resubmission of 14/01149/OUT) – approved 09.09.2015.
- 3.2 14/01149/OUT - Outline proposal for residential development of up to 150 houses – refused (the reasons for which addressed by the 2015 application above which was approved).
- 3.3 15/00686/ENV - Request for screening opinion in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 relating to a proposed residential development – not EIA development.

### **4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

#### **4.1 Part 1 Policies**

- 1.3: Creating a Cleaner and Greener Environment.
- 1.4: Providing More Choice and Quality Homes.
- 1.5: Following the Principles of Sustainable Development
- 1.6 Securing Urban Regeneration
- 1.12: Ensuring an Accessible, Safe and Healthy Environment

#### **4.2 Part 2 Policies**

- E2 (11): Development Opportunity Area
- H4: Type, size and affordability of dwellings
- H5: Open Space Provision
- H7: Mixed Use and Density.
- H10: Detailed Design of Housing Developments
- OL10: Landscape Quality and Character
- S6: New Local Shopping Developments
- T1: Highway Improvement and Traffic Management.
- T10: Parking
- T11: Travel Plans.
- C1: Townscape and Urban Form
- N4: Trees and Woodland.
- N5: Trees within Development Sites.
- N7: Protected Species
- MW11: Contaminated Land.
- U3: Water Services for Developments
- U4 Flood Prevention
- U5 Energy Efficiency

#### **4.3 Other Policies**

- Greater Manchester Spatial Framework - Publication Draft October 2016
- Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document

#### **4.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

- Section 1 Delivering sustainable development
- Section 2: Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Section 7: Requiring good design
- Section 8: Promoting healthy communities

#### **4.5 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

This is intended to complement the NPPF and to provide a single resource for planning guidance, whilst rationalising and streamlining the material. Almost all previous planning Circulars and advice notes have been cancelled. Specific reference will be made to the PPG or other national advice in the Analysis section of the report, where appropriate.

### **5. PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT**

- 5.1 Neighbour notification letters were issued, notices displayed on site and an advert published in the press, in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

### **6. RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

- 6.1 Highways England – no objections to the proposals in terms of impact on the strategic road network.
- 6.2 Transport for Greater Manchester (TFGM) – no objections to the proposals. The principle of development for up to 150 dwellings was established at the outline planning application stage and the impact on the highway network in terms of trip generation was considered to be acceptable. The site is considered to be within close proximity to sustainable means of transport which would provide an alternative to making journeys via the private car. There are existing bus stops on the A57, within close proximity of the site, which are served by the regular service from Mottram to Manchester Piccadilly. Hyde Central Train Station is also within a bus journey and short walk from the site. The layout of the development should create a safe and attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists and opportunities for connection through to surrounding streets should be provided. No further condition suggested as a condition requiring the submission and approval of a Travel Plan for the development was attached to the outline planning permission.
- 6.3 Local Highway Authority – no objection was raised to the principle of development at the outline stage, subject to the commencement of construction of the Denton Link Road prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings. This has now been constructed and is open to traffic.
- 6.4 United Utilities – did not object to the principle of development at the outline stage, subject to the means of drainage being laid out in accordance with the details submitted with that application.
- 6.5 Greater Manchester Police – raised no objection to the outline application indicating that a Crime impact Statement should be submitted and that the scheme should be designed to meet Secured by design standards.
- 6.6 Borough Environmental Health Officer – no objections subject to conditions requiring adherence to the contents of the submitted Air Quality Management Plan and a restriction on the hours of activity and deliveries during the construction phase of the development.
- 6.7 Borough Ecologist – no objections to the proposals. A number of conditions were recommended at the outline stage including securing biodiversity enhancements through the redevelopment of the site, control of invasive species and the timing of tree/shrub removal from the site. As a result of the content of the Bat and Great Crested Newt surveys

submitted with the outline planning application, no further survey work or mitigation measures is required in relation to the preservation of these species.

## **7. SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES RECEIVED**

- 7.1 Andrew Gwynne MP has raised concerns regarding the impact of potential ground contamination on the site on the future occupants of the development. A condition requiring the submission of an investigation into potential sources of contamination on the site, the agreement of a remediation strategy and the implementation of this strategy prior to the commencement of development was attached to the outline planning application. This matter does not therefore need to be revisited at this reserved matters stage.
- 7.2 No representations have been received from any other local residents in relation to the reserved matters application.

