



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 1 February 2022

Site visit made on 10 February 2022

**by David M H Rose BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 March 2022**

---

**Appeal Reference: APP/C4235/W/21/3279967**

**Land bounded by Ashton Road, the River Tame, Turner Lane and Bredbury Industrial Estate, Stockport**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant a hybrid planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Quorum Estates Limited and Edmund Hargreaves Ogden, Joanne Louise Ogden, Carolyne Patricia Ogden and Kristine Michelle Ogden<sup>1</sup> against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council<sup>2</sup>.
- The application Reference DC/074399, dated 9 August 2019<sup>3</sup>, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2021.

The development proposed is:

Part A: Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the creation of a commercial/industrial development providing up to 53,327 sqm of B2/B8 employment floorspace (including ancillary office accommodation), along with the provision of other associated infrastructure (including internal plot access, roads, parking, footpaths, internal landscaping and the provision of a car park to serve Stockport Sports Village); and

Part B: Full planning permission for the creation of two commercial/industrial units comprising 39,857 sqm (including ancillary office accommodation), strategic landscaping, the widening and realignment of Bredbury Park Way and the relocation of its junction with Ashton Road, along with the provision of other associated infrastructure (including access, parking and internal landscaping).

---

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matters

#### (i) The Inquiry and Site Visits

2. The Inquiry opened on Tuesday 1 February 2022 and was held in a 'virtual' format. I heard evidence over a period of 7 days<sup>4</sup>. Oral Closing Submissions were presented on 15 February 2022.
3. As well as the Appellants and the Council, the Inquiry was attended by a Rule 6(6) Party, led by Andrew Gwynne MP, to represent opposition expressed by the local community. Several interested persons, including local Councillors and CPRE The Countryside Charity, also spoke.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to as the Appellants

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter referred to as the Council

<sup>3</sup> The date of the original application - The application was later amended as set out in the heading above

<sup>4</sup> On 1 - 4 and 8, 9 and 11 February 2022

4. I held Case Management Conferences, again in virtual format, on 18 October 2021 and 9 December 2021, to make administrative arrangements and procedural decisions in advance of the Inquiry itself.
5. Before the Inquiry, on 27 January 2022, I visited the site, its surroundings and the wider locality, on an unaccompanied basis, following a route previously agreed by the parties. I also carried out an accompanied site visit on 10 February 2022.
6. The application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement and supplemented by update documents during the course of the application. I have taken all of the Environmental Information, additional reports and the evidence available to the Inquiry, into account in reaching my decision.

**(ii) Planning Obligation**

7. A completed Deed of Planning Obligation, made between the Council and the Appellants, pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, was submitted, by prior agreement, after the close of the Inquiry<sup>5</sup>. A Compliance Statement, in accordance with Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010, and a Monitoring Fee Statement are also before me<sup>6</sup>.
8. The Obligations include: an Ecology Contribution (£96,000) towards the cost of habitat improvement at Woodhall Fields and Reddish Vale Country Park (including 80 metres of offsite hedgerow); a Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution (£15,000); a Street Lighting and Signage Contribution for improvements in the locality of the site (£27,250); and a Monitoring Contribution (£7,500) relating to the monitoring and implementation of the Deed. Provision is also made for the cost of a queue loop detector scheme (if found to be necessary in order to reduce queuing on Ashton Road).
9. Other Obligations safeguard a cycle route corridor; and provide for the submission and reasonable endeavours to implement an agreed Employment and Skills Plan to maximise employment and skills development opportunities for the community during the construction period.
10. The Compliance and Monitoring Fee Statements carefully set out justification related to the underpinning tests set out in Regulation 122(2). There is clear validation through extant development plan policies; and the financial contributions are agreed and appear to be fair and reasonable. I am satisfied that the Obligations meet the requirements of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework<sup>7</sup> and Regulation 122(2).

**(iii) Planning Conditions**

11. A comprehensive suite of draft planning conditions<sup>8</sup>, reflecting the generality of development plan policy requirements, evolved during the Inquiry. These include a number of safeguards and mitigation measures that, in general terms, seek to protect, safeguard and enhance the natural environment; protect the amenity of nearby residents; secure strategic and non-strategic landscaping in accordance with an approved timetable<sup>9</sup>; minimise the effects

---

<sup>5</sup> ID-016.3

<sup>6</sup> ID-014 and ID-015

<sup>7</sup> Hereafter the Framework

<sup>8</sup> ID-017.1

<sup>9</sup> Draft condition B65 would secure the delivery of strategic buffer planting (along the River Tame and Ashton Road) to be carried out in the first planting season following the completion of the development platforms for Units 1 and 2

of construction works; ensure the implementation of highway, access and related transport works; provide appropriate drainage; and target unemployed local people for vacancies.

**(iv) The Development Plan**

12. The development plan includes the saved policies of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006)<sup>10</sup> and the Stockport Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011)<sup>11</sup>. The UDP made allocations to meet development needs for the period 1996 - 2011. The CS identified development needs from 2011 - 2026 but did not allocate any land to meet those needs.
13. The Appellants and the Council agree that the most important policies relevant to the determination of the appeal are:-
- (i) UDP saved policies**
- GBA1.1: Extent of Green Belt
  - GBA1.2: Control of development in Green Belt
  - LCR1.1: Landscape Character Areas
  - LCR1.1a: The urban fringe including the river valleys
- (ii) CS policies**
- Core Policy CS1: Overarching principles: sustainable development – addressing inequalities and climate change
  - Development Management Policy SD-1: Creating sustainable communities
  - Core Policy CS7: Accommodating economic development
  - Core Policy CS8: Safeguarding and improving the environment
  - Development Management Policy SIE-1: Quality places
  - Development Management Policy SIE-3: Protecting, safeguarding and enhancing the environment
14. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to UDP saved Policy GBA2.1: Protection of agricultural land. However, the appeal site is not categorised as '*best and most versatile agricultural land*' and it is agreed that the proposed development would not be in conflict with this policy.

**Main Issue**

15. Having regard to the foregoing, the main issue is:
- (i) the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
  - (ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including landscape character and visual amenity;
  - (iii) would the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the development.

---

<sup>10</sup> Hereafter the UDP

<sup>11</sup> Hereafter the CS

## Reasons

### (i) The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt

16. The majority of the appeal site lies within the Greater Manchester Green Belt as defined by saved Policy GBA1.1 of the UDP. The presumption against the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt, set out in saved Policy GBA1.2, makes no allowance for the consideration of very special circumstances and is inconsistent with the Framework. Nonetheless, the Appellants and the Council agree that the fact the policy is not fully consistent with the Framework does not have a material bearing<sup>12</sup>.
17. It is common ground<sup>13</sup> that the proposal, in so far as it relates to the land within the Green Belt, is inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances<sup>14</sup>. It is further agreed that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and 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<sup>15</sup>.
18. The Appellants and the Council also agree that the appeal site serves some of the purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the Framework, and that the proposal would result in harm to some of these purposes as well as both visual and spatial openness.
19. The concept of openness has a spatial as well as a visual aspect. In terms of the former, it is incontrovertible that a development of some 93,000 sqm of buildings, up to 22 m in height, with associated yards, related development and activity would have a marked effect on openness. In terms of the visual aspect of openness, although there is consensus that the development would have an adverse effect, this is a matter to which I return in my consideration of the landscape and visual effects of the proposal.
20. Paragraph 137 of the Framework confirms that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 138 sets out the five purposes which Green Belt serves.
21. The five purposes were examined by LUC in a report<sup>16</sup> commissioned on behalf of the ten Greater Manchester Authorities to assess the extent to which the land within the Greater Manchester Green Belt performed against the purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the Framework, with a view to informing the preparation of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework<sup>17</sup>.
22. The 2019 GMSF identified the broad area of the appeal site for release from the Green Belt to form an extension to Bredbury Park Industrial Estate with some 90,000 sqm of industry and warehouse space. The updated 2020 version of the GMSF reduced the area for development to the land nearest to the existing industrial estate (around 60,000 sqm of floorspace) and the retention of the remainder as Green Belt. A second LUC report<sup>18</sup> followed to assess the changes between the 2019 and 2020 versions of the GMSF.

