

AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 13th February 2020

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 Chair.

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	For
98489	32 Davyhulme Road East, Stretford, M32 0DW	Gorse Hill	1		
98751	Market Hall, Railway Road, Urmston, M41 0XL	Urmston	10	✓	
98779	Greenbank House, 15 Albert Square, Altrincham	Bowdon	27	✓	
98783	Beech House, Manchester Road, Partington, M31 4DJ	Bucklow St Martins	48	✓	
98906	Land Adjacent To Soccer Dome, Trafford Way Trafford Park, M17 8DD	Davyhulme East	71		✓
98907	Soccer Dome, Trafford Way Trafford Park M17 8DD	Davyhulme East	99		✓
99242	2 Ellaston Drive, Urmston, M41 0XB	Urmston	134		

the red edged site bringing into question the validity of the application as a Certificate B would be required for works on land outside the applicant's ownership. No access onto the adjacent land will be allowed during the construction process. Eaves, downpipes, fascias, cills, opened windows etc. would encroach onto the adjacent land.

- The plans also include the annotation "Proposed glass roof trading area as part of planning approval ref. 93629/FUL/18" in regard to the planning permission on the adjacent land. However, the material to be utilised for the roof has yet to be agreed and this could be a solid roof form which would in turn be detrimental to the proposed flats and restaurant uses.
- Paragraph 118(e) of the NPPF confirms that planning policies and decisions should support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. However, the same paragraph adds that such a scheme should be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, be well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and maintain safe access and egress for occupiers. Given that the proposed development is set at a much higher level than the adjacent land and would sterilise adjacent development of a similar fashion, with the eight eastern windows also failing to maintain a satisfactory level of amenity for occupiers, the development is contrary to the NPPF and saved UDP Proposals D1 and D3 and Policy L7 of the Core Strategy.
- The addition of four further windows in the East elevation will result in a loss of privacy as the proposed windows in both the apartments and restaurant will provide a direct line of sight into the rear of neighbouring residential properties and gardens.
- Reiterate previous concerns regarding the proposed waste management strategy which intends to locate both commercial and domestic waste containers just beyond the rear of neighbouring residential properties. The risks of smells, vermin and disruption have not been adequately addressed and alternative solutions not properly explored. Late night bottle emptying and general waste disposal will result in noise and disturbance. The application submission suggests that an "*Existing Eurobin for commercial waste*" is currently located in the proposed bin storage area. However, **no** commercial bin is or has been located in this area.
- The installation of outdoor lighting to the rear external area will have a negative impact on residential properties.
- Concerns regarding additional parking demands.
- Need more information regarding potential operating hours of restaurant and how noise restrictions will be enforced.

OBSERVATIONS

An objection has been received on the basis that the proposed windows in the side elevation would fail to provide a satisfactory level of amenity for the occupiers of the proposed development. As stated in the main report, the four dormer windows serving the apartments would have a clear view across the top of the approved Urmston Market development. The four first floor windows would have a more restricted outlook as they would face the side wall of the Urmston Market development, but as they would serve a restaurant (which was originally proposed without windows on the side elevation) rather than residential accommodation, it is considered that this would not result in an unacceptable level of amenity for the proposed building. The objection also states that the proposed development would prejudice the future opportunity of the owners of the neighbouring site to undertake any form of upper floor development. The impact on any future unknown proposals for the adjacent site would carry no weight in the assessment of this application, which must be assessed on the basis of the existing site circumstances and the extant permission on the adjacent land.

An objection has been received on the grounds that the proposed windows on the side elevation would overlook the residential properties to the north. However, these windows would be at right angles to the boundary of these dwellings and are therefore not considered to result in significant overlooking of these properties.

The other issues raised above have already been addressed in the main report. Whilst the current application does not include any proposals for outdoor lighting, it is considered that a condition should be attached requiring the approval of any lighting to be installed at the site. With regards to the concern regarding late night bottle emptying, it is recommended that Condition 9 is amended to also restrict the hours during which the tipping of glass can take place.

