



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 3-6 and 10 February 2026

Site visit made on 9 February 2026

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/W/25/3373210

**Woodford Garden Village Extension, Former Woodford Aerodrome,
Woodford, Stockport, SK7 1NX**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to non-determination of a planning application.
 - The appeal is made by Redrow Homes Ltd (Harrow Estates Division) against Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference DC/094533 is dated 10 January 2025.
 - The proposal is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved for a new residential led development comprising of the demolition of the existing employment building and structures; the erection of residential dwellings, extra care accommodation, and a local community hub; the creation of new vehicle, cycle and pedestrian connections, open space, landscaping, and other associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission with all matters reserved is granted for a new residential led development comprising of the demolition of the existing employment building and structures; the erection of residential dwellings, extra care accommodation, and a local community hub; the creation of new vehicle, cycle and pedestrian connections, open space, landscaping and other associated works in accordance with the terms of planning application reference, DC/094533, dated 10 January 2025, subject to the 'Schedule of Conditions' set out at the end of this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. An updated Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) dated 12 January 2026, was received shortly before the opening of the Inquiry narrowing disputed issues. Based on that information, highway network operation, sustainable transport, and active travel impacts as potential putative reasons for Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) to oppose the appeal scheme were not pursued by them.
3. In the submitted SoCG, it is agreed that obligations would be required concerning: on-site affordable housing and mix; local employment and training; provision and maintenance of public open space on-site; off-site formal recreational open space provision; bus service delivery; Travel Plan monitoring; education contributions; off-site ecological mitigation; Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) provision and an overall obligation monitoring fee.

4. The residual matters in contention are linked to planning obligation consequences towards education and open space provision infrastructure only. SMBC concede that the appeal should be allowed, subject to specific covenants.
5. Without prejudice to the outcome of the appeal, it was agreed during proceedings that the main appeal parties would be given until 13 February 2026 to produce a completed legal agreement. A signed planning obligation was subsequently received within that period. It is legally binding and informs my decision. My reasoning reflects those circumstances.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the acceptability of education and sports infrastructure provision, in the context of paragraphs 155-159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) regarding the Green Belt and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 compliance.

Reasons

Education infrastructure provision

7. The Framework at paragraph 156(b) identifies that where sites in the Green Belt are subject to a planning application, the contributions (as part of the 'Golden Rules') expected include making necessary improvements to local and national infrastructure.
8. Bearing in mind all submissions, the central question arises as to whether the contributions linked to the development proposal make the necessary improvements as required by Framework paragraph 156(b) to local education and sports infrastructure.
9. To properly gauge that issue, a completed planning obligation has been produced by the appeal parties incorporating various competing commitments relative to their respective cases. Such consideration has due interface as to whether the appellant's proposed covenants in the submitted planning obligation meet the three legal tests in CIL Regulation 122 or not.
10. Given the technical disputes concern both 156(b) and CIL compliance, I agree the appellant's proposed set of covenants should firstly be gauged. As SMBC's covenant position would otherwise potentially apply if the appellant's provisions were to be deemed deficient, in accordance with the legal agreement wording.
11. At a national level, the Framework seeks to ensure that a sufficient choice of early years, school and post-16 places are available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. It invites planning authorities to take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.
12. Indeed, this has parallels to the approach within s14 of the Education Act 1996 referred to by SMBC, seeking to ensure the sufficiency of schools providing primary and secondary education. Schools available for an area are not regarded as sufficient for the purposes of the Act unless they are acceptable in number, character and equipment to provide for all pupils the opportunity of appropriate education. Appropriate education is taken by the Act to mean education which offers such variety of instruction and training as may be desirable in view of pupils' different ages, abilities and aptitudes, and the

- different periods for which they may be expected to remain at school, including practical instruction and training appropriate to their different needs.
13. At a local level, Stockport Core Strategy Development Plan Document (March 2011) (CS) Policy AS-2 seeks to improve indoor sports, community, education facilities and their accessibility using capital investment streams. Albeit it refers to now long time legacy national policy and Government review periods.
 14. Schedule 7, Part A of the planning obligation details education infrastructure provision towards primary, secondary, and special education needs and disability (SEND) schools in response to prevailing policy. The alternative pursued by SMBC is contained within Part B. Part's A and B being subject to blue pencil Clauses 4.4 and 4.5 which my findings have a direct bearing upon.
 15. The primary education contribution offered by the appellant is defined as £1,544,328.46, which would be paid prior to the commencement of any development. The money would be used to enable Woodford Primary School to expand from 1 Form Entry (FE) to 2FE. There is also a balancing payment clause tied to the Building Cost Information Index, should a further payment be due alongside a mechanism for its calculation.
 16. The fact that Woodford Primary School is already centrally embedded within the existing Garden Village, meeting due walking distance criteria is of high importance from an infrastructure planning perspective. Accepting Queensgate Primary is nearby but at the edge of reasonable walking distance criteria.
 17. A primary school education financial contribution would be required because of the increase in primary school aged pupils generated from the development needing a school place. Such necessity is uncontested. Connected to this issue, I note the near parity between the appellant's 121 primary school pupil yield figure, against the 122 figure calculated by SMBC.
 18. For aggregation purposes it is credible larger data set use is more reliable than a smaller set. This makes the appellant's calculations utilising the Department for Education (DfE) dashboard home sizing approach more plausible. In turn, accepting those points, it demonstrates the 121 pupil figure would be directly related to the development. Moreover, the review clause mechanism ensures the contribution is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development in the event of increased pupil numbers.
 19. Considering existing school oversubscription, I am not persuaded assertions Woodford Primary 2FE expansion would cannibalise demand for other school places is adequately evidenced. In any event, I give most weight to the locational advantages of shorter walking distances.
 20. Beyond SEND specific provision, I fully appreciate the broad point that SMBC want to retain greater flexibility in spending primary education provision contributions than is proposed by the appellant. This is linked to formulating future strategic decisions by them as the education authority. Even so, the appellant's arguments towards applying CIL Regulation tests are cogent reasons for assessing the matter rather than through the sole lens of education authority decision making interest convenience. Furthermore, focusing monies elsewhere could erode from the overall sustainability credentials of the scheme.