---

<sup>12</sup> CD10.1 paragraph 6.43

<sup>13</sup> CD10.1 paragraph 6.17

<sup>14</sup> Framework paragraph 147

<sup>15</sup> Framework paragraph 148

<sup>16</sup> Greater Manchester Green Belt Assessment, Final Report July 2016

<sup>17</sup> Hereafter GMSF

<sup>18</sup> Greater Manchester Combined Authority, Stage 2 Greater Manchester Green Belt Study, Addendum: Assessment of Proposed 2020 GMSF Allocations, Final Report, September 2020

23. The GMSF has been submitted for examination, under the banner of Places for Everyone, following the Council's withdrawal from the collaboration of the ten authorities. Whilst the LUC documents assess the role of Green Belt within Greater Manchester, and inform the evidence base for Places for Everyone, they remain untested. Moreover, as the draft allocations within Stockport have been expunged, and the Council is to prepare its own local plan, I consider that the LUC studies, in so far as they related to the Borough of Stockport, are of very limited materiality to my consideration of the appeal.
24. Returning to the five purposes, the first is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. To my mind, that purpose cannot be divorced from the policy imperative of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The mere presence of a well-defined boundary within the Green Belt itself, in this case the narrow incised valley of the River Tame, should not be taken as an open invitation to leap-frog the already strong demarcation of the existing built-up area and, thereafter, extend built development into the Green Belt.
25. In this regard, Bredbury, along the edge of the industrial estate, has a well-defined and robust landscaped boundary which, albeit relatively narrow, provides clear distinction between the built-up area and the open countryside. In my opinion, the removal of some of the boundary to accommodate the proposal, and the manner in which large scale development would spread across open fields, would amount to sprawl. The fact that it would be 'restricted', or halted, by the sharp change in topography, as the land drops into the river valley, does not provide any basis for me to conclude that the Green Belt, as currently drawn, would be serving its first purpose by allowing the proposed development.
26. The second purpose is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. In this regard, the existing gap between Bredbury and Haughton Green is quite modest, and the scheme before me would occupy a substantial part of it.
27. In physical terms, the proposed development would extend the built-up influence and proximity of the industrial estate in the direction of Haughton Green. Notwithstanding the presence of development to the south-east of the site, including the Sports Village, the project would result in a significant change in the relationship between the two settlements, and their tangible separation at this point would be substantially reduced. Whilst this would not amount to the built-up areas actually merging into each other, it would, nonetheless, leave very limited separation, even with the deep nature of the valley and the proposed new landscaping.
28. Moreover, there would be a very strong perception of merging, notably from parts of Haughton Green<sup>19</sup>. Here the descent into and out of the valley is not readily apparent, and the existing buildings in Bredbury are distant and generally masked to a large degree. Notwithstanding the demarcation afforded by existing woodland, and the proposed strategic buffer planting, prominent large-scale buildings, above the tree-line and dominating the skyline, would be evident as immediate foreground and mid-ground elements.

---

<sup>19</sup> For example, from Viewpoint 11

29. Overall, in my opinion, the degree of merging, both physically and perceptually, conflicts significantly with the second Green Belt purpose.
30. The third purpose of Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is common ground that this purpose would be offended. For my part, I acknowledge that the appeal site has varying degrees of urban influence arising from its relationship with the industrial estate and built development to the south-east. Views across to Haughton Green and more distant settlements are also evident.
31. Although the appeal site can be characterised as urban fringe, the urban influences are generally peripheral to the site. Moreover, the land within it has strong hallmarks of countryside comprising gently undulating/sloping fields, hedgerow boundaries, views to the wider countryside and a distant backdrop of the Pennines. Whilst it cannot be denied that the significance of the site as countryside is influenced by its surroundings, I consider that the proposal would evidently run counter to the third Green Belt purpose.
32. The fourth Green Belt purpose, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, is not at issue.
33. The fifth purpose is to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other land. Although the Council is likely to favour re-using a significant amount of brownfield land and outmoded industrial sites for other uses, as part of its wider regeneration objectives, there is nothing to suggest that there would be a direct connection between developing the appeal site and facilitating the recycling of other land. Whilst it is claimed that the site would deliver potential positive benefits, I see this to be nothing more than neutral in the consideration of the Green Belt issue.
34. In terms of assessing the harm to the Green Belt, I have had regard to the context of the site and the proposed mitigation measures. Whilst the main effect on the openness of the Green Belt would be experienced at a local level, within the vicinity of the site, the reduction in openness would, nevertheless, be very significant in that the north-eastern boundary of the appeal site extends more-or-less to the shoulder of the valley.
35. Although it is said that building heights would be controlled to minimise the impact of the development, aided, amongst other things, by ground modelling and strategic landscaping, there is no basis to suppose that the proposal would not have an overwhelming impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
36. Moreover, whilst the Green Belt boundary has not been reviewed or amended since its inception, the Framework is clear that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. However, that does not preclude the approval of inappropriate development within the Green Belt, where very special circumstances are shown to exist. Whilst it is claimed that '*..... the proposals would provide a firm, clear and a defensible long-term Green Belt boundary in this location where such a boundary does not exist at present*<sup>20</sup>' this provides no policy or other rationale in the context of this appeal.

---

<sup>20</sup> QEL/5/2 paragraph 7.55

37. I have also had regard to the fact that not all of the appeal site would be used for built and ancillary development. Notably, approximately one-third would remain as green infrastructure, including new perimeter paths. Although it is suggested that there would be improvements to the wider Green Belt, as advocated by paragraph 142 of the Framework (in relation to the strategic review of Green Belt boundaries), I consider that this would not counter the harm that I have identified.
38. Having regard to all of the above, I believe that there would be very significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and also to three of the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt, arising from the scale, nature and extent of the proposed development. In my opinion, very substantial weight should be given to the combined harm to the Green Belt.

**(ii) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including landscape character and visual amenity**

***Preliminary matters and areas of agreement/disagreement***

39. It is to be noted at the outset that the landscape and visual effects were assessed by the Appellants in the Environmental Statement. Also, the Appellants' case at the Inquiry was supported by a witness giving evidence on these matters. For its part, the Council's landscape and visual evidence took the form of a written report<sup>21</sup>, albeit prepared and given in accordance with the guidance of the Landscape Institute. Nonetheless, it was not capable of formal scrutiny.
40. In terms of agreed matters<sup>22</sup>, there is no technical dispute about the methodology or content of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. It is common ground that 'Significant'<sup>23</sup> effects would arise, during construction and operation, for users of the footpaths within and adjacent to the site; users of the informal green space accessed from Chaucer Avenue, Haughton Green; for residents of Castle Hill Park; and users of the local road and public footpath at Castle Hill. It is also agreed that as the mitigation planting matures, the above effects would reduce to become 'not Significant' for users of Turner Lane and nearby footpaths to the southeast of the site<sup>24</sup>. Finally, it is confirmed that the site does not form part of a Valued Landscape as defined in paragraph 174 of the Framework.
41. The matters of disagreement include the sensitivity of the landscape character of the site and its immediate context; the levels of effect on landscape character; and whether permanent visual effects on users of the footpath along the western boundary of the site<sup>25</sup>, and for residents at Castle Hill Park, would be 'Significant' once mitigation planting matures.

***Landscape effects***

42. Starting with the saved policies of the UDP, Policy LCR1.1 indicates: *'Development in the countryside will be strictly controlled, and will not be permitted unless it protects or enhances the quality and character of the rural areas .....'*

---

<sup>21</sup> STC/1/3a

<sup>22</sup> CD10.3

<sup>23</sup> 'Significant' - For the purposes of Environmental Impact Assessment - derived from separate judgements on the sensitivity of the landscape and the magnitude of effect, and the sensitivity and value of the receptors (people) combined with the magnitude of change and whether the effects would be beneficial or adverse

<sup>24</sup> PRoW 64aBR, 112BR and 115BR

<sup>25</sup> PRoW 49BR and 50BR

43. Policy LCR1.1(a), relating to the urban fringe and river valleys, records: *'Proposals for development in the urban fringe should protect, conserve and improve the landscape quality and natural history of the locality, and encourage the development of a variety of attractive landscape types .....'*
44. Further, CS Development Management Policy SIE-3 reiterates the protection of the natural environment as: *'..... The Borough's urban and rural landscape will be conserved and enhanced in line with the borough's Landscape Character Assessment .....'*
45. Each of these has to be interpreted in light of the Framework's guidance that planning decisions should contribute to the natural and local environment by, amongst other things: *'protecting and enhancing valued landscapes .....; and recognising the intrinsic and beauty of the countryside .....'*. It is evident from the advice on plan-making that plans should *'..... allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value .....'*
46. The importance of the river valleys, in terms of environmental protection, recreation provision and their history, has long been recognised<sup>26</sup>. Although the local community, understandably, places great significance on the role of the Tame Valley, and describes it as the 'jewel in the crown', the appeal site does not constitute a Valued Landscape for the purposes of the Framework.
47. In terms of independent appraisal, the Greater Manchester Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment<sup>27</sup> places the appeal site in Landscape Character Area<sup>28</sup> 36 The River Tame, within the Incised Urban Fringe Valleys Landscape Character Type.
48. Key characteristics of the latter include *'Typically narrow incised valleys ..... downstream the rivers widen and meander across flatter valley bottoms ..... valleys typically traced by riparian woodland ..... the valleys are typically overlooked (by) adjacent urban areas ..... networks of footpaths criss-cross the valleys ..... long distance footpaths and cycle routes run through the valleys ..... other routes include the Tame Valley Way ..... views are typically contained by the steep valley sides and woodland .....'*. Finally, *'While proximity to urban areas, transport and other infrastructure can significantly affect their character, the narrow valley landforms and often dense woodland cover provide a sense of seclusion and tranquillity'*.
49. Intactness and condition is set out as: *'The narrow incised valleys are typically wooded and have a natural character, with areas having a strong sense of seclusion and relative tranquillity, contrasting with surrounding densely populated urban areas. Their character is influenced by a complex mix of land uses and variations in topography. Traditional farming practices with enclosed pastures and areas of rough grazing land are intermingled with pony paddocks, recreation grounds, golf courses, industrial sites and large scale utility infrastructure forming a juxtaposition of scale and form. Some areas are strongly influenced by the visual presence of the adjoining urban edge .....'*
50. The overall assessment of landscape sensitivity to commercial/industrial developments is recorded as 'high', albeit The River Tame is one of three LCAs where sensitivity is judged to be 'moderate-high' as *'They contain existing large scale development, such as ..... industrial complexes ..... The surrounding urban areas also have a strong influence, detracting from the rural qualities and naturalistic character of the valleys .....'*