It is also recommended that the approved plans condition is updated to refer to the latest set of plans, which shows minor alterations to the design of the proposed dormers to ensure that the treatment of the gables of the dormers is consistent.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

That Condition 2 is amended to read as follows: -

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan, number 0719-02 Rev xiii, received by the local planning authority on 29 January 2020.

That Condition 9 is amended to read as follows: -

9. Servicing, waste collections and deliveries to or from the premises and the tipping of glass shall only take place between the hours of:

accordance with the requirement and it is therefore recommended that an amended landscaping condition is attached to reflect this.

RECOMMENDATION

That Condition 5 is amended as follows: -

5. a) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include, but not be limited to, the planting of 11 additional trees net of any clearance, together with the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks, boundary treatments (which shall include the retention of the existing fencing to the rear of No. 49 Hardwick Road), hard surfaced areas and materials (including the car parking areas), planting plans, specifications and schedules (including planting size, species and numbers/densities), existing plants/trees to be retained and a scheme for the timing/phasing of implementation works.

(b) The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme for timing/phasing of implementation or within the next planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

(c) Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

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

**Page 71 98906/FUL/19: Land Adjacent To Soccer Dome,
 Trafford Way, Trafford Park**

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Scott Penman
 (b/h of Agent)**

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Policy position:

1. Paragraph 4 of the main committee report states that policies relating to heritage are considered to be amongst the 'most important' for determining the application in the context of NPPF Paragraph 11. This is not deemed to be the case for this proposal given the nature of the development and its distance to identified heritage assets. As such, the 'most important' policies are those relating to town centre uses, the strategic location, design and impact on amenity. This does not affect the conclusions or recommendation set out in the main committee report.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

2. A final response has now been received from TfGM which maintains that the approach taken to sensitivity testing of Bridgewater Circle is incorrect. TfGM notes however that as a non-statutory consultee, it does not object to the application and refers to the local planning authority to determine the application in balance of the comments received.
3. The comments made by TfGM have been referred to the Local Highway Authority which advises that the proposed development is not expected to have a significant impact on existing traffic flows outside of major events. The LHA acknowledges that during a major event, any modelling of the Bridgewater Circle would show a significant impact, but consider that the proposal would be acceptable subject to a condition requiring a phased Traffic Management Plan. The Traffic Management Plan would deal with the management of overspill parking, management of traffic flows during busy times, and the option to use the service yard as an egress point.
4. On this basis, Officers consider that the application is acceptable in highway terms and the recommendation remains as per the main committee report.

Page 99 **98907/FUL/19: Soccer Dome, Trafford Way,
Trafford Park**

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:**

**FOR: Nick Fillingham
(b/h of Agent)**

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Loss of football pitches:

1. For clarity, it is noted that the existing building contains 14no football pitches with 4no external pitches. The planning permission granted in

March 2018 (ref. 93120/FUL/17) resulted in the loss of 6no of the internal football pitches and whilst this has not been implemented, the permission remains extant. The combined pitch space of the remaining indoor and outdoor pitches is 7,941sqm whilst the pitch space of the facility proposed under application 98906/FUL/19 is 7,992sqm, relating to a net gain of 51sqm compared to the position established through the earlier consent. It is on this basis, together with the other factors set out in paragraph 15 of the main report, that Sport England confirmed it is satisfied with the proposed replacement provision and the scheme as a whole.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

2. A final response has now been received from TfGM which maintains that the approach taken to sensitivity testing of Bridgewater Circle is incorrect. TfGM notes however that as a non-statutory consultee, it does not object to the application and refers to the Local Planning Authority to determine the application in balance of the comments received.
3. The comments made by TfGM have been referred to the Local Highway Authority which advises that the proposed development is not expected to have a significant impact on existing traffic flows outside of major events. The LHA acknowledges that during a major event, any modelling of the Bridgewater Circle would show a significant impact, but consider that the proposal would be acceptable subject to a condition requiring a phased Traffic Management Plan. The Traffic Management Plan would deal with the management of overspill parking, management of traffic flows during busy times, and the option to use the service yard as an egress point.
4. On this basis, Officers consider that the application is acceptable in highway terms and the recommendation remains as per the main committee report.