21. DfE guidance on securing developer contributions is also applicable. In the absence of a specific locally adopted methodology utilised by SMBC the appellant's covenant would be consistent with the DfE guidance.
22. I find that the appellant's approach of paying a contribution prior to the commencement of development and then to require the primary pupil yield to be reassessed at the stage of reserved matters approval, of the last phase of the development, would be appropriate. The review mechanism would correctly allow the primary contribution to be increased but not reduced with a balancing payment, if it were required.
23. Tellingly, at prior planning stages Woodford Primary School was deliberately oversized to ensure it would be suitable as a 2FE. This included: building additional specialist classrooms; additional studio space/toilets; a larger library, staffroom, kitchen, and administrative areas than would otherwise be needed. The fact that the appellant's contribution level is calibrated to reflect this situation is therefore justified. Otherwise, a greater amount may well lead to a double funding scenario in conflict with the relevant legal tests.
24. Additionally, the evidence available substantiates adequate secondary school places would be available if the development proceeded. Thus, unless an unexpected change of circumstance arises in future years, I am satisfied a commuted sum would be unnecessary for additional secondary school places.
25. Nonetheless, I cannot completely rule out any potential emerging circumstantial change. As a result, I agree the Secondary School review mechanism, allowing for fragmentation with a 20% discount, is a sensible and reasonable approach included in the s106 drafting to suitably derisk such conclusions should they be proved inaccurate in future years.
26. A secondary education payment would only be triggered if the Secondary Education Assessment undertaken prior to the completion of the 250th dwelling shows it is required. This would initiate the landowner to then pay any derived sum prior to the occupation of the 300th dwelling in the overall phasing.
27. With respect to the suggested discount level, I have no compelling reason to conclude pupil yield figures should not be adjusted downwards. This is because based on the existing 300 house sales at Garden Village 37% of households have moved to the site within a two mile distance, indicating that the appellant's approach is modest. Consequently, in all aspects towards secondary school provision, the necessity test detailed in Regulation 122 would be upheld.
28. SEND school provision is a further element of infrastructure offered to comply with Framework paragraph 156(b). The SEND contribution to be made, is defined as a sum up to £478,418.04 (index linked). This is proposed to be paid in stages prior to the occupation of the first dwelling in each respective phase of the development.
29. Unlike in the case of Woodford Primary expansion provision, funds would be able to be directed to within the whole of the conurbation at the discretion of SMBC. Given the uncertain needs of the residents of the appeal scheme itself coupled with recent Government reform announcement to the SEND system, I concur this would be a pragmatic step ensuring monies can deliver the best outcomes and life chances possible for children.

30. Thus, in this regard the appellant's proposal featuring a fixed sum also meets the three tests within CIL Regulation 122. The timing of the payment in line with SMBC's preference is justified compared to primary school funding given SEND payment would not be linked to a specific project and the flexibility warranted.
31. Overall, when applying the approach of Schedule 7 Part A of the obligation and having regard to Framework paragraph 156(b) the development would facilitate all necessary improvements to local education infrastructure. There would be sufficient choice of early years, school and post-16 places made available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. From other planning perspectives the contribution would also be necessary; directly related to the development; and fairly related in scale or kind having regard to CIL Regulation 122. I find that the terms are aligned to the advice of the Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) combined.

Sports infrastructure provision

32. Adopted CS Policy SIE-2 supported by the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD collectively seek to ensure the adequacy of recreation space provision. Including spaces used for formal sports recreation activity when considering the impacts of new development.
33. Accounting for local policy, there is no disagreement between the main appeal parties toward the principle of seeking an off-site commuted sum for sports infrastructure provision, as opposed to on-site.
34. Based on an indicative 1,876 population yield and using the formula set out in the SPD, SMBC's officers originally calculated the expected sum to total £1,690,276. Consisting of £1,052,436 for capital and £637,840 for 25 years maintenance to be used to improve existing formal open space or to deliver new sports spaces across the Borough. However, their favoured approach would entail a costs multiplier formula calculation linked to eventual approved bedroom numbers and population capacity per each phase.
35. Comparatively, Schedule 5, Part A, of the planning obligation covers the off-site sports infrastructure contributions offered by the appellant. It entails contributions of £940,895 directed solely toward Woodford Recreation Ground for enhancement and renewal of sports pitches and ancillary facilities (including design and supervision), identified as a priority improvement site in SMBC's Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) 2024. And a maintenance sum of £530,720.
36. I note that monies would be paid in full prior to the occupation of 150 dwellings.
37. By virtue of the combined information within the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator estimate (PPC) and PPS (extending to football, rugby, hockey and cricket), I am satisfied the appellant's contributions to defined improvements to local sports infrastructure would make the necessary provisions when applying the terms of Framework paragraph 156(b). The documents provide me clear links between need arising from the proposed development and defined project delivery close to Woodford Garden Village.
38. The information within the PPS indicates that football provision at the recreation ground is overplayed, in poor condition, and in need of upgrade. In fact, the PPS lists it as a priority improvement site considered as key to the

- development of football in the Borough. Plus, the PPS seeks to ensure a dedicated maintenance regime for cricket wicket quality. Importantly, the recreation ground also enjoys good accessibility levels for the local populus.
39. Whereas SMBC primarily relies on the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD to make calculations about financial contributions, which can then be spent more broadly on a Borough wide basis. Yet, that alternative approach offers me no strong basis for identifying or assessing a specific type of sports provision need necessity. Nor a clear transport/travel implication.
40. In light of that situation, I have had regard to Sport England's CIL and Planning Obligations Advice Note. It advises against generic approaches. The tailored approach offered by the appellant is more fitting because it justifies how and why monies would be spent via a more robust assessment inclusive of feasibility and costings.
41. The appellant is able to link its contribution rationale to an up to date evidence base identifying a specific local need and project, relative to the appeal development. They draw appropriate distinction between recreation space and spaces used for formal sports. Furthermore, they adopt a more realistic sport-specific calculation of demand in order to work out the derived sum using Sport England's PPC.
42. I want to make clear that there is nothing inherently wrong with a Borough wide spending approach and there may be other areas of sports facility need in the Borough such as at Bramhall High School. But equally there is nothing convincing to go beyond the provisions identified by the appellant's analysis supported by the PPC/PPS. Or to seek a review mechanism given the overall sports facilities which would be made available. There being significant formal sports recreation within the existing garden village when including 4 planned pitches to the north of the proposed open space otherwise secured.
43. I am cognisant that monies would be procured toward improving an existing facility rather than creating a new one. This ties to the calibrated level of maintenance contribution offered by the appellant. In those circumstances, the level of maintenance contribution they offer would be appropriate given there would be some income generation and maintenance activity already in place.
44. There may be criticism toward adopting capital contributions based on new facility provision. But there is no convincing reason upgraded facilities would not incur similar fit out or construction costs. Particularly to bolster the ancillary offer, where there is none.
45. Additionally, indexed fixed sums for capital and maintenance would be suitable to provide certainty toward a local project. I accept if payment were in stages, it would serve no useful purpose toward viable local project delivery.
46. I have had regard to the Mirrlees Fields and Gatley Golf Club appeal decisions mentioned by SMBC. However, the circumstances are materially different in this appeal. The appellant in this case is addressing technical points which need to be considered on their own merits relative to current circumstances inclusive of site specific locational factors and an up to date evidence base. Therefore, I give those competing decisions little weight in forming my overall conclusions.
47. Overall, there would be some conflict with CS Policy SIE-2 and the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD for calculating payments arising from

Schedule 5 Part A of the obligation. However, Framework paragraph 156(b) would be complied with. And having regard to CIL Regulations the appellant's sports infrastructure provisions would be necessary; directly related to the proposed development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. It would be compliant with the policies of the Framework and NPPG combined.

