

## AGENDA ITEM 5

### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> December 2021

#### 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
<a href="#">104577</a>	Land Adjacent To Market Hall, Railway Road, Urmston, M41 0XL	Urmston	1		✓
<a href="#">105250</a>	56 Barrington Road, Altrincham, WA14 1HY	Altrincham	41		
<a href="#">105350</a>	35 Graysands Road, Hale, WA15 8SB	Hale Central	55	Cllr. Mrs. Young	✓
<a href="#">105540</a>	95 Derwent Road, Flixton, M41 8UJ	Flixton	68	✓	
<a href="#">105662</a>	119 Park Road, Timperley, WA15 6QQ	Timperley	77	✓	✓
<a href="#">106219</a>	26 Grangethorpe Road Urmston, M41 9HT	Urmston	103		

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Paul Carr  
(Agent)**

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Two objections have been received since the report was completed which are summarised below.

- Re-iteration of concerns that the development will exacerbate traffic and noise issues for local residents in the area and states that these issues have worsened since the application was first made.
- Concerns regarding the accessibility of the development, particularly for wheelchair/scooter users, older people with mobility difficulties and parents with buggies/ prams and specifically in relation to access and egress to the site, size and number of lifts, mix of tables and chairs in terms of height style and location.
- That Trafford Council should adopt best practice rather than simply complying with minimum legal standards and should not grant planning permission for this development without being assured that accessibility will be integral consideration from the outset and will permeate all aspects of the scheme.

Two comments of support have been submitted since the report was completed stating the site has been left for a number of years, is in a central location with easy access to public transport, will bring the community together and show visitors what the town has to offer.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

At para 3 of the report reference to R5 should be replaced with W2 so that the sentence reads *'Policies L4, L7 and W2 of the Core Strategy are consistent with the NPPF and therefore considered to be up-to-date.'*

It is considered that the issues raised in the representations received since the report was completed are addressed within the main Committee Report. With specific reference to the accessibility issues raised, the applicant was asked to clarify the approach to accessibility during the consideration of the application and the outcome of this is covered in the 'Equalities' section of the main report. It is also of relevance that the development, if approved, will also need to comply with the relevant Building Regulations (Statutory Guidance Document Part M) in relation to 'Access to and use of buildings'.

**ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS**

With regard to equalities, in respect of access for those with disabilities, Building Control were consulted on this application and have confirmed that the proposed basement flat conversion would satisfy the functional requirements of the Building Regulations.

They further note that the proposal would be treated as a change of use under Building Regulations, which limits full compliance being applied. For non-new build residential properties, Building Regulations do not require level or ramped access and therefore stepped access would be permitted in this instance.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation of approval is unchanged.

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST: Councillor Mrs. Young**

**FOR: Toby Tayler  
(Agent)**

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST: Kyle Bailey  
(Neighbour)**

**Statement read out only**

**FOR:**

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Following the publication of the committee agenda one further objection has been received from a previous objector:

99 Derwent Road - The objection reiterates previous concerns that have already been noted and considered in the main committee report. Additional grounds for concern noted in the objection are that they cannot understand how and why the details on the original plans have been ignored; and that the structure could be used to house a business or dwelling.

**OBSERVATIONS**

The wording within previously recommended proposal section is partially incorrect. It did read “The maximum height of the proposed amended

*development has also been confirmed by the agent to be 2.8m and thereby only 100mm higher than the extant permission".* In fact, the maximum height of the proposed amended development has been confirmed by the agent to be the same height as previously approved. The height of the previously approved building was indicated within the Officer's Report to be 2.7m in height but, in fact, this was measured from the damp proof course so the overall height from the original ground level would have been approximately 2.9m. Whilst the external ground level and floor level of the building have been slightly raised in comparison with the approved scheme, amended plans have been submitted showing the proposed maximum height of the building as 2.87m from the original ground level. To achieve this, it is proposed to alter the "as built" structure by removing the existing top course of blockwork and constructing the fascia immediately above the level of the door and window on the front elevation whereas previously a gap was proposed below the fascia. As a result, the overall height of the building from the original ground level would be no greater than the existing.