CONDITIONS

Condition 15 in the main committee report to be amended to the following for greater clarity:

15. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a Pedestrian Signing Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall relate to the routes between the application site and key destinations, including the Trafford Centre Bus/Metrolink interchange station, and any overflow parking locations approved as part of the Traffic Management Plan. The Strategy shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The following condition to be added for clarity:

28. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any equivalent Order following the amendment, revocation and re-enactment thereof, the premises shall only be used as an events, conference, training, gala dinner and exhibition venue and for no other purpose within Class D1 of the above Order.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 134 99242/HHA/19: 2 Ellaston Drive, Urmston

OBSERVATIONS

In the Observations section under the heading “Impact upon 11 Greenfield Avenue”, the report states that the projection of the rear extension beyond the north facing kitchen window of no. 11 would be approximately 4.5m and that this would be in excess of the standard guidelines that would allow for a 3m projection in addition to the separation distance to the boundary. This is incorrect. As the application property is a detached dwelling, the SPD4 guidelines would normally allow a 4m projection in addition to the separation distance to the boundary. As the extension would be 1m from the common boundary, the proposal would comply with the SPD4 guidelines when measured either from the rear elevation of the application property or from the kitchen window of no. 11. As the report states, the property could extend up to 4m at ground floor level under permitted development rights and the extension also only projects 0.6m further than the existing outrigger in this position and is considered to be an acceptable projection that would not unduly harm the amenity of the occupiers of that property.

AGENDA ITEM 7 98031/OUT/19 Land to east and west of Warburton Lane, Warburton Lane, Warburton

Residential development of up to 400 dwellings, including the creation of new points of access, provision of formal and informal open space, ancillary landscaping, car parking and highway and drainage works

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has this afternoon submitted a letter in response to the report to Planning Committee, together with an updated highways note, produced by their highways consultants, SCP, and an updated plan showing the arrangement of the site accesses and surrounding highways and pedestrian infrastructure. In summary:-

- The rationale behind the £1.5m contribution to highways infrastructure improvements at the Flixton Road junction shown in the FVA is based on the cost of designing and constructing a roundabout solution which was previously proposed and the applicant states was discussed with officers. The letter states that the officer report dismisses this scheme and set out a preferred option in line with the Heath Farm Lane resolution which would require third party land. They state there are no guarantees that this scheme is deliverable and in any event is only a contingency should there be delays to the Carrington Relief Road. The applicant confirms that the funding required to deliver the highway improvements at the Flixton Road junction could be diverted towards the delivery of the CRR. Concern is also expressed over the trigger point of any Grampian condition required and suggests that up to 80 dwellings could be occupied before the highway improvements are required.
- They confirm two separate planning applications have been submitted to the Council today pertaining to the bridge crossings over Red Brook. One is proposed in each of the sites (1 and 2) and they would link to new footpaths and cycleways to the north of Red Brook and to paths and open spaces within the development site. The applicant states that the proposals have been fully designed and the applications include details of the precise routes, bridge designs and materials.
- They confirm no objection in principle to provision of a public transport contribution subject to compliance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations.
- In respect of a controlled pedestrian crossing at the site frontage again the applicant is agreeable to this approach and has provided a revised drawing illustrating how this might come forward.

Response to applicant's further information

- The applicant submitted an entirely revised TA on 17 December 2019 which superseded the previous transport note from November 2019 which proposed a roundabout solution at Flixton Crossroads. This revised TA removed any reference to the roundabout proposal as mitigation and put forward the alternative left hand turn lane scheme. There was nothing to suggest the roundabout scheme was still an option and thus officers gave no further regard to it, particularly as the LHA did not consider it to be appropriate mitigation for the highways impact arising from the scheme.