48. Given that I find the appellant's underpinning rationale linked to both Schedule 7 Part A and Schedule 5 Part A to be appropriate, Part B of each of those Schedules are not required. For the avoidance of any doubt they should be deemed inoperable should the appeal be allowed as they would fail the test of necessity. Therefore, I do not need to assess Part B components further.

Other considerations

49. I acknowledge that the emerging Draft Stockport Local Plan (2025) has completed its Regulation 18 consultation period. Whilst it is a material consideration, I attribute it limited weight given its stage of development.
50. Importantly, it is common ground that the Council has a housing land supply of only 1.77 years. The appeal scheme would deliver up to 540 new dwellings in total. SMBC's Housing Needs Assessment 2025 sets out a need of 1,861 dwellings and 1,305 affordable units per annum and a total need of 1,157 extra care units running to year 2041.
51. The direct benefits on offer include the provision of up to 465 C3 and up to 75 C2 dwellings in the context of a demonstrable under supply of new homes. Notably, there would be up to 15 self and custom build dwellings and up to 270 affordable units, where there is an accepted need. Thus, the scheme aligns with Section 5 of the Framework which aims to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing.
52. Additionally, there would be some 14.65ha of on-site open space for recreation purposes exceeding development plan policy provision. Plus, BNG delivery exceeding a 10% threshold would be likely.
53. Collectively those benefits, particularly the new home provision meeting local demonstrable needs, carry substantial overarching positive weight.
54. I have had regard to the duties under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Nearby designated heritage assets impacted on include listed buildings located outside of the site covering: New Hall Farm (Grade II*) and other farmstead associated buildings (Grade II) as well as the Grade II listed buildings linked to Old Hall Farm.
55. In accordance with the Framework, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
56. Listed buildings: New Hall Farm; the Barn to the south of New Hall Farm; and the Garden Wall to the north and east of New Hall Farm and New Hall Cottage are recognised for their architectural and historic value as part of a farmstead. The farmstead comprises of an early example of a Cheshire yeoman farmhouse

- built in brick, dating back to the 17th century to which other farm buildings are affiliated to.
57. The general openness of the appeal land allows legibility and an understanding of the historic rural isolation and agricultural character of the farmstead within its surrounding landscape.
58. The proposed development would detract from the significance of the New Hall Farm heritage assets by severing the link between the buildings and a predominantly surrounding open landscape. Only space for a limited green buffer would be expected which would not successfully mitigate the detraction. The density, proximity, and visibility of the proposed development closest to Old Hall Lane and New Hall Farm would significantly alter the setting of the heritage assets. It would negatively impact on the characteristics of historic isolation, which is an important element of the significance of the buildings.
59. Elsewhere nearby, Old Hall Farm Farmhouse with Old Hall Barn, dating to the 16th and 17th century, was once home to the Davenport family (also of New Hall Farm residency). However, I agree with the main appeal parties conclusion, that harm to the setting of Old Hall Farm would be avoided due to public open spaces, recreational and sport pitches, and allotments, with new planting buffers surrounding these areas relative to Old Hall Lane.
60. In terms of relevant non-designated asset impacts, I note that the Pilot's Lodge previously functioned as an agricultural barn and has historic connections to New Hall Farm before its links to the Lancashire Aero Club, and airfield uses. Historically, large crowds assembled to see post-war organised air displays as an additional important point of local interest.
61. The urbanising character of the appeal scheme, directly reducing open space surrounding the lodge would be inconsistent with its functioning farm origins and its associations with the airfield in more recent times. I agree less than substantial harm would occur which is factored into my overall conclusions.
62. I recognise that whilst Woodford Aerodrome was not a frontline operational airfield, it was still an important base in the manufacture of Lancaster bombers and other planes. The existing various non-designated pillboxes in the vicinity illustrate a common defence measure employed at airfields during wartime.
63. The pillboxes located both inside and outside of the site have notable local history and cultural value, nevertheless the ability to understand their origins can no longer rely upon the physical presence of the airfield because of demolition works. Therefore, I do not attribute harm to their setting in line with the rationale provided in the submitted heritage assessment. Plus, heritage interpretation displays as part of a local trail secured by planning condition use would otherwise preserve historic interest in them to an adequate level.
64. I have carefully considered other public objections relating to: the erosion of the character of the area; flood risks; loss of agricultural land; detriment to residential amenity; green belt harm; open space/maintenance deficiency; highway safety/traffic and active travel issues; community hub location and detail inadequacy; construction/phasing detriments; ecological ramification and mitigation; general safety, emergency and fire safety considerations; calls to update local plan policy; inadequate consultation; as well as wider local infrastructure capacity limitations inclusive of drainage provision. But there is

nothing compelling to suggest any of those objections are strong reasons to resist the scheme factoring the SoCG, expert witness statements, as well as all potential forms of legal agreement and planning condition use applicable.

Planning obligation

65. The obligated covenants are contained within 10 Schedules overall. As per the main issues of the case, I have already given my findings on Schedules 5 and 7 of the agreement. Not to repeat those. Nevertheless, it remains appropriate for me to assess the content of the remaining Schedules.
66. I note the planning obligation incorporates appropriate clauses whereby any other individual remaining covenant it contains would cease to be operable if it were found to be non-compliant with relevant legislation. This includes Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.
67. Schedule 1 defines the appeal site by way of the site plan; offsite ecology mitigation plan and land use parameters plan. The plans are consistent with the application plans and documents informing the appeal.
68. Schedule 2 covenants with the Council that not less than 50% of the dwellings subject to the appeal shall be affordable housing units, comprising of 75% shared ownership and 25% social rented units. The units are to be retained as affordable housing thereafter unless freehold interests, or staircasing to 100% equity or statutory rights to acquire transpire. In tandem, Schedule 3 secures discounted market sales units as affordable housing in perpetuity at not more than 70% of open market value.
69. The obligation facilitates structured commitments that an affordable housing scheme must be agreed detailing the number, type, size, tenure, timing, and registered provider linking details for each phase.
70. For all proposed affordable housing units, in any phase, a structured process for potentially securing alternative tenures is also given following reasonable endeavours for sale disposal to a registered provider. It incorporates due notice periods and determination clauses.
71. Such provision would allow SMBC to properly manage local home and affordable home need delivery. SMBC's CS Policy H-3, Housing Needs Assessment 2025, and recent housing delivery figures combined underscore the necessity of seeking affordable housing provision. An acute level of local need is demonstrated. This aligns with paragraph 156(a) and Section 5 of the Framework seeking to deliver enough homes, addressing the needs of groups with specific housing requirements and identified affordable housing needs.
72. Overall, I am satisfied that the phasing and delivery triggers ensure that affordable housing is provided in step with market housing, supporting mixed and balanced communities encouraged by Framework paragraph 64(b). Additionally, the obligation enables flexibility for alternative tenures if committed endeavours proved unsuccessful, which would be reasonable.
73. Schedule 4 concerns public open space provision (POS). On-site POS includes providing two allotment areas as per the Land Use Parameters Plan. The collective package would mitigate the impacts of increased population on local green infrastructure and recreational facilities.

