

## **LDF Allocations DPD (Marple) – Response to Issues and Options Paper**

### **Accommodating Economic Development**

#### Marple Issue 1 - Options/Questions

Should the existing employment allocation (Site 114) be retained for employment purposes?

*Yes*

Should the allocation be removed or amended? *Yes – see below for Goyt Mill*

Should Goyt Mill (Site 014) be de-allocated from that employment area to allow it to be used for a range of uses? *Yes – Along the lines of a mixed use development similar to the Houldsworth Mill model. Whilst this could include some residential use, Goyt Mill should retain its employment facility.*

Are there any other sites or areas with the Marple area that would be suitable for allocations for either employment or mixed-use development which include employment uses? *Compstall Mill and possibly Aqueduct Mill*

### **Providing a Decent Home for Everyone**

#### Marple Issue 2 - Options/Questions

Which of the following sites should be allocated for housing?

Hibbert Lane College Campus (Site 087) – *Social/affordable housing a possibility if site no longer needed for educational use.*

Former Peacefield Primary School (Site 153) *Site suitable for housing allocation.*

Dale Primary School (Site 156) *Before housing can be considered it needs to be determined that the site is not required for educational purposes which is what it is used for at present.*

*British Waterways yard off Church Street (Site 004) - This site should not be used for housing. The site is an important heritage site within a conservation area, basically unchanged for 200 years, There are adequate sites suitable for housing development within Marple to satisfy the current and future housing needs as set out in the Stockport Core Strategy. Whilst the British Waterways yard is Previously Developed Land (PDL) it has never previously been developed for housing and should be preserved for its heritage amenity and potential community and recreational amenity as outlined in the 'Vision for Marple' and supporting documents (see attached). The core strategy supports the maintenance of this site for its heritage and historical value which should be safeguarded for the future. Educational and recreational uses, as outlined in the 'Vision for Marple' would maximize the benefits to local people and visitors without damaging its heritage value (see ref. Core Strategy Heritage Conservation 3.300, 3.301 and 3.302)*

Land at Shepley Lane (Site 127) – *This site should not be allocated for housing. Although there is no mention of employment as a use for this site we consider employment use should be in Band A (it is currently an employment site)*

Should all or part of Goyt Mill (Site 014) be allocated for housing? - *The Civic Society would like to see a comprehensive mixed use development using a model similar to Houldsworth Mill which could include some housing and possibly some small scale retail and leisure (with restrictions – ie ancillary to other uses).*

*The building is “Locally Listed” and the only large mill building in the area so the heritage aspect should be respected and preserved within any development plan.*

### Marple Issue 3

As part of the call for sites exercise, some sites within the Green Belt were put forward for housing / employment development including:

Between Longhurst Lane, Mellor (Site 52)

Marple Garden Centre (Site 63)

Scotch Produce Centre, Andrew Lane, High Lane (Sites 90a / 90b)

Land adj. Windlehurst Road, High Lane (Site 92)

These areas are outside any MEDS and as Green Belt sites currently have a presumption against the construction of new buildings. Two options have been identified:

1. To maintain the Green Belt boundary and focus on making effective use of land within accessible urban areas, with the priority for development on previously developed land.
2. Alternatively, to look at the potential for local adjustments to the boundary and ultimately the releasing of land on the grounds of accommodating local needs (e.g. affordable housing / supporting regeneration in Neighbourhood Renewal Priority Areas).

Clearly, if looking at Option 2 and whether appropriate to change the Green Belt boundary regard must also be had to, amongst other things: the ability to maintain openness; the purposes of including Green Belts; the Green Belt objectives; and the need to provide clearly defensible boundaries.

### Options/Questions – Issue 3

Which of the two options identified above should the Council pursue and why?

*The council should pursue option one in Marple for the reasons stated within option one, and because Marple does not include Neighbourhood Renewal Areas and affordable housing can be accommodated elsewhere in the town to satisfy the requirements for the Stockport Core Strategy.*

### Marple Issue 4 - Options/Questions

Are there any sites you would like to see allocated for self build housing in this area? – *We have no objection to self build housing but have no sites in mind*

### Marple Issue 5 - Options/Questions

If they were available, are there any reasons why the sites listed below should be considered suitable or unsuitable for Gypsies, Travellers and/or Travelling Showpeople? Please note that as stated above these sites are not being proposed for this purpose, they are included simply because they meet basic locational criteria.