---

<sup>26</sup> GWY/1/2 Appendices A and B

<sup>27</sup> CD9.2 produced for Greater Manchester Combined Authority in 2018

<sup>28</sup> Hereafter LCA



51. In terms of the guidance and opportunities for future development and landscape management/enhancement, measures include: '*Avoid siting development on the edges of (the) valley where buildings would be prominent on the skyline ..... utilise the screening effects of the tight valley topography and existing tree/woodland cover to integrate limited new development into the landscape;*' and '*recreational opportunities should be maintained and enhanced in order to preserve the high recreational value of the valleys as green fingers through densely populated areas. Opportunities should be sought to strengthen the links between valleys along public footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes .....*'.
52. In turn, the Stockport Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Study<sup>29</sup> places the appeal site in part of LCA E: Tame Valley and Brinnington East.
53. It summarises landscape condition in the following terms: '*This rural landscape with a distinctive valley profile runs across the fringes of many urban communities and creates a major green corridor into the centre of Stockport' .....* The landscape is defined by the meandering course of the river and its associated habitat network and extensive woodland coverage that dominated most vantages. A number of well-wooded paths create quiet, tranquil routes into the countryside although in close proximity to many urban settlements. Issues around the current condition mainly relate to urban development nibbling away at the valley and threatening land that is regarded as one of Stockport's major green lungs'.
54. Key elements of the landscape sensitivity assessment, indicate moderate sensitivity for physical character; natural character; views and visual character including skylines; and perceptual and experiential qualities. Moderate-high sensitivity is limited to form, density and setting of existing development; and access and recreation.
55. Bredbury Park Industrial Estate (outside the LCA) is recorded in the assessment as having a close influence on the central part of the valley. The overall sensitivity of the LCA to large-scale commercial development (large distribution/warehousing/logistics (B8 use)) is stated to be moderate-high. This is qualified as being slightly less in the area of the industrial estate where industrial development already influences landscape character.
56. As to guiding future development, there is much in common with the Greater Manchester study. For completeness, and in short, development in more elevated locations that are overlooked, as well as the steep valley slopes, should be avoided; the green-lung function and immediate rural setting is to be protected along with its important separation function between the different Stockport suburbs; connecting limited new development to existing developed edges; and the LCA's relative sense of tranquillity and unsettled character away from existing urban/industrial development on its fringes should be protected.
57. Drawing all of these elements together, the studies place particular emphasis on the incised river valley itself and its densely wooded steep valley sides in terms of visual, perceptual and recreational functions. Although there is little reference to the role of land outside the wooded incised valley, the valley does not exist in isolation from its wider surroundings. However, that is not to say that the appeal site, as a whole, has any particular identified sensitivity or value. Nonetheless, its topography, natural field boundaries and its open uses contribute, physically and perceptually, to rural character and the separation of built-up areas.

---

<sup>29</sup> CD9.1 produced for Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

58. Taking this a stage further, it is to be recognised that landscape sensitivity and susceptibility to change, often varies within LCAs. In this case, the Council draws distinction, in three parts, across the appeal site, influenced by topography, contiguity with the urban edge and proximity to the incised river valley. Whilst there is gradual variation across the site, and sensitivity generally increases as one moves away from the urban edge, the subdivision of the site into clear-cut compartments results in a degree of artificiality. My overall conclusion is that the character of the site is not so divisible, and that its overall sensitivity and susceptibility to change is moderate-high.
59. Moving on to look at the effect of the scheme on landscape character, the Appellants accept that there would inevitably be a major/moderate level of harm<sup>30</sup>. In this regard, and in my own assessment, sloping pastoral fields would give way, after extensive ground modelling, to level platforms to accommodate industrial buildings and related activities; the existing industrial estate and built-up area would become more extensive; synergy with the wider countryside would be eroded; and trees and hedgerows would be lost. More positively, by way of mitigation, extensive buffer planting is proposed.
60. These effects would be largely confined to the site and its immediate locality, between Castle Hill, the edge of Haughton Green, the Sports Village and Castle Hill Park. Consequently, the effects on the relevant LCAs, as a whole, would be minor adverse, and the characteristics of the tightly enclosed Tame Valley itself would remain unaffected.
61. Nonetheless, by reference to photomontages at viewpoints 11, 14 and 23 (year 15) the adverse effect on landscape character would remain as immediate, substantial and unabated. On this basis, I do not agree with the Appellants' assessment that the '*..... Moderate-Major adverse overall landscape effect as described in the LVIA ..... would be reduced over time, due to the maturing to the planting within and around the site*'<sup>31</sup>.
62. Moreover, by reference to the two Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessments, although the proposed buildings would not be sited on the edge of the valley, they would nonetheless appear as dominant structures forming a new, and significantly imposing, skyline (photomontage viewpoint 11). Other than within the valley itself, topography and woodland would offer little by way of integrating the development into the landscape. Again, whilst tranquillity and seclusion within the valley would remain, the nature and ambience of the recreational routes across the site would be wholly urban-dominated, and a notable proportion of the established screening to the existing urban edge would be lost.
63. There would, however, be a net gain in new tree and hedgerow planting; and recreational opportunities would be improved, in particular, by means of a new multifunctional route along the diverted Turners Lane. Whilst the latter would create an accessible route on the south-western shoulder of the valley, bounded by significant buffer planting to soften the presence of new buildings, it would nonetheless have a proximate and dominant urban character and setting.

---

<sup>30</sup> ID-021 paragraph 80

<sup>31</sup> QEL/3/1 paragraph 7.4

64. Overall, I consider that the Appellants have underplayed the localised effects of the scheme on landscape character, and overstated the efficacy of the mitigation to be achieved by the proposed landscaping. This leads me to conclude that, notwithstanding the proximity of the adjacent industrial estate, in particular, and its influence on landscape character, the proposal would have a notable adverse effect on landscape character.

**Visual effects**

65. The consideration of this part of the issue effectively breaks down into three components, comprising medium-long distance views, views from within the Tame Valley and localised visual effects.
66. Representative medium-long distance views include views from the Trans Pennine Trail (photo viewpoint 24) and Werneth Low Road (photomontage viewpoint 28). In both instances, with the effect of distance and the panorama of other built development, the proposals would be perceived as comparatively minor additions to the settlement of Bredbury.
67. Further, as emphasised in the Appellants' evidence and closing submissions, the development would have very little effect from the nearby section of the riverside path within the incised valley. This, in turn, forms a small part of the linear route through the Tame Valley, as a whole, and its interrelationship with various built-up areas.
68. More locally, starting with Castle Hill (photomontage viewpoint 23), a comparatively open vista, experienced by residents and users of the public right of way, is available over the appeal site to the backcloth of Werneth Low and beyond. Taking account of existing built elements within the view, and the significant ground modelling, the proposed development would, even at year 15, provide an immediate, looming spread of bulky commercial / industrial buildings.
69. Indeed, the Appellants' Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment acknowledges long term effects:<sup>32</sup> *'..... the proposed woodland belt ..... would have sufficiently established as to provide a degree of screening to the built elevations beyond, however these will still form noticeable elements in the view from upper windows facing the site .....'*; and, for users of the public right of way, *'..... proposed perimeter planting will help provide some limited visual mitigation .....'*.
70. Moving round to Fitzgerald Court, Haughton Green, the top eight floors, depending on orientation, would have outlook towards the appeal site and experience a tangible loss of mid-ground green space. However, overall effects would be moderated by the elevated nature of the view, distance and the backdrop of the existing industrial estate.
71. Nonetheless, the Appellants' assessment acknowledges that *'..... the proposed structural woodland planting will help the built development to assimilate better with its surroundings, however from elevated viewpoints this will provide only very limited screening, due to the angle of the view'*.
72. More significantly, from the open space at the end of Chaucer Avenue (photomontage viewpoint 11), which looks over and beyond the valley itself, the undeveloped nature of the appeal site currently provides definitive foreground separation from those limited backdrop elements of the established industrial area that are noticeable in the view.