74. On or before commencement of development of any phase, the owner must agree with SMBC a Public Open Space Strategy (POSS) linked to specific phases. The POSS would then be managed and maintained in perpetuity by an appropriate management company. Or in the event of failure the landowner itself, until a replacement management company assuming such responsibility is appointed.
75. This would meet the quantum and needs described in CS Policy SIE-2, saved policy L1.1 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the Open Space and Commuted Payments SPD. It would align with Framework paragraph 156(c).
76. Schedule 6 entails public transport provision improvements. This would be undertaken via a new Third Bus Service Agreement negotiated with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) prior to the occupation of the 150th dwelling proposed to be built.
77. In the event a Third Bus Service Agreement cannot be met (subject to specific criteria) an extended bus service clause would be triggered to be implemented prior to the occupation of the 169th dwelling, still with further caveats for reasonable endeavours to secure a Third Bus Service Agreement thereafter. Other notice and stipulations are also included in the wording.
78. I accept that the scale of the development requires enhanced public transport provision and active travel infrastructure to reduce car use dependency, promote sustainable travel, and mitigate traffic impacts in line with CS Policies CS9, CS10, and T-1. I note the obligations are limited to what is necessary to serve the development. They are also time-limited, ensuring proportionality.
79. Schedule 8 relates to off-site ecology mitigation provision to be delivered through a scheme to be submitted to SMBC and approved in writing. Off-site mitigation works would need to be completed prior to commencement. The works would be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme thereafter by an agreed management company.
80. The development would have various ecological impacts. Consequently, mitigation is needed to comply with CS Policy SIE-3 and the Framework. Where on-site measures are insufficient to address these impacts, off-site ecological mitigation is necessary to ensure that biodiversity is protected and enhanced.
81. Schedule 9 details BNG delivery using a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan over a period of 30 years from completion of on-site Habitat Creation Works. A BNG monitoring sum of £27,929 would be paid as part of the arrangement, prior to the commencement of the development. Should the works not be able to generate 10% BNG the landowner would be able to either secure registered off-site BNG or purchasing credits to ensure a minimum of 10% is achieved. Hence, notional deficiency risks are adequately dealt with.
82. This provision is supported by paragraph 193(d) of the Framework which encourages new development to minimise impacts on, and provide net gains for, biodiversity.
83. Schedule 10 encompasses an Active Travel package delivery mechanism complementary to Schedule 6 and enhanced bus service negotiation with TfGM. This ties to the aims of CS Policies CS9, CS10, and T-1 advocating for sustainable transport and using active travel infrastructure to reduce car use

- dependency. Compliance with Framework paragraph 156 criteria (b) and (c) provides further justification.
84. Although planning condition use could secure a Travel Plan in its own right, the appellant proposes overlapping delivery interests through an Active Travel Scheme which involves wider highway network construction considerations. The scheme anticipated involves a series of negotiated upgrades to Woodford Road, Chester Road/Moor Lane mini roundabout, and Church Lane.
85. The design agreement, final cost and timings of the upgrade works linked to phasing and bus transportation delivery would not be able to be successfully managed solely via planning condition imposition, owing to the definition of terms required. Without more stringent provision it would generate enforceability risks. Subsequently, it is appropriate for an obligation mechanism to be employed capturing all coordination delivery interests which residents and visitors to the locality would be reliant upon succeeding.
86. I highlight, relevant costings would need to be agreed with SMBC, before any sum is finalised and following payment any unspent money would be returned. Accordingly, the mechanism on offer would be appropriate from fairness and scale perspectives. It would ensure a greater prospect of delivery effectiveness as opposed to a planning condition and s278 agreement alternative.
87. The Active Travel Scheme provision would facilitate new highway infrastructure in the form of footways; cycle routes; new pedestrian crossings; tactile paving; traffic calming measures; new and upgraded bus stops; speed limit alterations; mini roundabout adjustments and other works. I concur it would be necessary for the proper function of the highway network and the area. It would enable timely delivery of the works required relative to phasing interests in compliance with CS Policies CS9, CS10 and T-1.
88. An overall monitoring fee of £7,500 and a separate Travel Plan monitoring fee of £5,000 are included. NPPG Paragraph 036 recognises that authorities can charge a monitoring fee through planning obligations, to cover the cost of monitoring and reporting on delivery, for the lifetime of the obligation.
89. Similarly, CIL regulation 122(2A) permits the principle of monitoring fees. I find the overall monitoring fee provisions would be proportionate reflecting the actual cost of monitoring, based on estimates, and would allow SMBC to actively enforce the obligation in future periods.
90. Outside of the main issues, I find that the series of obligations defined in the remaining Schedules 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10 are all justified and meet the provisions of Regulation 122. The Schedule provisions are necessary; directly related to the development; and fairly related in scale or kind. They all also accord with the terms of the Framework and NPPG, combined.

Conditions

91. Without prejudice, the main parties have compiled an agreed list of planning conditions in the event the appeal is allowed inclusive of pre-commencement agreement. The suggested wording would meet relevant legal tests apart from SMBC's conditions linked to ensuring active travel works. As they would be unnecessary given the commitments in the legal agreement.

92. Conditions would be needed to specify the time limit and plans in line with statutory provision and to provide a formal mechanism for amendment.
93. Alongside time limitations for outline and reserved matters, conditions would be required to specify the quantum of development in relation to housing, extra care homes, commercial, community and other floor spaces, as well as phasing. Local Plan requirements and function of the area interests necessitate this. It would also be necessary to restrict the age profile of the extra care accommodation for similar reasons.
94. A condition ensuring self and custom build housing would be necessary. It is justified via Policy CS3 of the Stockport CS to ensure the delivery of appropriate housing mixes as well as having regard to sustaining an adequate supply within SMBC's Self Build Register.
95. Pre-commencement construction management conditions inclusive of piling details and level change agreements would be needed to protect public safety, amenity and the character of the area.
96. A suite of highway management, public right of way management and maintenance, and Travel Plan procurement related conditions would be necessary to ensure adequate highway safety levels are maintained for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicle users. It would ensure alternative modes of travel other than car use can be suitably encouraged as realistic alternatives.
97. A range of conditions some of which would need to feature pre-commencement wording would be appropriate to manage land contamination risk interests as well as to control light, air and noise pollution arising from the development including from construction work and demolition. This would ensure adequate public safety levels are maintained and that public nuisance or erosion of amenity can be avoided or properly managed.
98. Various conditions would be necessary to deal with flood risk and drainage interests to ensure: proper water management; due mitigation is provided; successful pollution control; synchronisation with phasing and other construction management conditions; and to ensure suitable overall environmental enhancements are achieved.
99. I agree conditions pertaining to heritage and archaeological interests would be appropriate to ensure historic assets/artifacts are protected and respected.
100. A package of conditions dealing with tree protection measures, invasive species removal/management, ecology, and BNG would all be necessary to protect habitats, wildlife (including protected species) and to ensure due enhancement to the local environment.
101. On top of those an energy consumption and carbon management condition would be necessary to secure a sustainable form of development.
102. A condition concerning employment and training would also be appropriate to ensure members of the local population have adequate work opportunity and options for upskilling. This would be in accordance with furthering the local economic wellbeing of the area.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