## **8. ANALYSIS**

- 8.1 The issues to be assessed in the determination of this planning application are:
- 1) The principle of development
  - 2) Layout, Design and Landscaping of the proposed development
  - 3) The acceptability of the proposed landscaping scheme
  - 4) The impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties
  - 5) Other matters

## **9. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

- 9.1 The principle of residential development and means of access to the site have already been established following the grant of outline planning permission in 2015. The key issues for consideration now is whether the detailed reserved matters relating to layout, scale, design and appearance of the proposed new homes are acceptable. This is discussed in more detail below.

## **10. LAYOUT, DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING**

- 10.1 In overall terms, and following careful, it is considered that the proposed layout and design of the scheme is unsatisfactory, fails to take the opportunities presented by this key town centre site and as a result fails to achieve sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. As a result, officers are recommending that this reserved matters application is refused.
- 10.2 Whilst negotiations have taken place during the life of the application to try and resolve these issues, and an amended scheme submitted for formal determination, this scheme still does not address our concerns and falls well short of the standard needed to deliver successful urban design and in terms of creating a successful sense of place that would successfully regenerate this site and wider area.
- 10.3 In making a decision on this application, there are a number of planning policies and guidance documents that deal with, and set out the importance of, good design. These are covered within the NPPF and associated Planning Practice Guidance and the adopted Tameside UDP and associated Residential Design Guide.
- 10.4 At section 7 of the NPPF, paragraph 56 recognises the importance of good design where it states that *'Good design is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively*

*to making places better for people*'. The NPPF also emphasises the importance of new development effectively responding to the character of the surrounding area. In this respect, paragraph 58 of the NPPF sets out a number of criteria stating that decisions should aim to ensure that, amongst other things, developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping

10.5 Paragraph 64 of the NPPF is also clear that permission should be refused for developments of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Matters relating to design and our concerns are now discussed in more detail below.

10.6 As an application site that is located in a highly prominent location and in close proximity to the heart of the town centre, this site is of critical importance within Denton as a major regeneration opportunity. This is reflected in the 2004 UDP designation as a Development Opportunity Area where policy E2 states that in these areas 'the council will permit redevelopment or refurbishment schemes which include uses likely to create high levels or quality of... residential provision and bring about significant improvements in overall appearance.

10.7 In order to achieve the quality required by the NPPF, adopted UDP (including policy E2) and Residential Design SPD, it is considered that the scheme needs to be designed to connect to the wider regeneration of this part of Denton, recognising that the DOA extends beyond the boundaries of the application site.

These connections should be evidenced in the scale, density, siting and detailed design of the buildings, how public and private spaces are treated, how routes through the site are defined and using landscaping that supports these functions.

Having assessed the scheme, Officers consider that the scheme fails to achieve these objectives in a number of areas, key examples of which include:

A. the scheme has been designed from the outset as a low density suburban layout that sits poorly within the context of the surrounding urban grain that comprises a high density terrace homes with strong built form and streets.

B. One of the most prominent vistas of the site (the northern boundary of the site to Lance Corporal Andrew Breeze Way) lacks the strength and quality of design required to create an appropriate and robust sense of built form and place.

C. The layout and built form fails to properly recognise or capitalise on key views and vistas with the result that the site fails to make appropriate visual connections to the town centre and which undermines the quality of place and legibility.

D. Poorly thought out relationships between public and private spaces to detriment of public realm, quality of street scene and connecting routes and spaces.

E. The choice and design of house types which emphasise the inappropriate suburban form of the scheme and the poor relationship between the development and the urban character of the surrounding area.

The following paragraphs assess each of these issues in turn:

**Low density/suburban character:**

10.8 The scheme proposes a very low density of development, 29 dwellings per hectare (dph). Policy H7 of the UDP requires schemes to make efficient use of land through densities of between 30 and 50 dph or greater in locations highly accessible by public transport. Given the comments by TFGM (quoted at paragraph 6.4), this is considered to be a highly

sustainable site. Adding this factor to the regeneration objectives of policy E2 and the density of adjacent residential development, it is considered that a significantly higher density of development should be presented on this site. In this respect the outline permission allows for up to 150 homes (36 homes more than currently proposed) which would serve to boost density and help to address some of the key weaknesses that the current suburban layout presents. It would also support a development that would more effectively regenerate this important urban site.