---

<sup>32</sup> CD2.40 Environmental Statement Appendix J3: Visual effects table

73. The Appellants accept that *'the proposed units will be immediately noticeable from this location when travelling southwest, as they break the skyline. Although only upper sections of elevations are visible, the large massing of these buildings means that the buildings extend horizontally across a good proportion of the view. During summer months, when foreground vegetation is in leaf, the buildings will be less intrusive in the view'*.
74. In my opinion, this assessment offers little solace to the undeniable loss of physical and visual separation from the built-up area of Bredbury. In particular, the introduction of dominant, large-scale, commercial/industrial buildings would strike across the majority of the skyline and remove any sense of open aspect provided by the fields bordering the incised valley. Moreover, even at year 15 with the strategic landscaping in leaf, and taking account of the juxtaposition and siting of lower buildings (notably units 3 – 6), the proposed structures would remain highly intrusive.
75. Looking next from Castle Hill Park (photomontage viewpoint 14), the Appellants' assessment states: *'..... views into open grassland and pasture will be replaced by large scale industrial units in close proximity to the receptors. A belt of woodland planting, proposed on the southeast boundary of the site will, in time, help to soften views of the development. By year 15, this structural planting along the site boundary should over time provide some screening of the proposal, reducing the level of effect on visual amenity'*.
76. However, in my judgement, although the landscape buffer, approximately 20-25 m in depth, would be capable of screening service areas and the lower parts of the buildings, unit 7, backed by units 1 and 2, would, by the nature of their height and bulk, remain dominant and continue to have a distinctive adverse effect on visual amenity.
77. Moving on to the public rights of way, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment presents a careful analysis of predicted effects. In this regard, users of footpaths 46BR, 47BR, 48BR, 49BR, where they cross the site, are shown to experience moderate/major adverse effects at year 15 post completion, whilst those routes adjacent to the site (49BR, 50BR, 64aBR, 112BR and 115BR) are recorded as moderate/minor adverse at the same date. For Turners Lane, the conclusion is said to be moderate adverse.
78. I acknowledge that these local paths are already influenced, to varying degrees, by the presence of Bredbury Park Industrial Estate. However, those that cross the site, through predominantly undeveloped fields, would become routes within an industrial/commercial setting dominated, initially by extensive ground modelling and construction works, and thereafter by new buildings that would define and enclose views.
79. By way of example, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, with reference to photo viewpoints 1, 3 and 4, records *'Users will pass through the development along redirected routes with the immediate context of views having changed from urban edge farmland to industrial dominated by large scale buildings. Adverse impact on visual amenity will reduce over time, as the internal green infrastructure establishes, helping proposed units to assimilate with their surroundings'*.
80. Similarly, for photo viewpoints 2 and 5, *'Users will pass through the development along redirected routes with the immediate context of views having changed from urban edge farmland to industrial dominated by large scale buildings. By Year 15, there will be some reduction in adverse impacts on visual amenity as the internal green infrastructure establishes, softening the built elevations'*.

81. And, for Turner Lane, *'The Lane will be removed as part of the scheme. Users will pass through the development along redirected routes with the immediate context of views having changed from a vegetated route through urban edge farmland to industrial dominated by large scale buildings. Where the track extends just outside the Site boundary users will still observe a notable change to the view, with the proposed development dominating the view beyond retained perimeter vegetation and replacing views of the existing farmsteads. By Year 15, the landscape setting, in which the diverted route of Turner Lane sits, will have sufficiently established to provide some degree of visual mitigation. Some sections of the lane are set within proposed woodland, while other sections are more open, with views of building elevations filtered by small groups of trees'*.
82. It is evident to me that the Appellants place great weight on the efficacy of the proposed landscaping scheme to ameliorate the adverse effects of the development. Those effects are admitted as being considerable. It is apparent that, even at year 15, the adverse impacts on visual amenity, albeit somewhat reduced from the initial stages of the development, would remain. In my opinion, although the extensive landscaping would result in a well-designed industrial/commercial development, it would provide scant consolation for the continuing long-term adverse visual effects arising from the scale and nature of the proposed scheme.

***Landscape and visual effects: conclusion***

83. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to the updated illustrative landscape masterplan for the site and its primary objective of providing a robust wooded buffer around the perimeter of the site. Whilst this would reflect the landscape character of the area and, after a period of years, would provide softening to the development, the proposal as a whole would, nonetheless, remain at odds with landscape character and result in serious and prolonged adverse visual effects.
84. The Appellants' closing submissions pose the question about the weight that should be given to the landscape and the visual effects of the scheme. Context is important in that the appeal site is not of high sensitivity, it is undesignated, and it is not a Valued Landscape. I also recognise that there is no claim to adverse effects on the incised river valley and its valued recreational resource.
85. However, it is clear to me that the Appellants' focus has been on this latter element, and it pays insufficient regard to the broader role of the appeal site as a component of the wider landscape and the immediacy of local public views, albeit from a limited number of residential properties and recreational routes.
86. I also find an over-emphasis on the claimed effectiveness of landscaping by way of proposed mitigation. Whilst I do not subscribe to the notion of wholesale screening, the very nature of the extent and scale of the development, and its relationship with its surroundings, inevitably limits the effectiveness that a well-designed comprehensive scheme, as required by CS Core Policy CS8<sup>33</sup>, sets out to achieve. In this regard, the manner in which the bulk of the buildings would remain unscathed above the landscaped belt after a period of 15 years is a very telling factor.

---

<sup>33</sup> *'Development that is designed and landscaped to a high standard and which makes a positive contribution to a sustainable, attractive, safe and accessible built and natural environment will be given positive consideration'*

87. Overall, I conclude that the proposed scheme would have a considerable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, including landscape character and visual amenity. I attach very substantial weight to the resultant harm.
88. In policy terms, the proposal would be in conflict with UDP Policies LCR1.1 and LCR1.1(a) and also with CS Policy SIE-3. However, UDP Policy LCR1.1, in seeking to strictly control development in the countryside, is inconsistent with the Framework, and it is therefore to be considered out of date. I therefore attach no weight to the conflict with this policy.

### **(iii) Other considerations**

#### **Need for industrial and warehousing space**

89. In the same way that the Council did not present formal landscape evidence, it did not call an expert witness for this topic either. Rather, reliance was placed on a written Bredbury Employment Land Supply Note<sup>34</sup>.
90. By way of background, and recording elements of general consensus, the development plan does not make provision for sites to meet present employment land needs and it does not reflect recent and current trends and demand for warehousing and distribution space.
91. It is also to be noted that the Council is in the preliminary stages of preparing a local plan, following withdrawal from the GMSF, and that the resultant submission of Places for Everyone takes no account of Stockport's needs. Although the distribution of employment land in the GMSF largely reflected sub-regional opportunities, with a focus primarily in the northern sector of Greater Manchester, the 2020 publication plan sought to identify sites across the region, including Bredbury, to meet a variety of needs.
92. The evidence base underpinning the preparation of the GMSF has been found to be a material consideration in recent appeal decisions<sup>35</sup>. It is notable that the appeal site was identified in Policy GM Allocation 31 as an extension to the existing Bredbury Park Industrial Estate, with part of the site to be retained as Green Belt, and an anticipation of some 60,000 sqm of industrial and warehouse space. However, following the withdrawal of the Council from the GMSF, the document carries no weight in the determination of this appeal, and the need for additional floorspace falls to be considered on the basis of the evidence before the Inquiry.
93. The Council, through the note prepared on its behalf, records that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for industrial and warehouse space in Stockport<sup>36</sup>. However, it maintains that the specific level and type of need can only be determined through a full employment land review which would, typically, be prepared in support of the local plan process. Be that as it may, the Appellants' assessment follows recognised process and guidance. For its part the Council relies on the Stockport Employment Land Review 2018<sup>37</sup>.

---

<sup>34</sup> STC/1/3b

<sup>35</sup> For example, CD7.2 and CD7.3

<sup>36</sup> STC/1/3b paragraph 4.2

<sup>37</sup> CD6.1

94. The Employment Land Review reached the conclusion that the baseline figure for the industrial land requirement to 2035 was an estimated 4.4 ha (0.2 ha per year) with an uplift of 10% for an element of pent-up demand. This took the land requirement to 4.8 ha equating to an average annual delivery rate of 0.25 ha. The Appellants' evidence clearly demonstrates that considerable adjustments need to be made to this figure to accommodate a variety of factors, including up-dated data and projections; loss replacement; a 2-year margin of choice; and the economic impacts arising from Covid-19.
95. Taking an overview of the Appellants' analysis, and whilst some elements rely on the application of professional judgement, I find the methodology to be generally conservative. Depending on whether weak market conditions or strong market conditions are applied, the gross annual land requirement (2021- 2038) for industrial/warehousing development would be in the range of 32.1 ha to 49.4 ha on the basis of past take-up.
96. Comparison can be made with the Updated Note on Employment Land Needs for Greater Manchester (March 2021)<sup>38</sup> which provided independent advice on the future scale of employment land needs in Greater Manchester for the GMSF excluding Stockport. The updated assessment of total assessed need reflected the proposed Places for Everyone plan period (2021 - 2037). The illustrative estimate of future industrial/warehousing floorspace, based on past completions, was 240,000 sqm for Stockport which amounted to some 53.3 ha with a 5-year margin of choice.
97. Corroboration for the generality of the Appellants' assessment can be found in the extensive work it undertook on econometric modelling. This includes translating job forecasts into floorspace requirements and thereafter into land requirements. Again, I find professional judgements, including the application of vacancy rates, the 2-year margin of choice and loss replacement, to be conservative and robust. Overall, based on Experian's latest job growth projections, 34.83 ha of industrial/warehousing land would be required over the next 17 years.
98. There are two further factors. Firstly, the Stockport Employment Land Review (2018)<sup>39</sup>, in assessing current and future demand for employment land, opined that '*..... additional land may be required in order to fully respond to pent-up demand ..... in particular ..... in locations with prime connectivity to the strategic highway network*'. Secondly, an update note with particular reference to the implications of Covid-19<sup>40</sup>, observes that '*..... internet shopping has helped drive up demand for warehousing and logistics space .....*'. This is endorsed in other market assessments<sup>41</sup>.
99. Against this background, the Appellants suggest that little weight should be applied to the weak market take-up, and that the gross requirement for industrial/warehousing land is in the range of 34.8 ha to 49.4 ha. I find nothing of substance to undermine that conclusion.