- Additionally, TfGM do not consider this option as an appropriate solution and Highways England have not considered this in their assessment of the application.
- The LHA consider the roundabout option to not be appropriate mitigation for the following reasons::
 - Does not provide adequate vehicular capacity to accommodate traffic with or without the Warburton Lane development
 - The model provides very optimistic results
 - Traffic signal cycle time is very low, understandably to keep queues short, but this offers no flexibility in the operation of the signals
 - Does not provide any resilience. The nature of the offset stopline on the Carrington Spur will mean traffic is very likely to block the roundabout despite the suggested yellow box
 - Does not provide for the recently introduced cycle lanes
 - Does not provide safe signalled pedestrian crossing facilities, which are currently present
 - Does not consider local property access
 - TfGM do not accept this as a solution

In responding to the applicant's comments on the trigger point for the Grampian condition requiring off site works at the Flixton Road Junction, the officer report concludes that without this mitigation any development of the site would result in severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network and has to be in place before the occupation of any of the proposed dwellings to be acceptable in planning terms.

- At the time of drafting this AIR, one of the applications for bridge crossings had been received by the LPA and the other had not. They have yet to be publicised or consulted on and can be given very little weight at this stage. There remains a lack of clarity in respect of deliverability (and whether third party landowners are agreeable) and the extent of the new footpath and cycleway proposals to the north of the Brook are also currently unknown. The proposals are not at a sufficiently advanced stage to provide any confidence that they address officers' concerns, even in part, in respect of the connectivity of the site to Partington.
- The applicant's acceptance of the principle of a financial contribution toward public transport is noted and welcomed. This will be progressed with the applicant, LHA and TFGM to determine an appropriate contribution and in accordance with the CIL regulations. The indicative reason for refusal will remain as part of this recommendation given the detail of the financial contribution is still to be agreed.

- The LPA welcomes the applicant's agreement to the suggested pedestrian pelican crossing across Warburton Lane. The LHA have reviewed the proposal and the crossing could be secured by way of condition.

OBSERVATIONS

Impact on Heritage Assets

Members are advised that paragraph 10 of the original officers' report contains a formatting error in respect of the underlining of 'Brook House and the site of Brook Farm'.

Built Heritage

Paragraph 13 of the officers' report should refer back to 'paragraph 10' (rather than 'paragraph 11'). With further reference to paragraph 13, the list of non-designated heritage assets should exclude Lighthouse Farm.

In addition, and further to paragraph 14 and 16 of the officers' report, it should also be made clear that the outline submission has not fully addressed the requirements of paragraph 190 of the NPPF (as well as paragraph 189), which is essential in enabling a full understanding of the impact of the proposed on affected heritage assets and to inform possible mitigation.

Archaeology

In respect of paragraphs 21, 23, 24 and 25 of the officers' report, further discussions with the Greater Manchester Archaeology Advisory Service (GMAAS) have served to provide clarity regarding what the recently submitted geophysical survey has revealed. This includes two parallel linear features at the eastern edge of Site 1, which could represent the boundary of Warburton Park or an earlier routeway and which are located where the main vehicular access from Warburton Lane is proposed. In addition, a curving feature in the northern part of Site 2 is considered, by GMAAS, to have archaeological potential. For Site 1, there are a series of linear features which are interpreted as 'banks and ditches', possibly of pre-historic or Romano-British date, and with another 'ditch' of early original and a further 'bank'. GMAAS is also aware of a possible post-medieval kiln in Site 1 which the survey did not reveal. It did, however, reveal features belonging to early 'ridge and furrow' agriculture. Overall, officers' conclusions regarding matters of archaeology are unchanged, but with this clarification serving to confirm that there are several features of potential archaeological significance within the site.

The Principle of the Development Proposed

In considering the acceptability of the proposed development in principle, a further issue has arisen following officers' continued review of the proposal. This is a significant point which has the potential to amount to a further indicative

reason for refusal in the event that the applicant does not accept the requirements of a further, crucial condition, as recommended by officers.

The original officers' report referred (para 63), to an imminent process of developing a formal masterplan for the emerging New Carrington allocation. The Council itself is to be involved in this process, along with all key landowners, including this applicant. This work will set out how the draft allocation could most effectively be developed in order to deliver sustainable growth over the plan period. As part of this, a key objective will be to develop an appropriate phasing plan underpinned by key infrastructure requirements (as informed by a Transport Locality Assessment which is currently being produced). The original report (Para 66) also referred to some early high-level masterplanning work, which has already been completed and which has proven useful to date in providing some indication regarding possible phasing options and infrastructure needs. This work reinforces the case for the Carrington Relief Road (CRR) but also supports the need for other new link roads and other new road connections over time as part of New Carrington.

