

7: CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

POLICY C 1

Conservation and Enhancement of the Built Environment

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Roland Bardsley Homes	658	54	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
54	A relaxation of normal development control standards must be considered for landmark buildings, otherwise retention cannot always be assured.

Main Issue

- 7.1.1 Whether the policy should state specifically that there will be a relaxation of normal development control standards for proposals involving landmark buildings.

Conclusions

- 7.1.2 The policy as written sets out the Council's objective to protect landmark buildings which contribute to the Borough's historic, social and architectural significance. It is permissive in principle of the re-use and conversion of redundant landmark buildings. The Council in its statement clearly recognise that the retention of such buildings must involve a balancing exercise between economic viability and the physical impact of alterations. The policy does not say that the Council will apply rigid development control standards to such development, only that it must meet other relevant policies.
- 7.1.3 In practical terms whether such proposals will need to adhere to strict development control principles will be a matter of judgement, dependent on the particular circumstances of individual proposals. The Council intend to produce a strategy to guide such proposals and I note here that SPG for the design of housing developments is to be updated - policy H10 refers. It seems to me that the occasions when it may be appropriate to relax any development control standards would be better addressed in these complementary documents rather than the policy itself which sets out the broad underlying principle.

Recommendation

- 7.1.4 I recommend no modification to the policy as a result of this objection, but consider that the Council should consider addressing such matters in SPG.

POLICY C 2

Conservation Areas

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Redrow Homes (North West) Ltd	643	479	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
479	The preservation and enhancement of the character, appearance and wellbeing of conservation areas goes beyond the requirements of PPG15.

Main Issue

- 7.2.1 Whether the policy should be amended to reflect the requirements of national policy guidance.

Conclusions

- 7.2.2 The wording of the policy was changed in the revised deposit draft and now refers to the preservation or enhancement of conservation areas. In this respect it is in accord with the duty imposed on local planning authorities by section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. However the policy still retains the words *physical well-being* of conservation areas. This is not a term which emanates from section 72 nor is it defined by the Council. In my view the term lacks clarity. I find its inclusion to be unnecessary, adding nothing of value to the policy.

Recommendation

- 7.2.3 I recommend that the policy be modified by the deletion of the words *physical well-being*.

POLICY C 3

Demolition of Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Roland Bardsley Homes	658	55	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
55	Unlisted buildings contributing to conservation areas should be identified. As written the policy is too onerous.

Main Issue

- 7.3.1 Whether the policy should be more flexible in terms of the requirement for non listed buildings to meet the criteria identified in policy C8.

Conclusions

- 7.3.2 In respect of the main issue, PPG15 at para 4.27 says explicitly that the general presumption is in favour of retaining buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area and that the Secretary of State expects that proposals to demolish such buildings should be assessed against the same broad criteria as proposals to demolish listed buildings. The criteria in C8 are taken directly from PPG15. Policy C3 is therefore in line with national policy guidance.
- 7.3.3 Section 54A recognises that material considerations can overcome the presumption in favour of the development plan and it seems to me that it is more appropriate for applicants to argue the particular circumstances of their case should the need arise

rather than relax a development plan policy which is in line with national policy guidance. It follows from the above that I do not support the objection.

- 7.3.4 Insofar as the original objection referred to the need for unlisted buildings which make a positive contribution to conservation areas to be identified in an up-to-date appraisal, the supporting text to the policy in the revised deposit draft has been amended to refer to this situation. The conservation appraisals will form the basis of SPG and give a better understanding of which buildings make a positive contribution to a conservation area's character or appearance.

Recommendation

- 7.3.5 I recommend no modification to the plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY C 7

Enabling Development for Conservation of Heritage Assets

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
English Heritage	276	197	O	
English Heritage	276	646	O (rd)	Yes

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
197	There should be specific reference to the English Heritage publication "Enabling Development and the Conservation of Heritage Assets"
646	It is important to ensure that all the listed criteria are met.

Main Issue

- 7.4.1 Whether it is reasonable to include the suggested alterations in the policy and its reasoned justification.