---

<sup>38</sup> CD6.7

<sup>39</sup> CD6.1 paragraph 10.23

<sup>40</sup> CD6.8 Covid-19, EU-Exit and the Greater Manchester Economy - Implications for the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Plan March 2021 paragraph

<sup>41</sup> CD6.8 paragraphs 1.80 – 1.83

100. In terms of qualitative need, criticism was made of the Appellants' reliance on property enquiries<sup>42</sup> received as an indicator of pent-up need through market signals. In most instances, the floorspace requirements are wide-ranging, and some are below the threshold of the minimum unit size promoted. Additionally, some enquiries are specific to the locality, a number of entries are sub-regional/regional/national or even specific to areas excluding Stockport.
101. Nonetheless, they provide an indication, without quantification, that the appeal site falls within the area of search (however broad) identified in the overwhelming majority of enquiries. This suggests that the site might thus be worthy of further consideration, and a more detailed comparative assessment by potential end-users, having regard to a range of factors, including the market in general, timing, cost, accessibility and labour supply.
102. It is also relevant to note that, prior to the Inquiry, several called-in applications for logistics operations on sites in Bolton, Wigan and St Helens were approved by the Secretary of State. These amounted to approximately 530,000 sqm, of which 234,000 sqm is within the sub-region. Whilst the Appellants' assessment does not take account of these approvals, the recently consented floorspace does little to undermine the evidence relating to continuing demand for high quality new space.
103. Further, although the Council points to the reduction in the amount of land required in the sub-region for industrial/warehousing development, as set out in Places for Everyone, the Updated Note on Employment Land Needs for Greater Manchester states: *'This assessment is based on using past completions, with some modest re-weighting, and extrapolating this annual figure forward over the 16 year Plan period (2021 to 2037). It shows the results for the GM-9 and the GM-10'<sup>43</sup>*. To my mind, it does not diminish the report's illustrative estimate for Stockport, as described above.
104. Moving on to employment land supply, current availability within Stockport can be characterised as having one or more traits of being small in scale, previously developed, or where alternative uses might be preferable.
105. The Appellants' alternative sites assessment identified four sites, including the appeal site, that might accommodate all or part of the appeal proposals. The Council does not challenge the conclusions about the constraints or unsuitability of the other sites, which in any event lie outside the Borough of Stockport (Ashton Moss 3000, Ashton Moss West and Mottram South). Although Ashton Moss 3000 is identified and marketed for employment use, and despite the announcement of a mayoral development zone around Ashton-under-Lyne<sup>44</sup>, the site's fundamental impediments would seriously delay its availability for development.
106. I therefore conclude that, at the present time, there is no available alternative site either within or outside the Green Belt where a comparable development might take place.
107. Finally, much has been made as to whether or not Stockport's needs might, in time, be met through co-operation with neighbouring authorities<sup>45</sup>. In short, even if that were to occur in the fullness of time, it does not change the considerations which are material to the determination of this appeal.

---

<sup>42</sup> QEL/2/3 Appendix 4

<sup>43</sup> CD6.7 paragraph 1.11

<sup>44</sup> ID-018

<sup>45</sup> ID-022 – ID-024



**Need for industrial and warehousing space: conclusion**

108. Overall, on the material before me, I find the Appellants' evidence compelling. However, that is not to say that it represents a definitive assessment which binds the Council in the preparation of its local plan and any relevant assessments it might undertake. Moreover, having identified need for the purposes of this appeal, the local plan process will have to balance employment needs with all other material considerations.
109. In existing policy terms, CS Core Policy CS7, in seeking to accommodate economic development, refers to opportunities that were, at the time, available on the (existing/identified) Bredbury Industrial Area. Whilst the policy refers to the locational advantages of proximity to the motorway, and the benefit that clustering of employment uses can bring, the policy does not expressly support the appeal proposal.
110. Nonetheless, the Framework is clear: *'Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development ..... Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for ..... storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations'*<sup>46</sup>.
111. Against this background, I attach substantial weight to the meeting of industrial and warehousing needs as identified by the Appellants.

**Socio-economic benefits**

112. The make-up of the socio-economic benefits is not in dispute. It is the weight that is contested.
113. During the construction of the development, the proposal would support an estimated 184 gross direct Full Time Equivalent<sup>47</sup> jobs annually, and an additional 204 FTE indirect jobs. Employment on completion, depending on the relative proportion of industrial and warehousing uses, could be in the order of 1,213 net additional local jobs (1,132 FTEs), based on a combination of uses, and 853 jobs (779 FTEs) with warehousing use only.
114. Population projections (2021 – 2043) indicate that the working age population is set to grow by 4.5% and 4.7% in the Boroughs of Stockport and Tameside respectively. Comparable activity rates for the two Boroughs are 78.9% and 77.6%. However, in Haughton Green rates fall to 72.7% and are markedly lower in Brinnington (61.9%). Unemployment in Stockport Borough has also been increasing.
115. It is evident that Brinnington has an extremely high (12.8%) claimant count<sup>48</sup>; and that the type of jobs that the development would provide would reflect the needs of those looking for employment in the four areas<sup>49</sup> immediately surrounding the appeal site.

---

<sup>46</sup> Framework paragraphs 81 and 83

<sup>47</sup> Hereafter FTE

<sup>48</sup> Jobseekers' allowance and Universal credit

<sup>49</sup> Bredbury, Brinnington, Haughton Green and Woodley

116. Moreover, the appeal site is surrounded by areas of high deprivation. By way of example, the four defined areas of Brinnington are amongst the 3% most deprived Lower Layer Super Output Areas nationally. Brinnington West and North feature as the second and third most deprived in the whole of Stockport. Two further areas, in each of Haughton Green and Bredbury, are within the 10% most deprived areas nationally. The jobs offered by the proposal would be readily accessible to residents in these areas.
117. Both Stockport and Tameside experience strong flows of out-commuters. Additional jobs, during construction and operation, would help to address this and, with good local links and accessibility by public transport, would contribute to more sustainable working. The development would also offer opportunities to raise skills through training and to boost household incomes. Employment also offers significant benefits to individual and family well-being; and increased disposable income would help support the wider local economy, reduce inequalities and contribute to the objectives of the Council's Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

**Socio-economic benefits: conclusion**

118. The scheme would create a range of employment opportunities, in significant numbers, in an area that exhibits severe economic deprivation. The benefit to the local community and to the local economy, as well as associated sustainability, equality and related and consequential regeneration considerations, is a matter to which I attach substantial weight. The proposal would also be in accordance with CS Core Policy CS1 which seeks to address inequalities and climate change.

**Highways and accessibility**

119. The starting point is to record the extent of common ground between the Appellants and the Council<sup>50</sup>, and to note that highway matters form part of the concerns expressed in the written representations from interested persons and reinforced orally by Andrew Gwynne MP during the Inquiry.
120. In short, the Appellants and the Council agree that the Transport Assessment and the Framework Travel Plan are robust, and the development would not give rise to unacceptable impact on highway safety as set out in paragraph 111 of the Framework.
121. Moreover, mitigation measures would create additional capacity and enhance accessibility by means other than the private car<sup>51</sup>; the improvements to Turner Lane to bridleway standard would be a significant benefit to accessibility<sup>52</sup>; and the proposed junction improvements and accessibility, and upgrades to public rights of way, should be afforded moderate weight. The proposed car park to serve Stockport Sports Village would be an added benefit by reducing on-street parking pressure.
122. The two parties also agree that the existing railway bridge over Ashton Road, between the site and the motorway junction (M60 J25) only restricts access to the site by high-sided vehicles over 4.4 m (comprising a very limited number of Heavy Goods Vehicles). Local concerns relate to the likelihood of increased numbers of high-sided vehicles avoiding the railway bridge, and seeking access to the motorway network (M67 J1A and J2) through Denton, with attendant congestion, noise, danger, vibration and air pollution.