- 10.9 In relation to the scale of the proposed development, the use of homes that are largely 2-storeys (but with a maximum height of 2.5 storeys) fails to provide for the form of presence necessary to create a distinctive character or quality of place. Whilst some improvements have been made in terms of simplifying the treatment of the revised house types, the design approach is simply using standard house types in the first instance is considered to be fundamentally flawed in this location. The objective can only be achieved by an approach that is design led, responding to the opportunities that the site presents and which recognises the wider urban regeneration context. For example, increasing the height of homes to L/CPL Andrew Breeze Way and designing homes that allow car parking to be integrated into the lower level of the home itself would create a much more robust, strong built form that would be much better suited to this urban context.
- 10.10 As a result of inefficient layout and poor design, there are also a number of other issues such as plots being sited in a way that compromises the overall quality of the scheme and the amenity that would be afforded to the occupants of those dwellings. For example; the principal elevation of plot 108 would face into the parking area at the rear of the units fronting Edward Street; Plot 10 would be sited immediately behind plots 3 and 4 and would appear to have no private amenity space. Plot 56 on the north western edge of the development has no private amenity space, is sited immediately adjacent to the boundary of the site and provides a very weak focal point for a key long view. Whilst these issues could be addressed through further revisions to the layout, they are entirely symptomatic of a scheme that is poorly designed, seeks to utilise inappropriate design and house types and fails to achieve the quality required by the NPPF, UDP and design SPD.
- 10.11 The suburban character of the development is emphasised by the extent to which the principal elevations of a number of plots are set back from the footway. For example, in the south eastern corner of the scheme, this weakness leads to a lack of enclosure within the courtyard which would create conflict between public and private space, thereby undermining the design principle of the shared surface area.

**Lance Corporal Andrew Breeze Way:**

- 10.12 The treatment of the frontage with Lance Corporal Andrew Breeze Way is also considered to be weak. This frontage requires presence, through development of a quality and scale that defines this key boundary and elevation of the scheme and which links the site to the wider town centre to the west of the site. Increasing the height of the buildings in this location to 3 storey development would have the twin benefits of providing a stronger frontage along the longest boundary of the development and would allow for car parking to be integrated within the buildings, without reducing the level of accommodation proposed. This would negate the need for the long stretch of frontage parking along that edge of the development as currently proposed and would allow an appropriate response to this important edge.

**Lack of strong built form/ quality of and relationship between public and private spaces:**

- 10.13 The weakness in the current proposals is highlighted by the failure to use buildings of a greater scale or different design in the north eastern and south eastern corners of the scheme. Such variation would help to define Edward Street as the key vehicular route through the wider Opportunity Area, providing a stronger frontage along this key public view of the site and emphasise the connectivity of this site with the parcel of land on the eastern

side of Edward Street. The integration of parking into taller units would also create space within the development as the need for parking courts would be reduced or negated.

- 10.14 The poor design in the north western corner of the site means that the proposed built form would lack suitable connectivity with the remainder of the Opportunity Area, further northwest and the site of the proposed Denton Wellness Centre. Given the objective of policy E2 is to significantly improve the appearance of the area, the absence of tall feature buildings and pedestrian link through this part of the site is considered to be a major weakness in the layout and scale of the proposals.
- 10.15 The quality of parts of the public open space within the development is compromised by the relationship between this space and the built form. For example, the fact that the gables of plots 61, 75 and 85 would provide the only potential active frontage along the main length of the pedestrian link in that part of the site would significantly reduce the attractiveness of this space and potentially present concerns in terms of crime and safety. The effectiveness of the shared surface space in the square within the north western part of the development is also weakened by the number of private parking spaces located within or off that space which undermines its function.
- 10.16 The dominance of car parking on the frontage of plots, such as on the northern edge of the development and the extent of hardstanding required to create access roads which could be avoided through a more efficient layout are not elements that could be effectively 'broken up' by soft landscaping.

**Inappropriateness of the proposed house types:**

- 10.17 In relation to the proposed house types, these are considered to re-enforce the suburban character of the layout of the scheme. As well as the height of the dwellings, the weakness in the ability to relate to a high density urban setting is emphasised by the proportions of the openings in a number of the house types, which lack vertical emphasis. The gable features on the principal elevation of a number of the house types are a further example of the lack of verticality to the design of the dwellings. These features emphasise the dominance of detached and semi-detached style units. The use of these house types across the development undermines the ability to create a clear definition of separate character areas across the scheme. This factor weakens the effectiveness of the terraced areas, which have been positioned with the intention of providing a strong frontage to Edward Street. Overall, the house types are considered to lack clear referencing to the style of surrounding development or introduce new and innovative features that would define the character of the scheme.
- 10.18 The dominance of detached and semi-detached house types across the development also results in an inefficient layout, which compromise the quality of the development. For example, a relatively minor repositioning of some plots would remove the need for the parking courts and allow a stronger frontage to be presented to the internal access roads. Coupled with the extent of parking courts within the scheme, the inefficiency of the layout would re-enforce the suburban character of the development.

