

PLANNING APPLICATION ----- ANALYSIS CHECK LIST
(REQUIRES COMPLETION FOR ALL DELEGATED APPLICATIONS UNLESS
SUPPLEMENTED BY A WRITTEN REPORT IN ACOLAID

Application DC/047839	Case Officer Mark Jordan	Date 07/09/2011
-----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

UDP POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Site location zoning on Proposals Map [ie, Residential, Green Belt etc]	Green Belt & Landscape Character Area
Other Special Controls [Conservation Area, Listed Building etc,]	Adjacent to Grade II Listed Building & Conservation Area
Relevant UDP Review/SPG Policies [ie, CDH1.8 and CDH1.1, + Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings SPG]	Adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD:- SIE-1 "Quality Places" CS9 'Transport and Development' T-3 'Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network'

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY/APPEAL DECISIONS

Application Number(s)	Issues Raised
N/A	

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

Neighbour Consultation	Issues Raised
Letter of objection = N/A (including a petition).	
Letter of support = N/A	
Other Observations = N/A	
Statutory/Internal Consultation Response [ie, Highway Engineer, NRA etc.]	<p>Highway Engineer: No objection.</p> <p>Conservation Officer: (verbal response) Any assessment should look at the significance of the bridge to be removed (date, numbers remaining elsewhere) and mitigation (proposed reuse elsewhere) and also looking at the impact of the new bridge on views of and from the listed buildings/conservation areas (these appear quite limited as the line forms a gap between the two CAs).</p> <p>The design of the new bridge the span itself is very stark and the material will be important and should probably be natural. An improvement would be to consider making the top of the parapet more visually permeable (e.g. railing).</p> <p>Arboricultural Officer: (verbal response) No objection.</p>

ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT

Compliance with UDP Review/SPG Policies	N/A
Impact on adjoining properties and character of area	Acceptable

Any other comments to note	This is a prior notification with only siting and external appearance for consideration, as to whether it could be better sited on land elsewhere or whether its appearance could be reasonable amended to avoid harming the amenity of the surrounding area.
-----------------------------------	---

DELEGATION PROCEDURE CHECKLIST

(REQUIRES COMPLETION FOR ALL DELEGATED APPLICATIONS)

Application No. DC/044981	Case Officer: Mark Jordan	Date: 07/09/2011
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------

DEADLINE EXPIRY DATES - the following answers must be YES or Not Applicable

Has the Committee Call Up Period lapsed?	N/A	
Has the Consultation Period lapsed?	N/A	
Where applicable has the Site Notice Period lapsed?	N/A	
Where applicable has the Press Notice Period lapsed?	N/A	

For applications recommended for APPROVAL following answers must be NO

Has the application been 'called up' by a Committee Member?	N/A	
Are there 4 or more letters, or a petition objecting to the application?	N/A	
Does the Decision-maker have a management interest in the application/site?	N/A	
Has the application been submitted by a Councillor or Officer employed by the Council?	N/A	

• following answers must be YES or N/A

Where relevant, has a Commuted Sum or Section 106 been paid/signed under <u>UL1.3</u>	N/A
---	-----

and NO to (1) below or YES to (1) and (2) below

1. Is the proposed development contrary to UDP Review/SPG Policy ?	N/A
2. If the proposal is contrary to UDP/SPG policy, are there any special circumstances to be taken into account? <i>Details of any special circumstances to be taken into account should be clearly outlined on the Application Analysis Check List or in the Supplementary Report</i>	N/A

For applications recommended for REFUSAL - following answers must be NO

Has the application been 'called up' by a Committee Member?	No	
Are there 4 or more letters, or a petition, supporting the application?	No	
Does the Decision-maker have a management interest in the application/site?	No	
Has the application been made by a Councillor or Officer employed by the Council?	No	

ANALYSIS :-

Application for prior approval under Part 11 of the GPDO for a replacement footbridge and small, single storey extension to provide improved wc/ticket office facilities on Network Rail land off Brabyns Brow at Marple railway station. In assessing the application under the above legislation issues of siting and external appearance are for consideration only. This prior approval requirement is subject to a caveat that development is not to be refused by the appropriate authority or conditions applied unless-

(a) the development (other than the provision of or works carried out to a dam) ought to be and could reasonably be carried out elsewhere on the land; or

(b) the design or external appearance of any building, bridge, aqueduct, pier or dam would injure the amenity of the neighbourhood and is reasonably capable of modification to avoid such injury

The proposed footbridge is designed to provide step free access for the public and would be set out in a U shaped layout. The footbridge comprises two 9.7m high lift towers with a 2m wide span crossing the railway line, in addition to step access. The pedestrian span is enclosed by 1.7m high parapets and sits 4m above platform level.

External materials are indicated as including gritstone cladding and blue painted steel.

Although modern in design in comparison to the existing footbridge, the proposed replacement structure indicates the use of appropriate materials to reflect the setting of the wider Conservation Area proposed footbridge would be re-positioned approximately. The design and proportions are also limited by the physical constraints in providing step free access to the platforms. The small single storey extension reflects the existing flat roof design of the adjacent ticket office.

The siting of the footbridge is such that it would have a similar impact on its wider surroundings, including nearby residential properties and the listed building and Marple Bridge Conservation Area beyond the tree line to the east, as the existing footbridge which is to be replaced and is currently positioned approximately 9m to the south. Similarly the proposed wc extension would be seen against the backdrop of the existing, larger ticket office.

Although the proposed works would appear to result in the potential loss of 3 trees, these can already be removed without any consent. Notwithstanding the above the Council's Arboricultural Officer has raised no objection to their removal.

Further works are indicated to the existing parking areas which serve the station, however these are capable of being carried out without the need for further approval under Part 17 rights. Notwithstanding the above no objections have been raised by the Council's Highway Engineer.

In light of the above and the absence of any objections from the Councils Conservation officers, the proposed works are considered to be acceptable in terms of their location and impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.

RECOMMENDATION

RELEVANT CONDITIONS/REASONS/INFORMATIVES

Grant	Materials
Reasons for Decision	See above
Human Rights Act Considerations.	Account has been taken of the Act's provisions - see report.

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY:-

DATE:-