---

<sup>50</sup> CD10.1 and CD10.2

<sup>51</sup> With particular reference to QEL/4/1 pages 7 - 12

<sup>52</sup> With particular reference to QEL/4/1 pages 6 - 7

123. From my own observations, and from the Appellants' surveys and evidence about overall fleet composition, it is clear that the railway bridge is capable of accommodating the vast majority of Heavy Goods Vehicles entering and leaving Bredbury Park Industrial Estate. Consequently, J25 of M60 is the nearest and most convenient link to and from the motorway network.
124. Although it is said, in correspondence submitted by Andrew Gwynne MP, that '..... 80%+ of high HGV's can still access Bredbury Industrial area from that end .....'<sup>53</sup>, implying that the balance take access through Denton, there is no quantifiable survey evidence, the terminology is not defined, and there is no indication whether the choice of route was for reasons other than the height restriction.
125. I acknowledge that the development is 'speculative' and without knowledge of end-users and their likely fleet composition. However, in my opinion, it would be a step too far to contemplate the development, as a whole, being served by a high proportion of vehicles incapable of negotiating the railway bridge or for the bridge to be an over-riding constraint to a variety of potential end-users. Moreover, there is nothing to show the inevitability of additional bridge strikes arising from the proposal.
126. It is also relevant to note the aspirations of the Bredbury Economic Corridor Improvement Package that forms part of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority's Five Year Transport Delivery Plan 2021 - 2026. The appeal scheme would deliver improvements to the M60 J25 roundabouts which are within the scope of the identified works.
127. It is inevitable that some Heavy Goods Vehicles arising from the development would route through Denton. However, the evidence firmly points to sufficient network capacity along A6017/A57 which are intended to provide inter-urban links and to be used by these types of vehicles. The technical evidence in the Environmental Statement<sup>54</sup> and the Response to Objector Comments<sup>55</sup> provide demonstrable evidence that in the scheme opening year, air pollution would meet air quality objectives. In total, air quality would not be materially affected in the wider locality.

**Highways and accessibility: conclusion**

128. Despite local concerns about highway issues, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have material adverse effects on network capacity, operation, safety or air quality.
129. Moreover, the Planning Obligation and planning conditions would secure a number of measures to mitigate the impacts of the development. At the same time, they would deliver wider benefits of highway capacity improvements, and contribute to the objectives of the Bredbury Economic Corridor Improvements. There would also be enhancements to sustainable transport infrastructure; and upgrading and extension of the existing public rights of way network, including new routes, surfacing and lighting.
130. Overall, the proposal, along with the mitigation measures referred to above, would be consistent with CS Core Policies CS9 and CS10 and Development Management Policies T-1, T-2 and T-3.

---

<sup>53</sup> CD8.26 i.e. from the direction of Stockport rather than through Denton – see also CD8.27 and CD3.2

<sup>54</sup> CD2.7

<sup>55</sup> QEL/5/3 Appendix 2

131. Given the combination of mitigation and benefits, I agree with the Appellants that the package of improvements should be given moderate weight in the planning balance.

#### **Biodiversity**

132. The principal Statement of Common Ground, and the topic specific agreement on biodiversity, identify a package of measures to be secured through the Planning Obligation. These include a financial contribution towards off-site enhancements to compensate for habitats lost from the site. The habitat offsetting scheme would deliver a 10.32% biodiversity net gain overall.
133. Nonetheless, CS Core Policy CS8 indicates that '*development will be expected to make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of the borough's natural environment, biodiversity .....<sup>56</sup>*'. CS Development Management Policy SIE-3 contains a similar commitment.
134. For its part, the Framework sets out that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, '*minimising impacts and providing net gains for biodiversity .....<sup>1</sup>*'.
135. The Appellants' closing submissions suggest that the biodiversity net gain should be given moderate weight as it would be a sizeable amount in real terms, and it would go beyond any policy or legal requirement. Although neither the development plan nor the Framework quantify a specific percentage of net gain that should be achieved, I consider, with the policy imperative in mind, that the net gain here should not attract anything more than limited weight.

#### **Other representations**

136. The application for planning permission, and the subsequent appeal, generated a considerable number of representations from, or on behalf of, the local community. I have not addressed all of the objections raised as many of the points do not reflect the main issue that I have identified and considered in some detail. In addition, some were of a generalised nature which provided no real basis to undermine the technical evidence in the Environmental Statement and other documents before the Inquiry.
137. As to the letters of support for the scheme, the principal matters, including the prime location and accessibility of the site; the need for, and lack of availability of, such premises; and the wider socio-economic benefits and infrastructure improvements have been considered as part of the main issue.
138. Overall, there are no other matters that would weigh positively or negatively in the overall balance to which I turn in the following section.

---

<sup>56</sup> CD 4.3 paragraph 3.296

**The planning balance: would the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the development**

139. In accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this appeal is to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations, indicate otherwise.
140. The appeal site is within the Greater Manchester Green Belt as defined by saved Policy GBA1.1 of the UDP. A related policy, GBA1.2, controls development in the Green Belt. Its wording is inconsistent with the Framework in that it does not make provision for development to be permitted where very special circumstances are shown to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm arising from the proposal.
141. National policy makes it clear that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
142. The proposal is agreed to be inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
143. In addition, I have concluded earlier that the scheme would conflict with three of the five purposes that Green Belts serve. First, the project would conflict with the purpose of checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, in that it would break the bounds of the existing well-defined industrial area and spread across open fields as far as topography would reasonably permit.
144. Second, the proposal would bring Bredbury and Haughton Green significantly closer together. Although the two areas would not merge in physical terms, there would, nonetheless, be a significant reduction in their separation. More particularly, there would be a very strong perception of merging, especially when experienced from the Haughton Green side of the intervening valley.
145. Third, although I have acknowledged that the significance of the site as countryside is influenced by its surroundings, the development would undisputedly run counter to the third Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
146. The inevitable conclusion is that the proposal, even with extensive mitigation, would fundamentally undermine the essential characteristic of openness, and that the Appellants' endeavours to justify the redefinition of the Green Belt boundary lack firm foundation.
147. Taken together with the definitional harm by reason of inappropriateness, I consider that, with the cumulation of harm outlined above, very substantial weight should be attached to the harm that would arise.
148. In terms of other harm, the proposal would result in no material effect on the inherent characteristics of the river valley itself. However, there would be significant localised landscape and visual effects that even a well-conceived landscaping scheme could not adequately offset. To my mind, the bulk and spread of the development, relative to its surroundings, would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area to which I afford very substantial weight.

149. Set against these harms, the demonstrable need for land to accommodate industry and warehousing, the absence of supply, the policy lacuna, and the lack of realistic deliverable alternatives, in combination, attract substantial weight.
150. It is also right that the socio-economic benefits of investment and employment, in an area which shows demonstrable facets of considerable deprivation, should also draw substantial weight.
151. The proffered highway and transportation improvements in the locality, although principally by way of mitigation to accommodate the development, would also realise a range of important wider benefits. I agree that these improvements should merit moderate weight.
152. Finally, the matters relating to biodiversity are primarily called for by mitigation, and an overall policy imperative to secure net gain. Although of importance, the outcome attracts limited weight.
153. Reverting to the Framework, my overall conclusion is that the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm as identified, would not be clearly outweighed by other considerations and that very special circumstances do not exist.
154. Accordingly, the proposal would be at odds with the Framework which sits alongside UDP saved Policy GBA1.2 in controlling development in the Green Belt defined by saved Policy GBA1.1. There would also be conflict with saved Policy LCR.1.1(a) and the related aims in CS Development Management Policy SIE-3.
155. Although the proposal would be consistent with a number of other policies, or parts thereof, it is the Green Belt policies, read with the Framework, that provide the starting point for the determination of the appeal<sup>57</sup>. In the absence of very special circumstances, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan when read as a whole.
156. I shall, therefore, dismiss the appeal.

*David MH Rose*

Inspector

---

<sup>57</sup> CD10.1 paragraph 6.44 – ‘It is agreed that the test relating to VSC set out within the Framework [§144] is the primary determining factor for determining the application and appeal. It is agreed that the proposals compliance with the Development Plan as a whole is centred around whether or not VSC exist in the context of the Framework’

## **ANNEX A: APPEARANCES**

### **For Quorum Estates Limited and Edmund Hargreaves Ogden, Joanne Louise Ogden, Carolyn Patricia Ogden and Kristine Michelle Ogden (the Appellants)**

Rupert Warren QC

Instructed by Lichfields

#### **He called**

Colin Robinson  
BA(Hons) MTP(Dist) MRTPI MIED

Planning Director  
Lichfields

Andrew Pexton  
BSc(Hons) MRICS

Lead Director  
North West Industrial and Logistics Team  
Jones Lang LaSalle

Gary Holliday  
BA(Hons) MPhil CMLI

Director  
FPCR Environment and Design Ltd

Christopher Hargreaves  
BEng(Hons) MSc DIC

Director  
Vectos (North) Limited

Simon Pemberton  
MA(Hons) MRTPI PIEMA

Senior Director  
Lichfields

### **For Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (the Council)**

John Barrett of Counsel

Instructed by the Council

#### **He called**

Simon Wood  
BA(Hons) BTP

Capita: Director (Planning and Building  
Control Breckland Council)

### **For Andrew Gwynne MP (Rule 6 Party)**

Andrew Gwynne MP  
(acting as advocate and witness)

Member of Parliament for Denton and  
Reddish

#### **He called**

Nick Fenwick  
MBA DipTP MRTPI

Interim Senior Manager (Planning Matters)  
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

**INTERESTED PERSONS**

Councillor Jack Naylor	Denton South Ward, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Dr Diane Coffey	Local Resident
Councillor George Newton	Denton South Ward, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Councillor Claire Reid	Denton South Ward, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Steve Marsland	Headteacher & National Leader of Education, Russell Scott Primary School, Denton
Jackie Copley MA, BA(Hons), PgCert, MRTPI	Planning Manager CPRE The Countryside Charity