Conclusions

- 7.4.2 At the revised deposit stage alterations were made to the plan to include specific reference to the document *Enabling Development and the Conservation of Heritage Assets*. This effectively met the objection.
- 7.4.3 In an attempt to meet some of the objections made at the revised deposit stage the Council notified individual objectors of proposed changes it was willing to make as part of the inquiry process. These objections were not advertised generally, as the Council did not consider the changes proposed issues of wider interest. The Council's response to objection 646 proposes one such change. It seeks to make it explicit in the policy that each of the criteria must be met. I support this change which adds clarity, whilst not fundamentally changing the content of the policy.

Recommendation

- 7.4.4 I recommend the policy be modified by inserting the words *each of* in the third line of the policy so that it reads*will only be permitted if each of the following criteria are met:*

POLICY C12

Art in the Environment

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Roland Bardsley Homes	658	56	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
56	The imposition on development of a pro-rata 1% payment to fund art projects would be contrary to Government advice.

Main Issue

- 7.5.1 Whether the imposition of a 1% contribution on developers would be in accord with government policy.

Conclusions

- 7.5.2 The objection was made to the deposit draft version of the policy. The policy was subsequently changed in the revised deposit draft. It is no longer as prescriptive. It now says that the Council will encourage public art subject to certain criteria being met; and that where large developments are proposed the Council will negotiate to secure the provision of public art in association with the schemes.
- 7.5.3 As rewritten the policy clearly sets out the Council's aspirations to encourage arts projects as part of the planning process. However it applies only to major schemes where it is intended that there would be an element of negotiation rather than a blanket imposition on developers. I consider that the alterations in the revised deposit version of the policy set out a legitimate planning objective in ensuring major development schemes have a beneficial impact on the environment.

Recommendation

- 7.5.4 I recommend no modification to the policy as a result of this objection.

NON POLICY SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

Conservation and Enhancement of the Built Environment

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Peter Simon	694	566	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
566	The plan fails to recognise the unique value and character of Longdendale in conservation terms.

Main Issue

- 7.6.1 Whether the plan satisfactorily recognises the rural character of Longdendale.

Conclusions

- 7.6.2 Since the objection was submitted employment allocation policy E1(3) – Mottram Business Park - has been deleted from the plan, as has policy E4(1) for a local

employment site on land off Woolley Lane and Mottram Moor, Hollingworth. The plan therefore no longer proposes the allocation of any employment land in Longdendale. Whilst the plan safeguards the routes of 2 new roads (policies T2 and T3(1)) these schemes are currently undergoing appraisal and will only be constructed if they are found to be the most appropriate solutions to the traffic problems in the area. Even then they must be subjected to environmental assessment before they can be built.

- 7.6.3 The emerging UDP does not contain a discrete section on Longdendale in the same way as the adopted UDP. Nevertheless it contains general policies which illustrate the Council's commitment to conserving the character of rural areas, their historic distinctiveness and biodiversity. Mottram is a designated conservation area and outside the built up area Longdendale is green belt, some of which is also protected for its ecological importance. Given the above circumstances I consider the plan satisfactorily addresses the conservation interests and rural character of Longdendale.

Recommendation

- 7.6.4 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Sandra Ray	640	531	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
531	There needs to be more account of the feasibility of plans and monitoring of work to avoid damage to the historic environment.

Main Issue

- 7.6.5 Whether it is necessary to modify the plan to take account of the objection.

Conclusions

- 7.6.6 The Council say that the objection is levelled at previous and current working methods of the planning department. If that is the case, even if details were available, it would not be appropriate for me to comment as part of my consideration of the policies in the UDP.
- 7.6.7 In general terms however the Conservation and Enhancement of the Built Environment Section of the plan sets out the Council's policies in respect of the historic environment, whilst part 1 policy 1.11 seeks the conservation of the cultural heritage, historic character, distinctiveness and local identity of buildings and areas. It says that the extension, conversion etc of historic buildings and areas should be sensitive to their surroundings. To my mind these policies demonstrate the Council's commitment to the preservation and enhancement of the environment and are sufficient to provide a sound framework for development control decisions.

Recommendation

- 7.6.8 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.