103. Pursuant to Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, local planning authorities and other decision makers should first have regard to the development plan and then to any other material considerations.
104. If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
105. From a development plan perspective there is conflict with saved Stockport UDP review (2006) green belt policies GBA1.2, GBA1.5 and GBA1.7. Nevertheless, those policies do not reflect the current content of the Framework which incorporates concepts of grey belt and the Golden Rules.
106. Yet, when applying Framework paragraphs 155 to 157, I note the development would provide: 50% affordable housing; necessary improvements to local infrastructure; and new or improved accessible good quality green spaces. Consequently, the appeal proposal does not constitute an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt according to national policy. Accordingly, very special circumstances do not need to be demonstrated.
107. Additional conflict arises with CS Policy SIE-2 and the Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments SPD. However, the alternative methodology for calculating contributions to off-site formal sports provision linked to the completed planning obligation is otherwise justified given the circumstances outlined by the appellant. Therefore, such conflict carries limited weight.
108. The appeal scheme would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of various designated assets: New Hall Farm (grade II*); the barn to the south of New Hall Farm (grade II); and to a listed wall (grade II); as well as the non-designated asset known as the Pilots Lodge, contrary to CS policies CS8 and SIE-1.
109. However, when applying Framework paragraph 215 the public benefits of substantially increased home delivery aligned to meeting the identified needs of the conurbation outweighs this harm.
110. Aside to my findings on conflict with the development plan, it is common ground that SMBC has a housing land supply well below the 5 year threshold. Those circumstances lead me to apply paragraph 11(d) of the Framework.
111. I recognise the terms of 11(d)(i) seek to protect areas or assets of particular importance. In this case, the content of footnote 7 when applied relates to Green Belt, designated heritage assets (accepting there are no non-designated assets of a sufficient value to be included as per the wording of footnote 75) and areas at risk of flooding.
112. Nonetheless, the appeal scheme utilises grey belt land and meets the Golden Rules. Although there would be heritage harm, it would be less than substantial in nature and the public benefits linked to the scheme would outweigh the harm caused. Additionally, I do not find discordance with any flood risk interests. Collectively therefore, there is no strong reason to resist the development having regard to all relevant area and asset protections.

113. Moreover, considering the obligated commitments when applying the terms of 11(d)(ii) there are no adverse impacts (including both designated and non-designated heritage asset harm and any other type of harm identified) which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework policies taken as a whole. Paying particular attention to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places, and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
114. Overall, the direct benefits arising from the development relative to all considerations give me appropriate reasons to allow the appeal. There are no other considerations of sufficient weight counting against it to conclude otherwise. Some of the overarching sustainability credentials of the scheme could also be potentially undermined if SMBC's approaches were adopted.
115. For the reasons set out above the appeal succeeds.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

John Hunter	Counsel
-------------	---------

WHO CALLED:

Christopher Harland	Education Provision Witness
Richard Wood, BA(Hons), MA, MRTPI	Open Space Provision Witness
Jane Chase	Planning Witness

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Katkowski CBE	Counsel (KC)
---------------------------	--------------

WHO CALLED:

Kerrie Norman BEng (Hons), LLM	Education and Sports Witness
Harry Spawton BA(Hons), BTP, MRTPI	Planning Witness
Ian Southwell	Transport Witness

INTERESTED PARTIES (WHO SPOKE AT THE INQUIRY):

Cllr Laurence Clarke	Poynton Town Council
----------------------	----------------------

Graham Plant

Woodford Action Group

Peter Outwin

Interested party/resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY:

- 1) Sport England CIL and Planning Obligations advice note
- 2) Travelling drafts of planning obligation
- 3) Opening submissions by the Appellant
- 4) Email trail between SMBC & the Appellant - Education
- 5) Opening submissions by the Council
- 6) Statements on behalf of Woodford Action Group
- 7) Statement from Councillor Clarke – Poynton Town Council
- 8) Email thread from the Council regarding Education
- 9) Clauses in relation to education and formal recreational open space submitted by the Council
- 10) Contributions and yield calculations for education
- 11) SLR response to Highways 1st August 2025
- 12) Site visit plans
- 13) Closing submissions by SMBC
- 14) Closing submissions by the Appellant
- 15) Planning obligation agreement/draft list of planning conditions
- 16) CIL compliance statement
- 17) Completed planning obligation

Schedule of Planning Conditions

1. Applications for the approval of Reserved Matters shall be made not later than the expiration of seven years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of reserved matters, or in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
2. Approval of the (1) access (2) appearance (3) landscaping (4) layout and (5) scale of the site ('the Reserved Matters') shall be obtained from the local planning authority before any development in each phase is commenced. These applications shall accord with the following plans: Site Location Plan PL1161.4a-PLA-XX-XX-DR-U-0024 P01; Demolition Parameter Plan PL1161.4a-PLA-XX-XX-DR-U-0020 P01; Movement & Access Parameter Plan PL1161.4a-PLA-XX-XX-DR-U-0007 P03; Land Use Parameter Plan PL1161.4a-PLA-XX-XX-DR-U-0014 P05; Density & Height Parameter Plan

PL1161.4a-PLA-XX-XX-DR-U-0015 P04; Open Space Parameter Plan
PL1161.4a-PLA-XX-XX-DR-U-0006 P06.

All reserved matters applications shall accord with the design principles set out in the Planit Woodford Garden Village Extension Design and Access Statement and Design Code issued 20 August 2025. It shall be accompanied by a completed Compliance Checklist which demonstrates Code compliance.

3. The development shall comprise:
 - (a) Up to 465 Use Class C3 dwellings including up to 15 self-build and custom build dwellings.
 - (b) Up to 75 Use Class C2 older persons extra care dwellings.
 - (c) Up to 560m² of Use Class F1 floorspace.
 - (d) Up to 500m² of Use Class E floorspace within which no more than 100m² shall be for Use Class E(b), no more than 200m² shall be for Use Class E(g)(i) and no more than 200m² shall be for any other Use Class E uses and limited to a maximum of 50m² per unit.
 - (e) 80m² of Sui Generis Floorspace (mobility hub). There shall be no provision of convenience retail within the Use Class E floorspace.
4. No development, including demolition, shall commence until a phasing and implementation plan for the entire development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved plan.
5. No person occupying a dwelling in the C2 extra care accommodation shall be below 55 years of age.
6. A C2 extra care statement shall be submitted with the first reserved matters application for the relevant phase of the development setting out: the precise nature of the C2 extra care accommodation proposed; the number of affordable units; and affordable tenure mix. The development in that phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
7. A self-build and custom housing statement shall be submitted with the first reserved matters application for the relevant phase of the development setting out:-
 - (a) how the plots will be serviced in terms of the timing and delivery of highways access and connections to all relevant utilities including but not restricted to energy, water, and drainage; and
 - (b) how the plots will be disposed in terms of their sale to those seeking a self-build plot which should include priority for those on the Council's Self Build Register.