Without prejudice to the forthcoming formal masterplan process, the work undertaken to date indicates a potential requirement for a southern relief road, and with its possible route running through the eastern land parcel of the application site (Site 1) on an east-west axis. However, with reference to the submitted parameters plan, the application presently makes no allowance for the development accommodating a potential piece of infrastructure of this significance. Whilst an internal estate road is indicated (and on a broad east-west orientation), it is not of the required specifications and dimensions to function as a relief road which would be used by through traffic across the wider area. In addition, no allowance has been made within the parameters plan for a connection to be made beyond the application site (i.e. at its eastern edge).

Even on the basis of present evidence, a case for a possible southern relief road would seem to exist, and with other options for its alignment (other than the application site) being limited (when having regard to the geographical extent of the allocation, and the restrictions posed by Red Brook and the surrounding Green Belt when needing to make a connection through to Warburton Lane).

If this proposal were to be approved without making some allowance for a connecting relief road, there is the potential for the forthcoming masterplanning process to be prejudiced, and for different (and potentially less favourable) solutions needing to be found in order to ensure that New Carrington would still deliver the scale and mix of sustainable development and associated infrastructure that is intended. This serves to further emphasise officers' concerns, as highlighted in the original report, of the acute and fundamental obstacles to achieving sustainable development on the application site. This is until a proper, detailed masterplan has been finalised and other major development, in line with this masterplan, starts to come forward (including associated infrastructure, roads and public transport).

With this in mind, therefore, and in the knowledge of the applicant's commitment to the forthcoming masterplan process, an additional condition is suggested. This would serve to secured through the reserved matters applications an amended parameters plan which would set aside sufficient land within the application site to accommodate the a possible southern relief road (or any other key infrastructure requirements which may become apparent). The condition could be caveated to remove the requirement in the event that the masterplan process concludes differently and an alternative alignment for infrastructure is found. However, when having regard to present uncertainty, such a condition is considered entirely reasonable and necessary.

Essentially, in the absence of the applicant's acceptance of this condition the development would not provide sufficient land to accommodate potential future infrastructure requirements, the development would not enable wider integration and would not facilitate future sustainable growth. It would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy L3, L4 and L7, and the NPPF, and an additional *potential* reason for refusal on these terms is recommended.

The potential need to amend the access arrangements in site 2 to ensure any junction fits appropriately with the Southern Relief Road would also need to be covered in conditions.

Trafford's Current Housing Requirement

As a point of clarification, and with reference to paragraphs 50 and 89 of the original officers' report, Trafford's current annual housing requirement (in applying the standard methodology for calculating minimum local housing need (LHN)) is now **1,359** (and not 1,362 as previously reported). This adjustment is not considered material.

The Emerging Statutory Development Plan

In addition, with reference to paragraph 54, a full consultation draft of the new Local Plan is expected to be published in Autumn 2020.

The New Carrington Masterplan

The following text replaces paragraph 66 of the original officers' report:

The intention is that the CRR would provide a new, high standard, alternative route through Carrington. Traffic would transfer from the existing A6144, thus reducing congestion as well as journey times by providing additional capacity, and with such benefits likely to be felt over a wide area. Whilst an indicative route for the CRR has been put forward, it is understood that the precise alignment will be guided by the emerging masterplan. Without prejudice to this ongoing, collaborative masterplanning work, provisional exercises have established that New Carrington could be established over three broad phases. Whilst the first phase could be accommodated when allowing for improvements to existing road infrastructure, it would seem that the delivery of Phase 2 would require the implementation of the CRR as well as other highways infrastructure, and with Phase 3 being dependent on this and other complementary new highway schemes. It is significant that, at this stage, the land covered by this

planning application is identified as being developed as part of both Phase 2 (Site 1) and Phase 3 (Site 2). Land within the existing SL5 allocation is included within both phases 1 and 2. It is understood that CRR would initially be built as a single carriageway road but with it designed to allow additional lanes to be constructed, should these be required to accommodate additional traffic generated by the New Carrington allocation. It would function as a spine road which would be capable of accepting new road links and other new road connections over time.

