



TRAFFORD
COUNCIL

**AGENDA PAPERS FOR
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE MEETING**

Date: Thursday, 10 November 2016

Time: 6.30 pm

**Place: Committee Suite, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, Manchester
M32 0TH**

AGENDA

ITEM

3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

To consider the attached report of the Head of Planning and Development, tabled at the meeting.

3

THERESA GRANT

Chief Executive

Membership of the Committee

Councillors Mrs. V. Ward (Chairman), D. Bunting (Vice-Chairman), Dr. K. Barclay, N. Evans, T. Fishwick, P. Gratrix, D. Hopps, E. Malik, D. O'Sullivan, B. Sharp, J. Smith, L. Walsh and J.A. Wright

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact:

Michelle Cody, Democratic & Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 0161 912 2775

Email: michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 10th November 2016

ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

1.2 Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chairman.

2.0 ITEM 4 – APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC.

REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against RECOMMENDATION	For REC.
88540	1A Catterick Avenue, Sale, M33 4GQ	St Mary's	1		
88646	3 Winmarith Drive, Hale Barns, WA15 8TJ	Hale Barns	12		✓
88899	Simpson Ready Foods Ltd, Stretford Road, Urmston, M41 9WH	Urmston	23		✓
88965	Bollindale, South Road, Hale Barns, WA14 3HT	Hale Central	43	✓	
89194	Land at corner of Northenden Road & Gratrix Lane, Sale Moor, M33 2QA	Sale Moor	55		
89209	Essoldo Buildings, 1123 Chester Road, Stretford	Longford	73	✓	
89210	Essoldo Buildings, 1123 Chester Road, Stretford	Longford	85	✓	
89303	Proposed Extension, Altrincham Crematorium, Whitehouse Lane, Dunham Massey	Bowdon	95		
89448	35 Bamber Avenue, Sale, M33 2TH	Sale Moor	113		

Page 1 88540/FUL/16: 1A Catterick Avenue, Sale

This application has been withdrawn from this month's agenda as the description of the development was factually incorrect and a re-consultation is required to clarify this.

Page 12 88646/HHA/16: 3 Winmarith Drive, Hale Barns

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Liam Donnelly
(Agent)**

REPRESENTATIONS

The neighbour at No. 2 Winmarith Drive has submitted further comments summarized below but, on the basis that the proposed extension would comply with the SPD4 guidelines and subject to factual amendments to the report, he has confirmed that he has no objections. He states that:

- The proposed distance of the single storey element of the extension further to the original rear wall of his property is not 4.763m and that the correct measurement should be 5.15m.
- The 3.763m measurement (from the original rear wall of the application property) as annotated on the plans should be clarified.
- There are errors in the description of the application property in the report and its relationship with No.2:
 - i) "There is a mature hedge along western boundary in common with No.2" – there is actually a low level privet hedge between the driveways of the two properties. Hedging to the rear has been removed by previous owner however recent discussions with the agent has agreed in principle that planting 1.8m high shall be planted within the curtilage of the application site to all rear boundaries to provide screening.
 - ii) "No.2 has 2no. dormers to its rear" - there are no dormers to the rear or in the eastern elevation facing the side boundary of the site.
 - iii) "...the property (is) positioned behind No.2" The property is sited forwards of No.2 by 1.4m.
- The position of a 3.9m long east elevation at ground floor located 763mm from the common boundary with No.2 should be referred to in the Proposals section for clarity purposes.
- The statement in paragraph 3 that "unlike several of the surrounding properties, No.3 has not been extended" is incorrect - there has been a ground floor flat roof extension behind the garage.

OBSERVATIONS

Given the above comments made by the neighbour, the report is amended in the following respects: -.

The wording of the "Site" section of the report is amended to read:

The frontages between the properties are relatively open with a low hedge, with a fence forming the boundary between the rear gardens of the two properties with a height of approximately 1.8m with additional planting within the curtilages of both adjoining properties.

To the rear of No.2, there are 2no. single storey gables with habitable room windows at ground floor only with the rear elevation facing north towards The Greens, a 3no. storey building containing 10no. apartments with access from Hale Road.

The main body of the application property is set slightly further back than no.2 and at right angles to No.4 Winmarith Drive.