**Layout and Design Summary:**

- 10.19 To summarise the assessment of the design approach, it is considered that the proposal would not achieve the standards set in policy E2 of the UDP, as quoted above and would fail to deliver good design which is a key aspect of delivering sustainable development in the NPPF. The scheme fails to define a strong sense of character, through a relatively low density development and the use of house types that are typical of a suburban setting. The proposals are considered to fail to provide the height, vertical emphasis or variation in density that is required to create an identity to the development and allow it to connect to the surrounding area. These factors are considered to result in layout which fails to respect the density and grain of development in an urban setting. Whilst the scheme has improved through revision, due to the cumulative impact of the weaknesses outlined above, officers

remain of the view that would not be of sufficient standard to improve the quality of the environment in the surrounding area. For these reasons, the scheme is also considered not to accord with policies in the Residential Design Guide SPD relating to the character and layout of development.

## **11. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

- 11.1 The scheme as proposed does not raise any concerns in terms of residential amenity and maintains sufficient separation distances between the edge of the development and the neighbouring residential properties on the terraced streets to the south to achieve the space standards set out in the Residential Design Guide (RDG). The fact that Edward Street bisects the wider site previously occupied by Oldham Batteries ensures that sufficient separation would also be provided between the eastern edge of the site that is the subject of this application and the western edge of the scheme that this the subject of application ref. 17/00514/REM. Given the approach taken to layout and design, there are general sufficient distances maintained to comply with the guidance contained within the Residential Design SPD albeit some of the units, plots 5, 10 & 56 for example clearly have a poor quality outlook being positioned in parking courts with little or no private amenity space.
- 11.2 Following the above assessment it is considered that the proposals would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties and would adequately preserve the amenity of future occupants of the development. Conditions relating to the location and design of boundary treatments and the treatment of glazing where necessary to preserve amenity would have been added to any decision if the application had been recommended for approval.

## **12. HIGHWAY SAFETY**

- 12.1 The Local Highway Authority raised no objection to the principle of the development of the site, subject to the commencement of development of the Denton Link Road prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings. This requirement was secured by condition 10 on the outline planning permission. At the outline stage, the Transport Assessment submitted with the application was considered sufficient to demonstrate that the number of trips generated by 150 dwellings would not have a severe impact on the capacity of the road network and would therefore not be prejudicial to highway safety. The scheme as submitted clearly falls within these parameters and so there is no concerns with the scheme in this respect.
- 12.2 The proposed plans indicate that 2 car parking spaces would be provided for each property, which would meet the requirements of the RDG. As highlighted by the response from TfGM to the outline planning application, the site is considered to be within close proximity to sustainable means of transport which would provide an alternative to making journeys via the private car. There are existing bus stops on the A57, within close proximity of the site, which are served by the regular service from Mottram to Manchester Piccadilly. Hyde Central Train Station is also within a bus journey and short walk from the site.
- 12.3 Given this context, it is considered that the level of parking to be provided within the development would not result in a reliance on on-street parking, ensuring that there would not be an unreasonable impact on highway safety in this regard. In terms of connectivity to the surrounding area, pedestrian links would be provided to Gresham Street and Lime Grove on the southern boundary of the development and footway links would be provided from the development along Edward Street, Hyde Road and Lance Corporal Andrew Breeze Way. These factors, alongside the information required to discharge the Travel Plan condition attached to the outline planning permission would ensure that the development would include provision for sustainable modes of transport.



- 12.4 Highways England has not objected to the application and did not object to the principle of development at the outline stage. Conditions requiring details of the surfacing of driveways, the provision of pedestrian visibility splays, requiring all car parking to be laid out prior to the occupation of the development, preventing direct access onto the motorway to the north and details of the boundary treatment along the northern boundary of the site could be added to the decision notice had the scheme been considered acceptable in all other regards.

### **13. FLOOD RISK**

- 13.1 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered to be at a lower risk of flooding. United Utilities have raised no objections to the proposals subject to the means of drainage being laid out in accordance with the details submitted with that application. Condition 4 of the planning permission requires a surface water drainage strategy to be submitted and approved prior to the first occupation of the development. The applicant confirmed on the application form at the outline stage that foul water would be drained from the development via a connection to the existing main sewer.
- 13.2 It is considered that the proposed development would not result in a harmful impact in relation to flood risk.