The development in that phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
8. No development in any phase, other than demolition, shall take place until existing and proposed contours, at 0.5m vertical intervals, relative to the adjoining land and any other changes proposed in the levels of the site associated with the development approved , have been submitted to and

approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved finished contours/ levels.

9. No development, including demolition, site clearance, earthworks, or construction works, shall commence in any phase or sub phase within the development until a Construction Method Statement dealing with how the works in that phase or sub phase will take place has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - (a) details of the demolition, site clearance, earth/groundwork and construction stages of the works and the likely number and type of vehicle movements involved.
 - (b) details of the routing of earth and material carrying vehicles to and from the site and access and egress arrangements within the site including details of signage, monitoring, and enforcement.
 - (c) details of the management of hazards arising from birds.
 - (d) delivery and collection times for vehicles associated with demolition, site clearance, earthworks, and construction works.
 - (e) details of arrangements for any recycling of materials.
 - (f) the laying out of a delivery area for all vehicles.
 - (g) the creation of areas and installation of all plant, huts, and welfare facilities.
 - (h) details showing how all vehicles associated with all phases of the works are to be properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage to mud and dirt onto the highway.
 - (i) details of the contractors compound and car parking arrangements.
 - (j) screening and hoarding details.
 - (k) details of a community liaison contact for the duration of all works including a complaints procedures and complaint response procedures.
 - (l) details of contractors membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.
 - (m) the provision of an emergency contact number.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

10. The reserved matters application seeking approval of detailed means of access for each relevant phase or sub phase of the development shall include full details of all road infrastructure, private accesses, parking and turning areas to serve the proposed development. The road infrastructure, accesses, parking and turning areas shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and maintained free from obstruction and shall be used only for these purposes for the life of the development.

11. Prior to the first occupation of each phase or sub phase of the development a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan should be consistent with the objectives, targets, governance arrangements, and monitoring schedule set out in the Woodford Garden Village Extension Travel Plan (19th June 2025 Revision 04) Plan and shall be reviewed and updated on an annual basis in accordance with details that shall be outlined in the plan. The Travel Plan shall include details on the method of operation, appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator, targets, infrastructure to be provided, measures that will be implemented, monitoring and review mechanisms, procedures for any remedial action that may be required and a timetable for implementing each element of the plan. The approved travel plan shall be operated at all times that the development is occupied and in use.
12. No development, including demolition, site clearance and earthworks, in any phase shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall address the environmental impact on heritage assets within and adjacent to the site and sensitive receptors (including those occupying dwellings approved in earlier phases) during the demolition and construction phase. The CEMP shall show mitigation measures in respect of:-
 - (a) Noise and disturbance during the demolition and construction phase including piling techniques, vibration and noise limits, monitoring methodology, screening, a detailed specification of plant and equipment to be used and construction traffic route. The carrying out of such shall comply with:

BS 5228-1:2009 + A1: 2014, Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise, and

BS 5228-1:2009 + A1: 2014, Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites –Part 2: Vibration.
 - (b) Dust and emissions generated during the demolition and construction phases including plant and vehicles emissions, dust suppression measures, and the methods to monitor emissions of dust arising from the development.
 - (c) Pile foundations including the type of piling to be used, potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations having regard to British Standard 5228-2:2009+A1:2014, Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 2: Vibration. The CEMP in this respect shall include the following details:
 - (i) Details of the method of piling.
 - (ii) Days / hours of work.
 - (iii) Duration of the pile driving operations (expected starting date and completion date).
 - (iv) Mitigation measures to be undertaken to safeguard the amenity of adjacent residents.

- (v) Prior notification to the occupiers of potentially affected properties.
 - (vi) Responsible person contact (e.g. site manager / office).
- (d) Concrete power floating and measures to be used to reduce the impact of noise and vibration on upon sensitive receptors. The CEMP in this respect shall include the following details:
- (i) The method of floor floating.
 - (ii) The days / hours of work.
 - (iii) The duration of the floor floating operations (expected starting date and completion date).
 - (iv) Prior notification to the occupiers of potentially affected properties
 - (vi) The responsible person (e.g. site manager / office) who could be contacted in the event of complaint.
 - (v) Public relations and how residents will be informed of the timing and duration of demolition and construction works and how to report issues of concern. The communication must provide contact details. A telephone number or live chat function must be provided for the time and the duration of the works, for residents to use at the time that they are being disturbed.

There shall be no burning of materials on site during construction and the CEMP shall be implemented throughout the demolition and construction phase of the development. All demolition and construction works shall not be carried out other than in full accordance with the approved details.

13. Details of external lighting shall be submitted with the first reserved matters application for each phase of the development. This shall include a written strategy together with a plan or plans to show how the amenities of the locality, aviation safety and ecology will be protected from light pollution. The scheme shall consider both illuminance (lux) and luminance (candelas/m²). It should include dark areas and corridors, avoid light spill upon bat roost features (such as the bat barn and associated habitat), bat commuting and foraging habitat (such as boundary hedgerows, trees, watercourse adjacent and within the site) aiming for <1lux light spill on these features. The scheme should also include a modelled lux plan and details of:-

- (a) Proposed lighting regime and contours.
- (b) Number and location of proposed luminaries.
- (c) Luminaire light distribution type.
- (d) Lamp type, wattage, and spectral distribution.
- (e) Mounting height, orientation direction, and beam angle.
- (f) Type of control gear.

All lighting shall be capped at the horizontal with no upwards spill. The development in the relevant phase shall not be occupied or brought into use until the lighting has been installed in accordance with the approved details. The lighting shall thereafter be maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

14. The reserved matters application seeking approval for layout for each relevant phase shall include details of electric vehicle charging points including the location, position, and specification of such. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details and the charging points shall be retained at all times or replaced with others of a similar capability.
15. No development, other than demolition, shall be carried out in any phase where Peat is present until a Peat Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include details of how peat will be extracted, handled, remains wet and does not dry out or decompose. The Plan shall also detail where and how the peat will be retained on site through the creation and management of a peat mitigation area together with a timescale/trigger for the creation of that area. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
16. No development in any phase, other than demolition, shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in that phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy will include the following components:
 - (a) Additional, detailed, site investigation, based on the reports already submitted at Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement, to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.
 - (b) The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (a) and based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 - (c) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance, and arrangements for contingency action.Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
17. Prior to the occupation of any phase in the development a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