The second paragraph within the "Proposal" section is amended to include the following: -

The existing attached garage is to remain in situ, but would be extended with a continued flat roof towards its rear, with a small roof pitch to allow it to link with the proposed rear projection. This element would project 5.15m further than the original rear corner of the adjacent property, No.2 Winmarith Drive, at ground floor level and 3.15m to the rear of the single storey extension to that property and would be 763mm from the common boundary. The length of the proposed development would increase the depth of the property from 10.9m to 14.5m, with the main two storey body of development being approximately 4m from the common boundary with No.2 and 5.3m from the eastern elevation of that property also.

The wording within paragraph 3 of the report is amended to read: -

Unlike several of the surrounding properties, the existing property has not been significantly extended from its original design.

The applicant has annotated the plan to state that the single storey element of the extension would project 3.763m to the rear of the original rear elevation of the application property. However, the neighbour has stated that the position of the original rear wall of the application property is shown inaccurately on the plan in relation to the rear elevation of his own property and that the projection of the single storey element to the rear of his (the neighbour's) original rear wall would therefore be 5.15m rather than 4.76m as stated in the report.

The position of the application dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling have been measured on site and it is confirmed that the position of the original rear wall of

the application dwelling is shown incorrectly on the submitted plan and that the extension would project approximately 5.15m past the original rear wall of the neighbour's dwelling. However, the neighbouring property has had a previous single storey extension that projects 2m further to the rear and the currently proposed extension would therefore only extend approximately 3.15m past this existing rear elevation. In any case, with respect to a detached property, the SPD4 guidelines normally allow an extension of 4m from the original rear elevation of the application property plus the gap to the boundary. (In this case, this would equate to approximately 4.7m whereas the extension will project a further 3.7m). Furthermore, the applicant could build a single storey extension 4m from the original rear elevation of their own dwelling under permitted development rights without needing planning permission.

The projection of the single storey element of the extension is therefore considered to be acceptable in relation to the SPD4 guidelines and would be approximately 3.15m beyond the neighbour's existing rear wall with a gap of approximately 0.76m to the common boundary and approximately 3.7m beyond the original rear wall of the application property.

Page 23 88899/OUT/16: Simpson Ready Foods Ltd, Stretford Road, Urmston

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

**Gary Earnshaw
(Agent)**

OBSERVATIONS

Insert following paragraph after paragraph 5:

6. The applicants have however, in this case, failed to demonstrate that they have considered other suitable available housing sites within the wider vicinity, as set out in policy W1.2.

Replace paragraph 7 with:

7. It is therefore considered that in this instance the proposed change of use of the site to residential is considered acceptable. The application site has not been identified as a site for future employment provision, and is in fact identified in the Council's SHLAA for housing development. The applicants have demonstrated that a sufficient number of alternative employment sites can be found within the Trafford Park area, in close proximity to the site, where future industrial development could be focused. Furthermore the primary function of the sites wider area remains residential and the development would aid in the provision of additional housing. Whilst the applicant has not demonstrated that they have considered other alternative sites as required by W1.12 this policy is afforded less weight given the lack of 5 year supply of housing. Therefore the development should be considered in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The development is in a suitable location, would reuse a brown field site and

would provide additional housing within the borough, therefore is considered to be an acceptable form of development and in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

Delete Paragraph 22 and replace with:

22. It is therefore considered that in this instance, a 10% contribution for affordable housing will be applied to the development proposals, given that the Borough is currently experiencing poor market conditions. If a lesser or alternative contribution is put forward by the applicant, this will need to be justified through the submission of a site specific viability scheme, submitted in support of any subsequent reserved matters application. The 10% contribution will need to be in line with the above criteria mentioned within policy L2 of the TBC core strategy and will be secured by way of a 106 Agreement. The proposals are therefore considered to be in line with policy L2 of the TBC Core strategy.

Delete Paragraph 40 and replace with:

40. The submitted transport statement further demonstrates that the erection of up to 58 housing units within the site would actually generate less 2 way traffic flows than an operations employment use. The application site is currently vacant however it could be used for an employment use at any time. The change of use would reduce the potential for heavy industrial vehicles within the local highway network and parking congestion associated with an industrial use during peaks hours would also benefit the amenity of existing local residents.