Residential Development

With reference to paragraph 96 of the original officers' report, up-to-date monitoring indicates a housing land supply of 2.6 years.

Highways Matters

For the avoidance of doubt, and with reference to paragraphs 75 and 133 of the original officers' report, it is accepted that there are some bus services from Partington to Manchester city centre and to Trafford Park. However, these services are not frequent, and in any event the services do not call at the stops on Warburton Lane near the application site. Thus, officers' conclusions regarding inadequate public transport provision are unchanged.

In the interests of clarity, the reference in paragraph 128 of the original officers' report should be to paragraphs 124 to 126 (and not 125 to 127).

The following text replaces paragraph 126 of the original officers' report:

Subject to the applicant's agreement with these crucial conditions (which has not been confirmed to date), it is accepted that incremental mitigation is available which would ensure that there would be no demonstrable severe impact on the safety or operation of the local road network. No notable betterment would be achieved but the works would address the impacts arising. As with the Heath Farm Lane decision, it is anticipated that the condition in respect of Flixton crossroads would provide an alternative to the left turn lane mitigation option in the form of the provision of the CRR. In either circumstance an as yet unknown level of contribution would be required to make the development acceptable in planning terms, secured through a S106. . The contribution specified by the applicant in the revised FVA does not specifically address this.

The following text should replace paragraph 134 of the original officers' report:

The LHA is familiar with the limited public transport availability across the Partington area. The draft GMSF and Policy SL5 encourage development proposals to make a contribution towards the delivery of improved sustainable transport choices. The submitted TA itself recognises that the only public transport option for Partington residents is the bus service. The nearest bus stops are located on Warburton Lane: southbound close to the main vehicular entrances; and northbound approximately 150 metres to the north of the entrance to Site 1. The TA explains that the local bus service provides connections to Altrincham, the Trafford Centre and Warrington. However, as has already been stated, the existing frequency of service is poor. The bus stop improvements, whilst welcome, do not address the frequency issue. Given the paucity of public transport provision – presently – it is to be expected that a significantly greater

financial contribution figure would be needed to deliver a real step change in the quality and choice of transport links to render this development accessible. The LHA and officers are agreed that contributions towards improvement to public transport are warranted, although – similar to the CRR position - what this figure might amount to has not been determined. This financial contribution would be secured by way of S106 agreement.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

The following text should be read as an adjustment to paragraph 238 of the original officers' report:

Alternative, as yet undefined, additional financial contributions are sought from the applicant on the following topics:

- Carrington Relief Road (or for left hand turn mitigation scheme at Flixton Road);
- Public transport improvements.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions as reported in the original officers' report are unchanged. It is considered that the proposed development is in breach of the development plan as a whole and fails in respect of both limb 1 (see NPPF paragraph 11d (ii)) and limb 2 (see NPPF paragraph 11 d (i)) of the NPPF's 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' (as previously reported). If the applicant does not accept the a Grampian style condition to address the additional reason for refusal (RFR10) then the harm that would arise provides even further justification to refuse the application under limb 11 d (ii).

RECOMMENDATION

A further possible Reason for Refusal is added (Reason for Refusal 10) in the event that the applicant does not accept the Council's proposed additional condition regarding a scheme amendment as described above.

The recommendation is otherwise unchanged, subject to some minor technical refinements to the wording of all existing Reasons for Refusal, and the incorporation of additional text to Reason for Refusal 2 and Reason for Refusal 3 to account for the matter of the failure of the proposed development to provide space for potential future road infrastructure (as noted within this report). That policy conflict arises in respect of Policy R2 (Natural Environment) of the Core Strategy has also been incorporated within Reason for Refusal 1 (which was previously an oversight).