- 18.No phase in the development shall be occupied until all works necessary to prevent landfill gas migration into that phase have been approved in writing by the local planning authority and carried out in full.
- 19.No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. Any proposals for such systems must be supported by an assessment of the risks to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 20.Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 21.No development, including demolition, shall take place in any phase until a Construction Environment Management Plan, including Pollution Risk Assessments and Method Statements, for that phase or sub phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:-
 - (a) Protection of surface and groundwater resources.
 - (b) Best practise on the use and storage of fuels, oils, and chemicals, to remove the risk of causing pollution during construction.
 - (c) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors.
 - (d) Loading and unloading of plant and materials.
 - (e) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development.
 - (f) Wheel washing facilities.
 - (g) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.The approved Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.
- 22.No development, including demolition, shall be carried out other than in accordance with an Operational Unexploded Ordnance Risk Management Plan that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall set out how the construction of the development will have regard to unexploded ordnance and the measures/actions to be taken in the event that such are encountered.
- 23.The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref: December 2024/WFE-BWB-ZZ-XX-RP-YE-0002_FRA Rev P03/BWB Consulting) and the following mitigation measures it details:-
 - (a) Adopting a sequential approach to the site layout in order to avoid locating built development in areas of higher flood risk.

- (b) Finished floor levels of proposed dwellings are to be set no lower than 0.6 metres above the nearest corresponding 1 in 100-year plus climate change flood level.
- (c) Finished floor levels for proposed commercial development buildings and access/egress routes are to be set no lower than 0.3 metres above the nearest corresponding 1 in 100-year plus climate change flood level.
- (d) Finished floor levels should be set a minimum of 300mm above adjacent highway levels where they may act as an overland flow/exceedance flow pathway. Finished floor levels should also be set above the maximum water level within any adjacent surface water drainage infrastructure.
- (e) Ground and pavement levels immediately surrounding buildings and dwellings shall be profiled to encourage any overland or pluvial flow away from any built development.
- (f) Residents, property owners, and users to be encouraged sign up to receive EA Flood Alerts and warnings to ensure awareness of potential flooding in the nearby local area (beyond the development red line boundary).

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of any phase and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

24. No development, other than demolition, shall commence in any phase until a scheme to raise finished ground floor levels of proposed dwellings and commercial buildings above corresponding flood levels in nearby rivers and watercourses has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Development in the relevant phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details and shall be subsequently maintained thereafter.
25. As part of the first reserved matters application for each phase, details of the specification pipework and designs for new and upgraded sewerage systems shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details must include highest specification pipework and trench lining to ensure proper detailing is secured for new development in groundwater source protection zone 1 (SPZ1) and groundwater protection zone 2 (SPZ2). The approved details shall be completed prior to first occupation of the relevant phase, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter, for the lifetime of the development. The installation of appropriate protection measures shall have appropriate Construction Quality Assurance records and inspection by United Utilities, provided to the sewerage undertaker.
26. No development, other than demolition, within any phase shall commence until details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:-
- (a) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This

investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water in accordance with BRE365.

- (b) An assessment and calculation for 1in 1yr, 30yr and 100yr + 40% climate change figure critical storm events showing flood exceedance routes.
- (c) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations).
- (d) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD.
- (e) Mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge.
- (f) Details in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards.
- (g) Drain foul and surface water on separate systems.
- (h) Mitigation measures to prevent pollution of Controlled Waters (Groundwater & surface waters).
- (i) Details of ongoing maintenance and management.

Development within any phase shall be completed and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.

27. As part of the first reserved matters application for each phase, a hydrogeological risk assessment for the development must be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The assessment must demonstrate that the physical and pollution risks, posed by disturbance of the aquifer, to groundwater from the development can be satisfactorily managed and/or mitigated for the lifetime of the development. Works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

28. No development, other than demolition, in any phase shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works. The works are to be undertaken in accordance with a Project Design (PD) submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning. The PD shall cover the following:

- (a) Informed by the North West Historic Environment Research Framework, a phased programme and methodology of investigation and recording to include:
 - (i) geophysical survey.
 - (ii) informed by (a) (i) archaeological evaluation trenching.
 - (iii) informed by (i)-(ii) more detailed targeted excavation (subject of a new PD).
 - (iv) Level 1-2 building recording of pillboxes.
- (b) A programme for post investigation assessment to include:
 - (i) analysis of the site investigations records and finds.

- (ii) production of a final report on the investigation results.
 - (c) Deposition of the final report with the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record.
 - (d) Dissemination of the results commensurate with their significance (could include but may not be limited to a summary of the works for inclusion in a local journal; installation of an information panel or panels along the route of the heritage trail and other measures in collaboration with the Avro Heritage Museum).
 - (e) Archive deposition of the report(s)/records of the site investigation.
 - (f) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved PD.
29. Any reserved matters application for a phase containing existing trees and hedgerows shall include an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method including an up to date survey, the impact of development upon them and the measures that will be undertaken to safeguard any retained trees and hedgerows. Development including demolition shall not proceed other than in accordance with the approved details.
30. No vegetation clearance works should take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests no more than 48 hours before vegetation clearance works commence and has provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site, including a minimum 4m exclusion zone left around identified active nests until nesting is confirmed complete by a suitably qualified person.
31. No development, including demolition, shall take place in any phase until an ecological Construction Ecological Management Plan (e-CEMP) has been submitted and approved by the local planning authority to ensure that ecologically sensitive habitats and species are protected during site clearance and construction works. The document should include and address (but not be restricted to) all the points detailed below:-
- (a) Pollution prevention and control measures, near the watercourses where 15m minimum buffer must be adhered to at all locations / times.
 - (b) Any pre-construction surveys such as for badger noting that if there are any changes, such that badger are impacted further by the development, a Natural England mitigation licence may be required.
 - (c) The demarcation of any biodiversity protection zones such a 30m exclusion buffer around the outlier setts, areas within Great Crested Newt breeding pond risk zones, tree root protection zones, retained habitats, watercourse and bat barn using appropriate fencing and information boards.
 - (d) The proper storage and use of hazardous materials.
 - (e) Tree and hedgerow protection measures.
 - (f) Appropriate biosecurity measures.

(g) The safeguarding of protected species during works such as Great Crested Newts through a preliminary working method statement and the protection of badgers / hedgehogs from excavations.

(h) The appointment and use of an Ecological Clerk of Works where appropriate.

(i) The installation of nest boxes designed for specific species requirements will be completed prior to site works commencing.

(j) The use of measures to ensure that Isles Wood is protected from construction activities such as dust, water pollution, root protection zones.

Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

32.A Biodiversity Enhancement Plan shall be submitted with each reserved matters application for each phase of the development to include the following:-

(a) Bats and birds: A minimum of one bat and/or bird box to be integrated into each of the new dwellings and on each of the new buildings in accordance with details to show the proposed number, location, position, and specification thereof.

(b) Landscape Strategy: To include locally native & wildlife friendly planting which will produce a year-round supply of nectar and berries. In particular, this should include buffer planting to retain and enhance habitat corridors across and within the site to ensure habitat connectivity is maintained. This should be confirmed in a written strategy and though the submission of a plan or plans showing the location, size, species, and density of planting.