Insert following paragraph after Paragraph 50:

51. The proposed development would be liable to an affordable housing contribution. This contribution will be secured by way of a 106 Agreement, as discussed within the Affordable Housing section of this report. The 106 Agreement will be used to secure an on-site method of delivery for the proposed affordable housing units, in this case, at least 50% of which are to be provided in the form of family housing. In addition the tenure split should be 50:50 between shared ownership and social/affordable rented housing, in line with policy L2 of the TBC Core strategy,

RECOMMENDATION

Please insert the following within the Recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT and subject to the following conditions:-

(A) That the application will propose a satisfactory development for the site upon completion of a legal agreement which will secure affordable housing provision, in accordance with Policy L2 of the Core Strategy.

(B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement has not been completed within three months of this resolution, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development; and

(C) That upon satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement / undertaking, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions: -

CONDITIONS

Replace condition 2 with:

2. No development for which outline planning permission has hereby been granted shall be started until full details of the following reserved matters, in respect of the development, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) appearance;
 - b) scale
 - c) layout; and
 - d) landscaping

Reason: The application is granted in outline only under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the details of the matters referred to in the condition have not been submitted for consideration.

Replace condition 3 with:

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, number: OP001.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

Replace condition 8 with:

8. Any application for reserved matters which includes layout shall include details (including calculations and reasoning) of the architectural sound mitigation, relevant to the control of external noise. The assessment scheme shall demonstrate that the noise criteria of BS 8233:2014 (or the prevailing guidance of the time) can be achieved and identify noise attenuation where necessary. Development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved measures and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: It is necessary for this information to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the development to ensure that the site area meets national standards, ensuring sufficient amenity for future occupiers. In accordance with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Replace condition 14 with:

14. No development shall take place on site until a detailed method statement for demolition has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The approved statement shall detail a demolition strategy which entails the removal of all slate roof coverings by hand during the winter period (November – March). The approved method statement shall then be implemented in full on site during the course of the works.

Reason: It is necessary for this information to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement in order to safeguard any roosting Bats on this site in accordance with Policy R2 of the TBC Core strategy and the relevant sections of the NPPF.

Page 43 88965/HHA/16: Bollindale, South Road, Hale Barns

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:** **Stuart Vendy**
(Recommendation to Refuse) **(Agent)**

FOR:

PROPOSAL

Insert additional paragraph into proposal section:

Should planning permission be granted for the retention of the access, legal have advised that a separate S73 application would not be subsequently required.

DESIGN AND IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSES

Consideration of Harm

Para 18 – The following to be added at the end of the Inspector’s quote:-

It should be noted that the Bowdon CAMP and the Ashley Heath CAMP contain very similar policies to each other in relation to the importance of boundary treatments and therefore the appeal decision is comparable to the current application.

Additional comments received from the Local Highway Authority in regards to highway safety:

The following comments were made by the LHA in regards to a previous application 82091/HHA/2013 on the site. I've extracted the relevant paragraph below.

“However, the LHA is concerned regarding the proposed second access. The LHA only supports second accesses in locations where they provide a valid highway safety benefit. The proposed second access would create an additional pedestrian – vehicular conflict point on the public highway and would remove kerbside parking space, the LHA would therefore recommend the removal of the second access point.”

Although the LHA did not object to the current application which proposes to keep the existing access, and therefore would provide 2 accesses to the property, the LHA can confirm that there would not be any benefit to highway safety by keeping this access and there would therefore be no public benefit to keeping this access, although it is accepted that there may be some benefit to the occupier of the premises.

RECOMMENDATION

Replace reason for refusal with:

The proposal by virtue of the retention of the existing access would result in an unacceptable loss of boundary treatment and enclosure which would have been mitigated by its closure. The retention of the access would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, would interrupt the rhythm of openings within the existing boundary treatment and would fail to provide adequate mitigation for any loss of the original boundary treatment. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ashley Heath Conservation Area or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset. The proposal is considered to result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets and no public benefits have been identified which would outweigh this harm. As such, it would be contrary to Policies R1, L5 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, Policies 18, 23 and 33 of the Ashley Heath Conservation Area Management Plan and relevant policies in the NPPF.