(A)That Members resolve that they would, had they been able to determine the planning application, been **MINDED TO REFUSE** for the reasons below:

1. The impacts of the proposed development on designated and non-designated heritage assets have not been adequately accounted for within the application submission. The proposed development – in principle and

without adequate pre-determination evaluation – could result in the total loss of potential assets of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments and to other non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which would equate to substantial harm in NPPF terms., The proposed development – by reason of its scale, layout and distribution – would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of other built designated and non-designated heritage assets. This harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the development. The proposal fails to satisfy the tests at paragraphs 195 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework and is contrary to Policy R1, Policy R2 and Policy R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

2. In reviewing this outline application it is apparent that a parameters plan and indicative drawings are not sufficient in seeking to establish the acceptability of the scheme as a whole, in particular the amount, nature and location of on-site mitigation required and potential necessary new infrastructure, and the effect this might have on the quantum of development the site can reasonably deliver. The proposal is contrary to Policy L3, Policy L4, Policy L7, Policy R2 and Policy R3 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed development is in an unsuitable location by virtue of being other protected, open or safeguarded land, in an area of poor accessibility to public transport, jobs and amenities, and with a heavily congested road network. The proposal does not support necessary new infrastructure and facilities, and has not been planned to enable sensitive integration with the existing settlement and a potential new settlement, and to support wider regeneration. As a result, the development would function as an isolated community and a sustainable pattern of growth would not be achieved. Sustainable development would not be delivered and the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, and to Policy L1, Policy L3, Policy L4 and Policy L7 and Policy R4 of the Core Strategy.

4. No allowance has been made for affordable housing provision within the development and the submitted financial viability appraisal has not adequately demonstrated that the development could not otherwise be delivered. The development would not contribute to affordable housing needs and would not support the creation of mixed and balanced communities. The proposal is contrary to Policy L2 and Policy L8 of the Core Strategy, SPD1: Planning Obligations and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The proposed development – by reasons of its scale, distribution and lack of landscape buffers - would be inappropriate to the site's rural context and would cause significant harm to landscape character and to the appreciation of rural views. The proposal is contrary to Policy R2 of the Core Strategy, SPG30: Landscape Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, distribution, layout and absence of off-site linkages, fails to respond to the site's context and character, and it would not deliver an accessible, integrated, outwardlooking and inclusive residential development. The proposal is contrary to Policy L7 of the Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide.

B) That should the appellants not accept the Council's proposed mitigation via condition / S106 contribution in respect of highways, accessibility and education matters, and sustainable future growth, that the following additional reasons for refusal are also put to the inquiry:

7. In the absence of an agreed off-site mitigation scheme, the proposed development would have severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network, specifically at the following junctions [delete as appropriate]: Central Road/A6144 mini-roundabout, Moss Lane/Manchester Road/A6144 mini-roundabout, Isherwood Road (B5158)/A6144. The proposal fails to satisfy the test at paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework and it is also contrary to Policy L4 of the Core Strategy.

8. The application site is located in an area where public transport provision is inadequate and there are limited alternative means of transport to the private car. Insufficient allowance has been made for the development to contribute towards an improved public transport network, and prospective residents of the development would become heavily reliant on the private car. The proposal is contrary to Policy L4 and Policy L7 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. There are insufficient primary school places in the local area to accommodate the needs arising from this proposed development. No allowance has been made for the development to contribute towards new/expanded primary school provision and the development would have an unacceptable impact by creating a shortfall in school places. The proposal is contrary to Policy L8 of the Core Strategy, SPD1: Planning Obligations and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. The proposed development does not allow for potential additional infrastructure to be incorporated into the site to enable wider integration and to facilitate future sustainable growth. The proposal is contrary to Policy L3, Policy L4, Policy L7 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(C) That should further information / submissions come forward before the public inquiry is held with the result that any of the matters above are considered capable of resolution via planning condition / S106 that the adjustment of the Council's case accordingly is delegated to the Head of Planning and Development.

Under the discretion of Item C above, officers request that this includes the ability to amend the wording of the recommended Reasons for Refusal, if necessary, as the appeal process continues.

RICHARD ROE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE

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