129 Marple Sorting Office and car park, Chapel Fields, Marple – *Unsuitable - Its central location in the District Centre is more suitable to retail or its present use as a car park.*

004 British Waterways Yard, Church Street, Marple – *Unsuitable - This is an important heritage site.*

087 Cheadle and Marple College, Hibbert Lane Campus, Marple – *Unsuitable This site is within a residential area and is more suitable for educational, community or housing uses.*

153 Peacefield Primary School – *Unsuitable - Within a residential area and more suitable for affordable housing.*

156 The Dale Primary School – *Unsuitable - Within a residential area, close to a sensitive Neighbour.*

Are there any other sites in the area suitable for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? – *No*

## **Access to Services**

### **Marple Issue 6**

The Core Strategy sets out that the boundaries of the District and Local Centres and their Primary and Secondary Frontages will be defined in the Allocations DPD. The current boundaries and frontages are shown on plans in 'Appendix A', along with suggested possible alterations (highlighted in red/orange) which are either the result of development that has taken place or changes to the way in which such things are defined. Changes are suggested as follows:

Marple District Centre: *No changes proposed*

Marple Bridge Large Local Centre:

*A. and B. 25 and 27 Town Street are now in residential use. The properties north of the electricity sub-station at Lower Fold are now longer in A1 (shop) use, most of them now also being in residential use. The Stockport Shopping and Leisure Study 2009 (6) states that '...Marple Bridge Local Centre would benefit from a revision to its boundary, to exclude the section at Lower Fold.' It is suggested that the centre boundary is amended to exclude these 2 areas.*

High Lane Other Local Centre:

*A. Vehicle garages would not normally be included within the boundary of a centre so it is suggested that the centre boundary be redrawn to exclude High Lane Garage at 113 Buxton Road.*

*B. The Red Lion pub and adjacent florists are uses which would normally be included within a centre. It is suggested that the centre boundary is redrawn to include these 2 properties.*

*C. The High Lane Medical Centre Building contains a Post Office (A1 use) and a pharmacy (A1 use), both essential services within the A1 use class that are typically found in centres like this. It is suggested that the centre boundary be redrawn to include the Post Office and adjacent Peak Pharmacy*

### **Options/Questions**

Should the changes highlighted on the plans be made? (please reference the centre name and the letter given to the suggested change)

Marple District Centre – *agree*

Marple Bridge Large Local Centre – *agree*

High Lane Local Centre – *agree*

Should any other changes be made and why? - *No*

## Marple Issue 7 - Options/Questions

Do you agree that the suggested Primary Shopping Areas should be allocated in the Allocations DPD? – Yes

If not, what area would you allocate alternatively?

## Marple Issue 8 - Options/Questions

Which of the following options should be taken in relation to hot food takeaways?

### *District Centres*

- a. Limit the percentage of units that can be hot food takeaways to (the average of) 3% within the Primary Frontage and 8% in the Secondary Frontage (or no increase if that percentage is already exceeded).
- b. Limit the percentage of frontage length that can be hot food takeaways to (the average of) 2% within the Primary Frontages and 7% in the Secondary Frontage (or no increase if that percentage is already exceeded).
- c. Limit hot food takeaways so that no more than 2 adjacent units are in such use, with a minimum number of other units before the next hot food takeaway within the frontage.

If options a. or b. are preferred, are the suggested percentages right? If not what should they be and why?

If option c. is preferred, how many other units should there be between groups of hot food takeaways?

### *Large Local Centres*

a. Continue the current (UDP Review) approach of limiting the percentage of non-A1 use to 20% in Primary Frontages and 40% in Other Main Shopping Frontages, with no threshold in Secondary Frontages, with no more than 12m continuous non A1-use frontage and no more than 2 adjacent units in non-A1 use (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase); or

b. Limit the percentage of non-A1 use to (the average of) 31% in Primary Frontages and 59% in Secondary Frontages (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase); or

c. A combination of a. and b. – please explain how you think that could be done.

### *Other Local Centres*

a. Limit the number of units that can be hot food takeaways to (the average of) 3 (or no increase if that number is already exceeded).

b. Limit the percentage of units that can be hot food takeaways to (the average of) 14% (or no increase if that percentage is already exceeded).

c. Something else – please explain what.

