

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 11th January 2018

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.
86160	Land at Lock Lane, Partington	Bucklow St Martins	1		✓
91610	Dovecote Business Park, Old Hall Road, Sale, M33 2GS	Sale Moor	51	✓	✓
92563	Merrick, 22 Willoughby Close, Sale, M33 6PJ	Ashton on Mersey	72	✓	✓
92598	Gateways, 14 Broadway, Hale Barns, WA15 0PG	Hale Barns	86	✓	✓
92764	Gulmarg, Garden Lane, Altrincham, WA14 1EU	Altrincham	107	✓	✓

Page 1 86160/OUT/15: Land at Lock Lane, Partington

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR: Andrew Bickerdike
(Agent)

CONSULTATIONS

Environment Agency – No objections, request that reference is included in wording of condition to ensure compensatory flood storage is provided as per section 6.1.2 and Appendix C of the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) AECOM (Ref:60429465).

Housing & Pollution (Contamination) – No objections to the amended wording relating to contaminated land

Health and Safety Executive – No objections

Public Health England – No further comments to add.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAS) – No objections

Greater Manchester Police Design For Security - Due to the size and nature of this proposal we would recommend that a full Crime Impact Statement (CIS) report should accompany the application in order to show how crime prevention has been considered for the proposals.

Natural England – No comments to make on the application, advise that proposal is assessed against Natural England Standing Advice.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) – No objections to the proposed amended wording to conditions.

Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) – TfGM have expressed concern that the applicant's TA is based on traffic survey data which is more than three years old and that the development of 550 houses would have a disproportionate impact on queueing and delays in the area due to the nature of the delay relationship in extremely oversaturated conditions. They note that the original analysis was based on simple volumetric traffic counts without any consideration given to queued traffic that effectively forms additional traffic demand. A number of specific concerns have been identified in relation to capacity at the Manchester Rd/Flixton Rd junction and the Manchester Rd/Carrington Lane/Banky Lane junction, the modelling for which was not assessed by TFGM UTC (Urban Traffic Control). They argue that in its current form, they do not have enough information available to comment more fully on the application and whether requirements for wider mitigation measures have changed since the original submission was approved.

Local Highway Authority – In relation to the amended wording to conditions the LHA have no objections.

With regards the comments received from TfGM the LHA have stated that they are satisfied that the conditions and obligations secured as part of this application largely address the comments raised by TfGM and the LHA are therefore satisfied with the proposed recommendation.

Network Rail – No objections to amended wording of conditions.

Education - No objection in principle – There has been a significant increase in the number of children in the area since 2010 and current figures show a shortfall of 20 reception class places in Partington in the 2018 admission round rising to 28 in 2019. 500 properties would notionally give an additional 15 children in each year group. This is not an issue for secondary age children since provision is available at Broadoak School, however the additional primary aged children will further increase the shortfall in the future. Whilst it is accepted that 15 children would not require an additional primary school (since the number is too low to be financially viable) the additional students would have to be accommodated elsewhere.

Lead Local Flood Authority - It is considered that the proposed works will not cause flood risk to the development or the surrounding area, the application is therefore satisfactory for approval subject to the drainage scheme being designed in accordance with the Level 3 Detailed Flood Risk Assessment Ref: 60429465, with a max surface water discharge of 34.9 l/s. This can be dealt with by way of condition.

RECOMMENDATION:-

Condition 6 to read:- All reserved matters applications submitted in respect of this permission shall be brought forward in broad conformity with the Development Principles listed in the submitted document Development Principles: Drawing Ref:298H._Draft C.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and residential amenity, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 9 to read:- Prior to works taking place on any phase of the development, details of existing external ground levels within and immediately adjoining the site and proposed finished floor levels for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The levels shall be set in accordance with the latest climate change allowances and as shown in sections 6.1.1, 6.1.3 and Appendix C of the FRA (the freeboard shall be set at 600mm above the 1% AEP plus climate change flood level). Compensatory flood storage is to be provided as per section 6.2 and Appendix C of the approved FRA. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent the risk of flooding having regard Policies, L7, R3 and L5 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 23 to read:- Prior to the first occupation of dwellings in any phase of development hereby approved, a scheme for the surfacing of the footpaths, highways and access points within that phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the

first occupation of any residential unit within that phase of the development, the scheme shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details and the approved timetable.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, residential amenity and pedestrian access and permeability, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

Condition 24 to read:- Any application for reserved matters which includes layout shall be accompanied by a scheme for providing pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the wider area. Prior to the occupation of any residential unit within each phase of the development, the approved works in respect of that phase of the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the approved timetable and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and cycle connectivity and permeability, encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport and the visual appearance and character of the surrounding area, having regard to policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The condition requires the submission of information prior to the commencement of development because the approved details will need to be incorporated into the development at design stage.

Condition 27 to read:- No residential unit shall be occupied within any phase of development which is to be served by a vehicular access from Lock Lane unless and until proposals for an off street parking area to be made available for our Lady of Lourdes School have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, residential amenity and the character and visual appearance of the area, having regard to policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 51 91610/FUL/17: Dovecote Business Park, Old Hall Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Matt Whiteley (For Neighbours)
	FOR:	Miss Janet Rowley (For Applicant)

REPRESENTATIONS

Two further letters of objection have been received on grounds already noted.

Page 72 92563/HHA/17: Merrick, 22 Willoughby Close, Sale

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Mrs Jackie Smith (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Roger Naylor (Applicant)

Page 86 92598/FUL/17: Gateways, 14 Broadway, Hale Barns

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Gary Earnshaw (For Neighbours)
	FOR:	David Cross (Agent)

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of representations

Within the representation section of the committee report it was identified that 5 letters of representation had been received. This is correct however for clarification; one of the representations received was submitted jointly by the two separate residences, namely Nos.15 and 17 Hill Top. Objections were therefore received from 6 separate addresses.