### **14. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**

- 14.1 The Borough's Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to the proposals, subject to the imposition of conditions limiting the hours of operation and deliveries during the construction phase of the development and compliance with the mitigation measures detailed in the Air Quality Assessment submitted with the outline planning application. These conditions were imposed on the outline planning permission (conditions 7 and 11) and therefore would not need to be re-imposed on a reserved matters approval, had all other material considerations been satisfied.
- 14.2 The applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment with the reserved matters application. This report indicates that a number of plots would require mitigation to be installed in order to minimise the impact of the noise generated by the traffic on the M67 and Lance Corporal Andrew Breeze way to the north of the site, Edward Street to the east and Hyde Road to the south. Within the parcel to the west of Edward Street that is the subject of this application, the report suggests that 2.5 metre high acoustic fencing would be required to the rear of plots 1-20, 48-53, 63-89 and 99-115. Furthermore, a number of the plots would need to be fitted with high specification glazing and mechanical ventilation systems that would allow air circulation without the need to open windows. Further details of the specifications of the glazing and the acoustic fencing could be required by conditions had the scheme been considered acceptable in all other regards, to ensure that the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the development would be adequately preserved.
- 14.3 The MP has raised concerns regarding the history of ground contamination on the site and the impact that disturbance of the contamination may have on the living conditions of the future occupants of the development. A condition requiring the submission of an investigation into potential sources of contamination on the site, the agreement of a remediation strategy and the implementation of this strategy prior to the commencement of development was attached to the outline planning application. This matter does not therefore need to be revisited at this reserved matters stage.

## **15. OTHER MATTERS**

- 15.1 As a result of the content of the Bat and Great Crested Newt surveys submitted with the outline planning application, no further survey work or mitigation measures is required in relation to the preservation of these species. A number of conditions were recommended at the outline stage including securing biodiversity enhancements through the redevelopment of the site, control of invasive species and the timing of tree/shrub removal from the site. These do not need to be repeated at this reserved matters stage.
- 15.2 Likewise, the siting and orientation of plots in relation to the public realm would compromise the quality of the structural landscaping of the development, for the reasons discussed previously at paragraph 10.10 of this report.

## **16. CONCLUSION**

- 16.1 The site plays a key role in the regeneration of Denton, as demonstrated by the designation of the site as a Development Opportunity Area. The scheme as submitted however is considered to fall far short of the design quality needed to deliver successful regeneration of this strategic site and sustainable development.
- 16.2 The scale, layout and appearance of the proposals are considered to be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and would not achieve the high quality development required by policy E2 of the UDP. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 10.1-10.17 of this report, the scheme is considered to take a suburban form in terms of its layout and the detailed design of the apartments and a number of the house types. This is considered to contrast negatively with the high density and strong linear form that characterises development in the surrounding area and is characteristic of urban development within the Borough. The lack of coherence in terms of the layout results in poor terminating vistas in key locations, unnecessary internal access roads to parking courts and spacing between buildings that creates a disjointed appearance and results in a development that does not enhance design quality or clearly define a sense of place on this prominent site.
- 16.3 The proposal is considered to be contrary to the requirements of section 7 of the NPPF and the harm arising from the extent of the conflict with the objectives listed in 10.3 to 10.5 this report is considered to be significant. Whilst the scheme would deliver additional housing in the Borough, it would do so in a way that would compromise design quality on a key regeneration site. This site is a suitable location for residential development as has been determined by granting outline planning permission. The same benefit could be achieved by a scheme that would meet the design objectives of local and national planning policy however, including a higher density scheme delivering more dwellings on the site. It is therefore considered that the harm identified in relation to the layout, appearance and landscaping of the proposals would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals. As such, the proposal does not accord with the definition of sustainable set out within the NPPF in accordance with the guidance contained within paragraph 14 of that document, planning permission should therefore be refused.

## **17. RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed layout, appearance and landscaping of the proposals would fail to achieve a standard of design that would be acceptable on this prominent site. The proposals are considered to fail to provide the scale, layout, built form or density of development that is required to create an identity that

would respond to the wider regeneration context and urban location of the site. Given this combination of factors, it is considered that the proposals would fail to comply with Section 7 of the NPPF (Requiring Good Design) policies E2, H10 and C1 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan and policies RD2, RD7, RD11, RD12, RD13, RD17, RD20 of the adopted Tameside Residential Design Guide SPD. The harm arising from the detailed layout and appearance of the proposals would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme and therefore planning permission should be refused, in line with the guidance contained within paragraph 14 of the NPPF.