Page 55 89194/FUL/16: Land at corner of Northenden Road & Gratrix Lane, Sale Moor

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

OBSERVATIONS

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Delete Paragraph 37 and replace with:

37. Following assessment of the submitted viability appraisal the Council's Estates Section (Amey) concluded it is viable for the development to provide affordable housing in the form of a commuted sum towards the provision of off-site affordable housing provision. Consequently a commuted sum of £85,000 has been agreed between the parties to deliver new affordable homes, and will be secured via a S106 Agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

Delete Condition 5 and replace with:

5. No clearance of trees and shrubs in preparation for (or during the course of development shall take place during the bird nesting season (March - July inclusive) unless an ecological survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to establish whether the site is utilised for bird nesting. Should the survey reveal the presence of any nesting species, then no development shall take place during the period specified above unless a mitigation strategy has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which provides for the protection of nesting birds during the period of works on site

Reason: In the interests of protecting the ecology of the area and having regard to Policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. This is required prior to the commencement of development to ensure the protection of nesting birds.

Delete Condition 6 and replace with:

6. No development or works of site preparation shall take place until all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations'. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS: 5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: This is required prior to the commencement of development to ensure the protection of the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with Policies L7, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Delete Condition 14 and replace with:

14. The apartments hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until a scheme for secure cycle storage for the apartment building has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Cycle parking infrastructure and its layout should meet the requirements of SPD3

Parking Standards and Design for Trafford. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and retained at all times thereafter for its intended use.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and the free flow of traffic and in accordance with Trafford Core Strategy Policies L4 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 73 89209/FUL/16: Essoldo Buildings, 1123 Chester Road, Stretford

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Mrs Angela Lowry
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

Delete Condition 2 and replace with:

2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 56058 01 Rev K; 02 Rev K; 03 Rev K; 04 Rev K; 05 Rev K; 06 Rev K; 07 Rev K; 08 Rev K; 12 Rev K; 13 Rev K; 14 Rev K; 15 Rev K; 16 Rev K; 17 Rev K and 18 Rev K received by Local Planning Authority 25/10/2016.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 85 89210/LBC/16: Essoldo Buildings, 1123 Chester Road, Stretford

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Mrs Angela Lowry
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

Delete Condition 2 and replace with:

2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 56058 01 Rev K; 02 Rev K; 03 Rev K; 04 Rev K; 05 Rev K; 06 Rev K; 07 Rev K; 08 Rev K; 12 Rev K; 13 Rev K; 14 Rev K; 15 Rev K; 16 Rev K; 17 Rev K and 18 Rev K received by Local Planning Authority 25/10/2016 and 19 Rev L received by Local Planning Authority 28/10/2016.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

OBSERVATIONS

Replace paragraph 9 with:

Although the construction of new buildings for cemetery facilities are listed here as being an exception to inappropriate development it has been established by case law that this is not applicable to a change of use application for new cemetery space. Therefore new cemetery space is deemed inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore considered to be harmful in principle.

Replace paragraph 10 with:

It is noted the application does not propose any new buildings and thus is considered to have very little effect on openness. However, in order to satisfy paragraph 88 of the NPPF, which states “When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”. Very special circumstances therefore need to be demonstrated in order for inappropriate development in the Green Belt to be considered acceptable.

Replace the second sentence of Paragraph 14 with:

- Stretford Cemetery and Sale Cemetery border the Mersey Valley Floodplain and would have the potential to pollute the ground water.

Replace paragraph 16 with:

Paragraph 87 of NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The applicant has demonstrated there is a lack of burial space within the borough and that there are no other alternative sites which could accommodate a similar development. It is therefore considered that very special circumstances have been demonstrated which would outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt from that inappropriate development. However, the very special circumstances are also required to be weighed against ‘any other harm’ i.e. other material considerations such as visual harm to the openness of the green belt, impact on residential amenity, ecological and highways issues before an overall conclusion can be reached.

Insert to the beginning of paragraph 37:

The applicant confirms that....

Add an additional paragraph after paragraph 37:

Objectors reference an existing Jewish burial ground within the cemetery being underused, however the applicant has advised that this does not form part of the application site and is a private burial space which is not managed by Bereavement Services. Therefore the allocation of burial spaces within this application does not take account of this existing space as it not within the control of the applicant and in this regard is not a material planning consideration; it is for the applicant to manage this on the basis of demand.

Page 113 89448/HHA/16: 35 Bamber Avenue, Sale

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

**HELEN JONES, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:

**Rebecca Coley, Head of Planning and Development, 1st Floor, Trafford
Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH. Telephone 0161 912 3149**