One further letter of representation received on the 10th January 2018

Subsequent to the committee agenda being publicised and an additional cross section drawing of the proposed development being prepared by Barnes Walker (Proposed south context elevation through Broadway – M2905.4), a further letter of representation has been received on behalf of the neighbours at 15 and 17 Hill Top regarding boundary treatments and the request to reduce the height of the ridge to the rear elevation.

The letter acknowledges the amendments made to the previous contextual plan through the introduction of the proposed sunken garden and the retention of the laurel hedge between the application site and No.13 Hill Top. It also requests that the conditions set out within the committee report are amended to refer to, and reflect the contextual plan, specifically in relation to the retention of the laurel hedge at its current height.

The letter also requests that the rear ridge line be reduced to the same height as the front section. This is considered by the adjoining residents to represent a better design which would benefit the amenities of neighbours at the rear and the general visual amenity of the area.

OBSERVATIONS

Retention of the laurel hedge

In response to the letter of representation received on the 10th January referencing the retention of the laurel hedge, it is important to note condition 7 of the committee report which refers to the protection of trees, shrubs and hedges on the application site.

'No trees, shrubs, or hedges within the site which are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be felled, uprooted, wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority; any trees, shrubs or hedges removed without such consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years from the completion of the development hereby permitted shall be replaced with trees, shrubs or hedge plants of similar size and species.'

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location and the nature of the proposed development and having regard to Policies L7, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.'

It is the opinion of planning officers that the condition detailed above is sufficiently worded to cover the protection of the laurel hedge.

As detailed within paragraph 206 of the NPPF *'Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.'*

As clarified within the committee report, the proposed development meets the spatial standards attached to the Council's PG1: *Guidelines for New Residential Development* in reference to the distance between the proposal and the rear boundary (10.5m) and that of facing habitable room windows of adjacent properties (Compliant with removal of permitted development rights in respect of the proposed dwelling). Accordingly, it is not considered that in this instance the attachment of a condition specifically referencing the retention of laurel hedge, or its height, is reasonable or necessary in making the development acceptable in planning terms.

Design of the proposed dwelling

As detailed within the submitted representation, it is requested that the rear ridge is reduced in height to correspond to that of the front section. Whilst it is understood that the outlook from the adjacent properties of Nos. 13 and 15 would be marginally improved through a reduction in the rear ridge height by 400mm, the proposal meets the spatial guidelines attached to the Council's PG1: *Guidelines for New Residential Development* whereby it is not considered that

the development will lead to visual intrusion or overbearing effect to the detriment of adjacent occupants. It is therefore considered that it would be unreasonable and unnecessary to require such amendments, which will not result in significant improvements to the amenities of neighbouring properties or the character and appearance of the street-scene.

RECOMMENDATION

The following amendments are to be made to the recommendation (in *italic*):

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO THE UNDERTAKING OF A BAT EMERGENCE SURVEY.

That Members resolve that they would be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission for the development and that the determination of the application hereafter be deferred and delegated to the Head of Planning and Development as follows: -

- (i) On receipt of the bat emergence survey, to consult with the Greater Manchester Ecological Unit;
- (ii) To thereafter determine the application appropriately in accordance with the advice of the Greater Manchester Ecological Unit, including if appropriate the imposition of any additional planning conditions;
- (iii) *To carry out minor drafting amendments to any planning condition;*
- (iv) *That subject to (i) to (iii) above planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions*

Page 107 92764/FUL/17: Gulmarg, Garden Lane, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:** **Kerry Nield
(Neighbour)**

FOR: **David Lambert
(Agent)**

REPRESENTATIONS

One additional representation has been received in regards to the proposal from an neighbouring property who has already objected. The additional objections relate mainly to parking and highway and pedestrian safety issues.

The additional issues raised are summarised below:

- The application is being treated as an modification or extension to an existing site
- Highway safety was a key part of the planning inspectorate's decision to dismiss the appeal relating to application 81794/FULL/2013, paragraphs 24-31 (appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/A/14/2223206) on a site next door to the current application.

- Access to the site does not comply with standards set out in the Manual for Streets
- An increase in bedrooms will result in an intensification of pedestrian activity and safe pedestrian access is not provided
- Can vehicles safety manoeuvre into site when other vehicles are parked?
- The application fails to accord with the three related transport tests set out in the NPPF, namely safe access to a development must be demonstrated for all users, the development must be demonstrated as being sustainable, and the development must not have residual severe impacts.

The Local Highway Authority have reviewed the additional objections and have provided additional comment which are incorporate in the LPA's response below:

- The LHA note that the application is for a replacement dwelling and therefore this is a key consideration in making a recommendation.
- In terms of the appeal related to application 81794/FULL/2013 the LHA do not believe that this decision has any bearing on the present application 92764/FUL/17 however the outcome of this has been noted.
- In terms of the guidance mentioned the references to Manual for Streets, (MfS), sections 7.5 & 7.7 are not applicable in this instance in that Section 7.5 refers to 'Stopping sight distance' and Section 7.7 refers to 'Visibility splays at junctions' both of which are not applicable in this case.
- Section 7.9 of MfS is relevant and this relates to frontage access stating '*It is recommended that the limit for providing direct access on roads with a 30mph speed restriction is raised to at least 10,000 vehicle per day*'. Garden Lane is considered to be well within that limit so as to allow for vehicles to not have to enter and leave the property in a forward gear.
- Pedestrian access to the site would be as existing and it is considered that acceptable.
- The LHA considers that the proposal accords with NPPF Par 32, safe access would be provided to the development which is considered to be sustainable without residual severe impacts on the local highway.

SARAH PEARSON, CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF 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