*Regarding hot-food takeaways: we believe it is important to preserve the distinctive character of the District Centre. To do this we need to control the number and scale of hot-food takeaways.*

*We suggest that a combination of options B & C would be appropriate i.e. to limit the shop frontage to present levels, and limit the number of adjacent hot-food takeaway units to two. We would suggest that the minimum number of other units between takeaway units should be six.*

Which of the following options should be taken in relation to the proportion of non-A1 uses allowed?

#### *District Centres*

- a. Continue the current (UDP Review) approach of limiting the percentage of non-A1 use to 20% in Primary Frontages and 40% in Other Main Shopping Frontages, with no threshold in Secondary Frontages, with no more than 12m continuous non A1-use frontage and no more than 2 adjacent units in non-A1 use (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase); or
- b. Limit the percentage of non-A1 use to (the average of) 27.6% in Primary Frontages and 60% in Secondary Frontages (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase); or
- c. A combination of a. and b. – please explain how you think that could be done.

#### *Large Local Centres*

- a. Continue the current (UDP Review) approach of limiting the percentage of non-A1 use to 20% in Primary Frontages and 40% in Other Main Shopping Frontages, with no threshold in Secondary Frontages, with no more than 12m continuous non A1-use frontage and no more than 2 adjacent units in non-A1 use (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase); or
- b. Limit the percentage of non-A1 use to (the average of) 31% in Primary Frontages and 59% in Secondary Frontages (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase); or
- c. A combination of a. and b. – please explain how you think that could be done.

#### *Other Local Centres*

- a. Limit non-A1 uses to (the average of) 35% with no more than 2 adjacent units in non-A1 use (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase);
- or
- b. Limit non-A1 uses to (the average of) 35% but with no limit on the number of adjacent units (where the percentage limit is already exceeded then there should be no increase);
- or
- c. Something else – please explain what.

*We agree that non-A1 use should be limited in order to preserve the character of the Centres and therefore suggest option A in all cases.*

## Marple Issue 9 - Options/Questions

Which of the following criteria could/should be used to determine whether planning applications for non-town centre uses within District, Large Local or Other Local Centres are acceptable or not:

- Development should safeguard the viability and vitality of the centre;
- Development should safeguard ancillary floorspace required to ensure the viability of the related commercial unit;
- Safeguard / ensure (and, where possible, enhance) residential amenity and environmental conditions;
- Provide separate access to first floor premises
- Provide adequate parking (inline with adopted parking standards) without detriment to the centre's existing parking or servicing provision.

*We believe that all the above criteria should be used to determine planning applications for non-town centre uses within District, Large Local and other Local Centres.*

## Marple Issue 10 - Options/Questions

Are the business frontages shown in Marple District Centre broadly representative of the types of unit that they contain? *Yes*

If not, how should they be changed?

## Marple Issue 11 - Options/Questions

Are there any sites currently within the Green Belt (not identified as MEDS) where adjustments to the boundary may merit consideration? *No, because there are sufficient development sites available outside the Green Belt*

## Marple Issue 12 - Options/Questions

Should the MEDS boundary at Goyt Works, Strines be maintained or be removed, with the area to be "washed over" as Green Belt and why?

*The MEDS boundary should be removed and the area washed over as Green Belt in order to protect the openness of the area and prevent further development.*

## Marple Issue 13 - Options/Questions

Should the confirmed viable hydroelectricity opportunities be included in the Allocations DPD? – *Yes*

If so, how should the opportunities be shown on the proposals map? *We would suggest a symbol on the proposals map with a reference number that refers to detail that would be given in a written policy.*

Should the Allocations DPD include a policy setting out that, if and when the hydroelectricity opportunities are delivered, other development that might be harmful to their efficient and effective operation should be prohibited? – *Yes*

Should the Allocations DPD include a policy setting out that, if and when an opportunity for wind generation is delivered, other development that might be harmful to its efficient and effective operation should be prohibited? **Yes**

#### Marple Issue 14 - Options/Questions

Should the Goyt Mill/Shepley Road site (Sites 014 and 114) be identified in the Allocations DPD as a 'low carbon opportunity area'? – **No. However, if proposed by a developer it would be acceptable so long as it wasn't a barrier to development.**

If so, how should the opportunity be shown on the proposals map?

#### Marple Area - General Question

Have you any other comments on the Issues and Options for this area? **See further comments on the civic society's response to the Appraisal Screening Report**