(c) Hedgehog Highways: Native species rich hedgerows should be used to demark boundaries wherever possible. Any close board boundary fencing should incorporate gaps (130m x 130mm) to maintain habitat connectivity for wildlife. This should be confirmed in a written strategy and on a plan or plans showing the position and composition of hedgerows, fencing and location/size of hedgehog gaps.

(d) Invertebrates: Utilising existing materials to create bug hotels, butterfly banks, dead wood and stone piles and other opportunities for invertebrates and other wildlife. This should be confirmed in a written strategy and on a plan or plans showing the position and composition of the measures proposed.

(e) Badger Foraging Habitat: Strategic planting around the badger setts identified though the Environmental Statement within and adjacent to the site is expected to provide protection against people and dogs interfering with the setts as well as additional foraging opportunities for badger. This should be confirmed in a written strategy and on a plan or plans showing the position and composition of the measures proposed.

(f) Hibernacula: The creation and management of habitats adjacent to any ponds including dense ground cover and hedgerow species to benefit wildlife. Log piles, turf, and stone piles to provide appropriate shelter /

hibernacula along the green corridors between ponds and next to ponds in order to protect them from increased risks of predation and trampling. This should be confirmed in a written strategy and on a plan or plans showing the position and composition of the measures proposed.

Development in the relevant phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details nor occupied or brought into use until the approved details have been carried out in full (or such other timescale as has first been agreed by the local planning authority).

33. Prior to the commencement of development, including demolition, in any phase an invasive non-native species protocol shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, detailing the containment, control and removal of Himalayan balsam on site. Development in the relevant phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details nor occupied or brought into use until the approved details have been carried out in full (or such other timescale as has first been agreed by the local planning authority).

34. An Overall Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) shall be submitted with the first reserved matters application for each phase of the development. The landscape strategy should provide details of how the existing and proposed green corridors will be enhanced and protected. Details shall include:-

(a) Diverse grassland seed mixes to create wildflower meadow and pollinator friendly areas.

(b) Creation of areas of scrub around wildlife areas and corridors to discourage disturbance from people and pets, incorporating native species such as hawthorn, blackthorn, gorse, holly, yew etc. These will also protect woodland edges for bats to commute and forage along, connecting known roosts with the wider area. Water quality of the watercourses should be monitored to ensure are no short or long-term impacts to the woodlands and associated wildlife through water pollution.

(c) Creation of a woodland corridor(s) through the site east – west and north – south to provide new bat roosts with commuting and foraging corridors as well as benefiting other wildlife.

(d) Native species rich hedgerows.

(e) Proposals for the creation of a new watercourse and other waterbodies within the site together with details as to how the watercourses and waterbodies will be protected from contaminated runoff from gardens, roads, and houses.

(f) Consideration of how the landscaping will protect existing wildlife and will be protected against the increase in footfall and household pets.

(g) Management of INNS / biosecurity.

(h) Details of the access management strategy for areas of public open space and the strategic greenways within the site including details of where public access is to be encouraged, controlled, restricted, or excluded according to the location, functional sensitive features present. This should

include monitoring the effectiveness of certain habitat management measures e.g. the buffer around the badger setts.

- (i) Details of how awareness will be raised within the residential population regarding the predation of nesting birds by cats such as through educational information packs and information boards.
- (j) Management of habitats to encourage Great Crested Newts away from roads.

Development in the relevant phase be carried out and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

35. The Overall Biodiversity Net Gain Plan and the first phase Biodiversity Net Gain Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with paragraph 14(2) of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

The Overall Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the BNG Assessment Report V2 (TEP, December 2024), the Statutory Biodiversity Metric submitted as part of this application on 4 December 2024 and in broad conformity with the Design and Access Statement and Design Codes, Woodford Garden Village Extension, PLANIT, 20 August 2025.

36. No phase of development shall commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP), prepared in accordance with the approved Phase Biodiversity Gain Plan for that phase, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and including:

- (a) A non-technical summary.
- (b) The roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP.
- (c) Planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Phase Biodiversity Gain Plan for that phase.
- (d) Management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Phase Biodiversity Gain Plan for that phase for a period of 30 years from the completion of development.
- (e) Monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority.

The habitat in that phase shall not be managed and maintained other than in accordance with the approved details.

37. If the development in any phase or sub phase does not commence) within 2 years of the ecology reports at appendices 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8 and 8.9 of the Woodford Garden Village Extension Environmental Statement dated December 2024, or other such reports approved as a result of this condition, the approved ecological measures secured through the above Conditions 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38 shall be reviewed and, where necessary, amended and updated. The review shall be informed by further ecological surveys commissioned to:

- (a) establish if there have been any changes in the ecological baseline; and
- (b) identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes.

Where the survey results indicate that changes have occurred that will result in ecological impacts not previously addressed in the approved scheme, the original approved ecological measures and BNG calculations will be revised and new or amended measures, and a timetable for their implementation, will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Works will then be carried out in accordance with the proposed new approved ecological measures and timetable.

- 38. An Energy Statement to detail all measures that will be used in the construction and occupation of the development to reduce energy consumption and to reduce carbon emissions shall be submitted with each relevant reserved matters application within each relevant phase for approval by the local planning authority. The development within that phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
- 39. A Crime Impact Statement shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority with each relevant reserved matters for each relevant phase. Development within the relevant phase shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the crime reduction and public safety recommendations contained therein as approved.
- 40. Details of the maintenance and management of vegetation alongside footpath 2HGB where it follows the boundary of the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority no later than the submission of the first reserved matters application for the final phase of development. The approved details shall be carried out upon the commencement of the final phase of development and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
- 41. No development, including demolition, in a phase shall commence until a detailed employment and training method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Development for that phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved employment and training method statement and be on an open book monitoring basis. The employment and training method statement shall include (but not limited to details of the following:-
 - (a) A skills and employment plan, outlining opportunities for unemployed Stockport residents in the construction phase of the development, including links to Work Clubs and Jobcentre Plus.
 - (b) Targets for on-site work Experience and Apprenticeship opportunities for Stockport local residents.
 - (c) Details of how the developer and its contractors shall co-ordinate with the Council, Jobcentre Plus and all other local partners to develop a partnership approach to incorporate pre-recruitment and work placement opportunities.

- (d) Details of how the Developer will work with subsequent end users ensuring they engage with local partners to offer employment and training opportunities to unemployed residents.
- (e) Details of how the Developer will ensure that Stockport's priority areas will be targeted for recruitment and training opportunities for unemployed residents, e.g. links to Work Clubs.
- (g) Initiatives to build community linkages, particularly in defined Priority Areas e.g. curriculum development activities with local schools.
- (f) An acknowledgement that the Developer shall have the final decision as to who is recruited for any job vacancies arising from the development as long as it is in accordance with the approved statement and all recruitment information has been submitted to the LPA on an open book basis.

End of Schedule