**ANNEX B: LIST OF CORE DOCUMENTS<sup>58</sup>**

Ref	Title	Comments
<b>SECTION ONE - Submission Documents Upon which the Decision was Made (excluding the ES)</b>		
CD1.1	Application Form 44176	
CD1.2	Covering Letter 44176	
CD1.3	Location Plan ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0029_P3	
CD1.4	Existing Site Plan ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0505_P4	
CD1.5	Existing Constraints Plan ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0021_P7	
CD1.6	Scope of Hybrid Areas Plan ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0510_P2	
CD1.7	Parameters Plan ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0501_P17	
CD1.8	Proposed Unit 1 and 2 Site Plan ref. 11747-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0526_P9	
CD1.9	Illustrative Masterplan ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0513_P7	
CD1.10	Illustrative Masterplan (Colour) ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0504_P11	
CD1.11	Illustrative Masterplan (PRoW Strategy) ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0519_P2	
CD1.12	Proposed PRoW Strategy ref. B9269-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0030_P3	
CD1.13	Proposed Phase 1 PRoW Strategy ref. 11747-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0527_P4	
CD1.14	Landscape Masterplan ref. 8383-L-01_H	
CD1.15	Detailed Planting Plan ref. 8383-L-02-08_G	
CD1.16	Unit 1 Ground Floor Plan ref. 11747-AEW-01-XX-DR-A-0511_P2	
CD1.17	Unit 1 First Floor Plan ref. 11747-AEW-01-XX-DR-A-0512_P2	
CD1.18	Unit 1 Second Floor Plan ref. 11747-AEW-01-XX-DR-A-0513_P2	
CD1.19	Unit 1 Roof Plan ref. 11747-AEW-01-XX-DR-A-0514_P2	
CD1.20	Unit 1 Elevations ref. 11747-AEW-01-XX-DR-A-0515_P2	
CD1.21	Unit 1 GA Sections ref. 11747-AEW-01-XX-DR-A-0516_P2	
CD1.22	Unit 2 Ground Floor Plan ref. 11747-AEW-02-XX-DR-A-0519_P1	
CD1.23	Unit 2 First Floor Plan ref. 11747-AEW-02-XX-DR-A-0520_P1	
CD1.24	Unit 2 Roof Plan ref. 11747-AEW-02-XX-DR-A-0521_P1	
CD1.25	Unit 2 Elevations ref. 11747-AEW-02-XX-DR-A-0522_P1	
CD1.26	Unit 2 GA Sections ref. 11747-AEW-02-XX-DR-A-0523_P1	

<sup>58</sup> With grateful thanks to Yvonne Parker – Programme Officer

Ref	Title	Comments
CD1.27	Gatehouse Ground Floor Plan and Section ref. 11747-AEW-03-XX-DR-A-0524_P1	
CD1.28	Gatehouse Elevations ref. 11747-AEW-03-XX-DR-A-0525_P1	
CD1.29	External Lighting Plan ref. 2556-E101_C	
CD1.30	External Lighting Details ref. P183-500-C	
CD1.31	Topographical Survey ref. SSL_17990B_250 (Sheets 44501 Combined)	
CD1.32	Planning Statement 44166	
CD1.33	Design and Access Statement 44166	
CD1.34	Draft Heads of Terms 44166	
CD1.35	Statement of Community Involvement 44136	
CD1.36	Archaeological Desk Based Assessment 43678	
CD1.37	Mineral Resource Assessment 43191	
CD1.38	Energy Statement 44161	
CD1.39	Utilities Statement 44161	
CD1.40	The Planet Mark New Development Certification	
CD1.41	Agricultural Land Classification Report 43466	
CD1.42	Crime Impact Statement 44166	
CD1.43	Employment and Skills Note 44197	
CD1.44	Response Letter 44214	
CD1.45	DEFRA 2 Biodiversity Net Gain Metric	
<b>SECTION TWO - Environmental Statement (Final Update Upon Which the Decision was Made)</b>		
CD2.1	ES Vol 1 - Non-Technical Summary	
CD2.2	ES Vol 2 - Chapter A (Introduction)	
CD2.3	ES Vol 2 - Chapter B (Scope & Methodology)	
CD2.4	ES Vol 2 - Chapter C (Site & Scheme Description)	
CD2.5	ES Vol 2 - Chapter D (Highways)	
CD2.6	ES Vol 2 - Chapter E (Noise & Vibration)	
CD2.7	ES Vol 2 - Chapter F (Air Quality)	
CD2.8	ES Vol 2 - Chapter G (Flood Risk & Drainage)	
CD2.9	ES Vol 2 - Chapter H (Biodiversity)	
CD2.10	ES Vol 2 - Chapter I (Ground Conditions)	
CD2.11	ES Vol 2 - Chapter J - Landscape	
CD2.12	ES Vol 2 - Chapter K (Arboriculture)	
CD2.13	ES Vol 2 - Chapter L (Socio-Economics)	
CD2.14	ES Vol 2 - Chapter M (Mitigation and Monitoring)	
CD2.15	ES Vol 3 - Appendix C1	
CD2.16	ES Vol 3 - Appendix C2	

Ref	Title	Comments
CD2.17	ES Vol 3 - Appendix C3	
CD2.18	ES Vol 3 - Appendix D1	
CD2.19	ES Vol 3 - Appendix D2	
CD2.20	ES Vol 3 - Appendix E1	
CD2.21	ES Vol 3 - Appendix E2	
CD2.22	ES Vol 3 - Appendix E3	
CD2.23	ES Vol 3 - Appendix F1	
CD2.24	ES Vol 3 - Appendix F2	
CD2.25	ES Vol 3 - Appendix F3	
CD2.26	ES Vol 3 - Appendix F4	
CD2.27	ES Vol 3 - Appendix F5	
CD2.28	ES Vol 3 - Appendix G1	
CD2.29	ES Vol 3 - Appendix G2a	
CD2.30	ES Vol 3 - Appendix G2b	
CD2.31	ES Vol 3 - Appendix H1	
CD2.32	ES Vol 3 - Appendix HX	
CD2.33	ES Vol 3 - Appendix I1	
CD2.34	ES Vol 3 - Appendix I2	
CD2.35	ES Vol 3 - Appendix I3	
CD2.36	ES Vol 3 - Appendix I4	
CD2.37	ES Vol 3 - Appendix I5	
CD2.38	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J1	
CD2.39	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J2	
CD2.40	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J3	
CD2.41	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J4a	
CD2.42	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J4b	
CD2.43	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J5a	
CD2.44	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J5b	
CD2.45	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J5c	
CD2.46	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J6	
CD2.47	ES Vol 3 - Appendix J7	
CD2.48	ES Vol 3 - Appendix K1	
CD2.49	ES Vol 3 - Appendix K2	
CD2.50	ES Vol 3 - Appendix K3	
CD2.51	ES Vol 3 - Appendix L1	
CD2.52	ES Vol 3 - Appendix L2	
CD2.53	ES Vol 3 - Appendix L3	

Ref	Title	Comments
<b>SECTION THREE - Documents associated with the Decision</b>		
CD3.1	Decision Notice	
CD3.2	Committee Report	
CD3.3	Minutes From the Committee Meeting	
<b>SECTION FOUR - Relevant Policy Documents</b>		
CD4.1	National Planning Policy Framework	
CD4.2	Planning Practice Guidance	
CD4.3	Stockport Core Strategy DPD March 2011	
CD4.4	Saved Policies from the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review May 2006	
<b>SECTION FIVE - Relevant Consultation Responses</b>		
CD5.1	Planning Policy Consultation Response received on 19th November 2021	
CD5.2	SMBC Highways Engineer Comments dated 16th February 2021	
CD5.3	Highways England Comments dated 19th January 2021	
CD5.4	EHO Comments dated 14th January 2021	
CD5.5	GMEU Comments 11th February 2021	
CD5.6	Economy, Work & Skills Manager Comments 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2020	
CD5.7	Flood Risk & Drainage Agreed Condition 25 <sup>th</sup> February 2021	
<b>SECTION SIX - Evidence Based Documents</b>		
CD6.1	Stockport Employment Land Review [ELR] (April 2018)	
CD6.2	Greater Manchester Green Belt Assessment (July 2016)	
CD6.3	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister [ODPM] Employment Land Reviews: Guidance Note -2004	
CD6.4	GMSF Publication Plan 2020 (October 2020)	
CD6.5	Places for Everyone Publication Draft Plan (August 2021)	
CD6.6	Stockport Employment Land Review -2015	
CD6.7	Nicol Economics (March 2021) Updated Note on Employment Land Needs for Greater Manchester	
CD6.8	Nicol Economics (March 2021) Covid-19 and the Greater Manchester Economy - Implications for the GMSF	
CD6.9	SMBC's Planning Officer's Committee Report (March 2021)	
CD6.10	GMCA (August 2021) Places for Everyone Statement of Common Ground	
CD6.11	Nicol Economics (February 2020) Note on Employment Land Needs in Greater Manchester	
CD6.12	BPF -2015 'What Warehousing Where'	

