

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2022

Late information

AGENDA PAGES	DETAILS
Pages 5-30	<p>AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 6</p> <p>SITE ADDRESS:</p> <p>Springhead Quarry, Cooper Street, Springhead, Oldham</p> <p>Amendment to PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section of report:</p> <p>The following amendments should be made to the Planning Consideration section of the Committee Report:</p> <p>Under the 'Public Rights of Way' section the following sentence needs to be amended:</p> <p><i>As set out earlier in the report, two PRow routes run through the site, including PRow 203, which runs roughly central through the site, before linking into other PRow routes to the south end of the site. This PRow route is maintained as part of the development, and within the submitted Landscape and Open Strategy it states that this footpath will be upgraded, and at the steepest section of the path, both steps and a feature curved graded path will be introduced. However no specific specifications of the proposed improvement work have been submitted at this stage The PRow Officer does object to these upgrades in principle, subject to being able to review and agree the specification of any upgrades</i></p> <p><u>Amendment (in bold):</u></p> <p><i>As set out earlier in the report, two PRow routes run through the site, including PRow 203, which runs roughly central through the site, before linking into other PRow routes to the south end of the site. This PRow route is maintained as part of the development, and within the submitted Landscape and Open Strategy it states that this footpath will be upgraded, and at the steepest section of the path, both steps and a feature curved graded path will be introduced. However no specific specifications of the proposed improvement work have been submitted at this stage The PRow Officer does not object to these upgrades in principle, subject to being able to review and agree the specification of any upgrades</i></p>

Under the 'Green Corridor' section the following sentence needs to be omitted:

~~The application encroaches into the Green Corridor, and Spatial Planning have concluded that, by the very nature of the encroachment, it does not protect the Green Corridor. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit have also reviewed the potential impacts to the Green Corridor, and it is in their view that the proposed scale of development will compromise the functioning of the Green Corridor. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the development would enhance the green infrastructure network, and this does not weigh in favour of the development.~~

Additional Consultees

Since the publication of the Committee Report, the Trees and Woodlands Officer has commented on the application and states the following:

Raises an objection based on the following:

This application will require a huge amount of tree loss from an area that has coherent tree cover and is a green corridor. It is agreed that many of those trees if taken as individuals as classified by BS5837:2012 can be described as cat C or U and therefore as defined in BS5837, should not be a barrier to development, but taken as a whole they all have collective value as part of a site which contains a range of habitats. The majority of the trees are relatively young and, if left, are likely to grow and mature into a woodland situation which is relatively rare in the Oldham area and should be encouraged wherever possible.

This application will fragment that coherence and in a large part the green corridor, with no prospect of replacing it on site post development. A number of the trees required to be removed are located within an 'area' TPO/19/89 adjacent to Highfield House at the proposed Cooper Street entrance to the site and more are potentially to be impacted but this does not appear to have been addressed or accounted for within the application. The TPO's are mentioned but tree removal from them has not. It is understood that new tree planting is proposed onsite such as individual street and garden trees, but this will not and cannot replace the coherence of the tree cover that exists at present, it is also understood that new tree planting, woodland edge, woodland screen and hedgerow are proposed and are likely to be the best that could be achieved onsite but again, this will not replace that which will be lost.

In respect of the Arb Officers comments, these are noted. When assessing tree loss saved UDP Policy D1.5 is relevant, and states: *Where trees are to be lost to development, the Council will require, as a minimum, replacement at a ratio of three new native trees for each mature or semi-mature tree lost*

	<p>It is evident from the Tree Officers response that many of the trees that would be lost are not semi mature or mature. For those trees that may be lost if the development was acceptable could be replaced at a ratio of 3:1 off site at a cost of £300 per tree. With that considered, it would not be reasonable to add a reason for refusal on the basis of tree loss alone. The applicant has submitted a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment on the 7th November 2022, to consider TPM Landscapes comments, however, it is too late to consider the content of this document.</p> <p>Additional Representations</p> <p>Since the Committee Report was published three representations have been received which raise the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• One representation included images of deer in the area• A question was raised as to whether the fire service had commented on the application. <p>It can be confirmed that no comments were received from the fire service.</p> <p>The applicant has also submitted a late representation which is attached. In summary, the representation re-emphasises what, in the applicant's view, are the benefits of the scheme. However, there are no changes made to the recommendation following these additional representations.</p>