Ref	Title	Comments
CD6.13	BPF (2020): Delivering the Goods in 2020	
CD6.14	SMBC -2020 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	
CD6.15	Tameside Borough Council (March 2020) Industrial and Commercial Land Supply Study for 2019/20	
CD6.16	HCA -2015 Employment Density Guide 3rd Edition	
CD6.17	HCA -2014 Additionality Guide, 4th Edition	
CD6.18	Greater Manchester Green Belt Topic Paper (2019)	
CD6.19	Greater Manchester Green Belt Study Stage 2 Addendum: Assessment of Proposed 2020 GMSF Allocations (2020)	
CD6.19.1	Appendix B Detailed Allocation Stage 2 Harms Assessment	1 February 22
CD6.20	BPF Delivering the Goods (December 2015)	5 January 22
<b>SECTION SEVEN - Relevant Appeal Decisions</b>		
CD7.1	Appeal by Liberty Properties Developments & Eddie Stobart Ltd on Land north of Barleycastle Lane, Appleton Thorn, Warrington (Council Ref: 2016/31656; Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/19/3222603), Decision Dated 11th December 2019	
CD7.2	Land West of Wingates Industrial Estate, Wimberry Hill Road, Westhoughton, Bolton (Council Ref: 04666/18; Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/V/20/3253244), Decision Dated 21st June 2021	
CD7.3	Application by Tritax Symmetry Ltd on Land at Junction 25 of the M6 Motorway, Wigan (Council Ref: A/18/85946/MAJES; Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/V/20/3253242), Decision Dated 21st June 2021	
CD7.4	Land at Omega Zone 8, West of Omega South and South of the M62, St Helens (Council Ref: P/2020/0061/HYBR; Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/V/20/3265899), Decision Dated 11th November 2021	
CD7.5	Former Parkside Colliery East of A49, Winwick Road, Newton le Willows, St Helens (Council Ref: P/2018/0048/OUP; Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/V/20/3253194), Decision Dated 11th November 2021	
CD7.6	Haydock Point – Land at A580 East Lancashire Road / A49 Lodge Lane, Haydock, St Helens (Council Ref: P/2016/0254/OUP; Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/W/20/3256861), Decision Dated 11th November 2021	

Ref	Title	Comments
CD7.7	Appeal Sites Map (Inspector requested it to be added)	31 January 22
<b>SECTION EIGHT – Documents submitted by Mr Gwynne MP</b>		
CD8.1	Extracts from Tame Valley Local Plan: A plan to develop recreation & improve the environment (Published in 1988).	
CD8.2	Extracts from The Tame Valley Joint Committee ‘Tame Valley Report of Survey’ (1981)	
CD8.3	Tameside Council ‘Motion B in the name of Cllr Newton’ – November 25, 2020	
CD8.4	Cheshire Wildlife Trust ‘Letter to Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council’ - 27th March 2020.	
CD8.5	Jackie Copley, CPRE – The Countryside Charity ‘Letter 28 February 2020 to Stockport MBC’.	
CD8.6	Rachel Hacking Ecology ‘Amendments to Bredbury Gateway January 2021’.	
CD8.7	Save Woodley’s Greenbelt ‘Wildlife Impact: not “neutral” but devastating: A response by Save Woodley’s Greenbelt to the “Ecological Impacts and Mitigation” section of SMBC’s report on Planning Application DC/074399.	
CD8.8	SMBC ‘Stockport Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Study of 2018	
CD8.9	Greater Manchester Combined Authority ‘Greater Manchester Air Quality Action Plan 2016-2021	
CD8.10	Manchester Evening News ‘Manchester has the worst traffic congestion of anywhere in England outside of London’ (published 8 September 2018).	
CD8.11	Greater Manchester Combined Authority ‘Economic Forecasts for Greater Manchester’ February 2020.	
CD8.12	DC/074399, 21 October 2019 Letter from Director of Growth on behalf of TMBC	
CD8.13	DC/074399, 11 March 2020 Letter from Director of Growth on behalf of TMBC	
CD8.14	DC/074399, 13 January 2021 Letter from Director of Growth on behalf of TMBC	
CD8.15	DC/074399, 1 June 2020 Letter from Director of Growth on behalf of TMBC	
CD8.16	North West Place – ‘Blow for GMSF as Stockport Quits’	
CD8.17	Andrew Gwynne Letter ‘Objection: Planning Application DC/074399’ - 21st October 2019	
CD8.18	Andrew Gwynne ‘Letter: Bredbury Gateway’ - February 2020.	

Ref	Title	Comments
CD8.19	National Rail 'New Campaign to target bridge bashes in Greater Manchester'	
CD8.20	Greater Manchester Combined Authority 'Our Five Year Transport Delivery Plan 2021-2026'	
CD8.21	Greater Manchester Combined Authority 'Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Revised Draft' - January 2019	
CD8.22	Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy – June 2019	
CD8.23	Copy of email from Ben Blackburn at Transport for Greater Manchester 'Railway bridge across the A6017 at Bredbury.	
CD8.23	Copy of email from Ben Blackburn at Transport for Greater Manchester 'Railway bridge across the A6017 at Bredbury.	
CD8.24	Boot V Elmbridge DC Judgement	6 January 22
CD8.25	Smith V York CC Judgement	6 January 22
CD8.26	'Bredbury Bridge: Emails between Council Officers, Constituents, and Andrew Gwynne MP'	31 January 22
CD8.27	'Bredbury Bridge: Private note between Tameside Council, Viridor Waste, Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority and Andrew Gwynne MP'.	1 February 22
<b>SECTION NINE – Documents submitted by Stockport Council</b>		
CD9.1	Stockport Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Study	
CD9.2	Greater Manchester Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Report	
<b>SECTION TEN – Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)</b>		
CD10.1	The Main SoCG	17 January 22
CD10.2	Transport SoCG	17 January 22
CD10.3	Biodiversity SoCG	17 January 22
CD10.3	Landscape SoCG	21 January 22
<b>SECTION ELEVEN – Miscellaneous</b>		
CD11.1	Notices for the Inquiry	19/1/22
CD11.1.1	Copy of Letters with Notice for the Inquiry	19/1/22
CD11.2	Site visit route	19/1/22

**ANNEX C: LIST OF INQUIRY DOCUMENTS<sup>59</sup>**

<b>REF</b>	<b>Name of Document</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Date submitted to Inquiry</b>
ID-001	Opening Submissions from the Appellant	QEL	1/2/22
ID-002	Opening Submissions from Stockport Council	STC	1/2/22
ID-003	Opening Submissions from Andrew Gwynne MP	GWY	1/2/22
ID-004	Statement by Diane Coffey	Dr Diane Coffey (IP)	1/2/22
ID-005	Existing and Proposed (Detail/Outline) Site Sections	QEL	2/2/22
ID-006	Statement from Claire Reid including decisions (ID6.1 & 6.2)	Cllr Claire Reid (IP)	2/2/21
ID-006.1	Appeal Decision - Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/W/18/3216380 Clearance site west of Derby Street, Denton, Manchester, M34 3SD	Cllr Claire Reid (IP)	2/2/22
ID-006.2	Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/W/19/3226399 Land Adjacent 30 Ivy Cottages, Denton, Tameside, M34 7PZ	Cllr Claire Reid (IP)	2/2/22
ID-007	Statement from Steve Marsland Headteacher Russell Street Primary School	Steve Marsland (IP)	3/2/22
ID-008	Transcript of excerpt from Planning & Highways Regulation Committee – Thursday 25th March, 2021	GWY	3/2/22
ID-009	Greater Manchester City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement 24A Prospectus 9 – final 003 p7-10	QEL	4/2/22
ID-010	Illustrative Master Plan – Separation distances	QEL	4/2/22
ID-011	Site Visit route – final version	QEL	9/2/22
ID-012	Illustrative Master Plan (Site aerial Plan)	QEL	9/2/22
ID-013	Tame Valley Boundary: Additional Evidence	GWY	9/2/22
ID-014	Monitoring Fee Statement	STC	10/2/22
ID-015	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010	STC	8/2/22

<sup>59</sup> With grateful thanks to Yvonne Parker – Programme Officer



ID-016	Draft S106 with Appendices	QEL & STC	11/2/22
ID-016.1	Updated Draft S106 with Appendices	QEL & STC	18/2/22
ID-016.2	Updated Draft S106 with Appendices	QEL & STC	21/2/22
ID-016.3	Certified copy of S106	QEL & STC	10/3/22
ID-017	Conditions and explanatory email (extract)	QEL & STC	11/2/22
ID-017.1	Final list of agreed Conditions including C93	QEL	1/3/22
ID-018	'Ashton Moss Mayoral Development Zone Announcement'.	GWY	14/2/22
ID-019	Closing submissions by Andrew Gwynne MP	GWY	15/2/22
ID-020	Closings submissions by Stockport Council	STC	15/2/22
ID-021	Closing Submissions from the Appellant	QEL	15/2/22
ID-022	Places for Everyone – covering email	QEL	25/2/22
ID-022.1	PfE – Duty to co-operate statement (Feb 2022)	QEL	25/2/22
ID-022.2	PfE – Statement of Common Ground (Feb 2022)	QEL	25/2/22
ID-023	Response to QEL from Stockport Council	STC	9/3/22
ID-024	Final response from the Appellant regarding PfE	QEL	11/3/22