Notwithstanding the above, it has come to the attention of Officers that the site location plan submitted with the application shows a different site boundary from that shown on a copy of the land registry plan also submitted by the applicant during the course of the application and from the boundary shown on other recent planning applications relating to 95 Derwent Road. Certificate A has been submitted with the application confirming that the applicant is the sole owner of the land to which the application relates. However, having regard to these discrepancies, it is considered that further investigation and discussion with the applicant is required in order to clarify whether the red edged site boundary and the ownership certificate are correct. It is therefore recommended that the application is deferred in order to allow this matter to be investigated further.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the application is **DEFERRED** in order to allow further investigation in relation to whether the red edged site boundary and the ownership certificate are correct.

**Page 77**                      **105662/FUL/21: 119 Park Road, Timperley**

**SPEAKER(S)**            **AGAINST: Colin Harvey  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:                      Jamie Hanson  
(Agent)**

### **PROPOSAL**

In order to clarify the development proposal, the first paragraph of this section of amended as follows:

“Permission is sought for the conversion of 119 Park Road into residential use (1 no. dwelling) together with the erection of 2 no. pairs of 3 storey semi-detached dwellings on land at the rear of the site following demolition of the existing bungalow. Accommodation at third floor level is to be provided within the roofspace.”

Updated plans have been received to correct inconsistencies in the submitted amended scheme, although the development proposal remains the same.

Landscaping and obscure glazing conditions have been updated to change the maintenance period for the lifetime of the development and reflect the recommendations within the committee report.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

A further letter of objection has been received from the owner/occupier of 8 Ennerdale Drive. The points raised are summarised below:

- 3 minutes allocated to speakers is insufficient time;
- The gable wall of Plot 1 is too close to the gable wall of 8 Ennerdale Drive which relies on light into the living lounge area from its French doors. The Committee report is incorrect by stating that the lounge has windows to the rear;
- The distance between the houses is less than 13 metres which contravenes Council guidelines, creating light and privacy problems;
- It has been suggested numerous times to the developers and Council that the new plots be moved forward by 6m in order to reduce the impact on neighbours. The restriction of maintaining the existing ‘housing line’ is preventing a more universally acceptable scheme;
- Side elevation windows should be obscure glazed and fixed shut;
- Developers had agreed to move the bins and sheds away from the boundary however this isn’t reflected on the drawings;
- The landowner has declined to respond to ownership of the boundary wall between plot 1 and 8 Ennerdale Drive.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### **DESIGN, IMPACT ON NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSET AND CHARACTER OF THE STREET SCENE**

#### **Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Asset**

Paragraph 16.

Replace with “As well as the proposed changes summarised above, the proposed development would also result in the demolition of the existing outbuildings associated with 119 Park Road, namely the bungalow at 119A and the detached double garage to the rear of 119. The bungalow is owned by the medical centre and has been rented out. Although currently occupied, the tenants

lease has now ended and it is understood the property is to be vacated this week.”

## RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The issues raised in the additional representation received are already addressed in the main report and do not alter the recommendation.

The representation from 8 Ennerdale Drive states that there a requirement to maintain 13m between the gable of Plot 1 and their facing gable in relation to light and privacy. The impact of the development is assessed within paragraph 35 of the report.

To clarify the point made regarding the facing windows being of a secondary nature; the property has benefitted from a two storey side extension. At ground floor there is a living room extending the full length of the property with a large, principal window on the front elevation and French doors leading out to the side of the property. A window at the rear serves a utility room (this information is taken from the floorplans of their previous planning application). The French doors, whilst providing additional light to this long room, are not the main window serving it, which is located to the front.

At first floor, there is a bedroom with dressing room and en-suite. The main bedroom window is to the front of the property, a second, smaller window on the side and a further window to the en-suite at the rear. As there are no principal, habitable room windows on the side gable facing the application site and no habitable room windows in the facing elevation of the proposed development, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the guidelines as set out in PG1.

As mentioned within paragraph 70 of the committee report, discussions between the developer and neighbours do not form part of this application and it is the submitted plans within the application that are to be considered. The position of the bins and shed are considered to be acceptable as is the position of the new dwellings in relation to neighbouring residents and the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. Pushing the properties closer to the existing building at 119 Park Road would further impact on the setting of this property and reduce the amount of space for planting within the scheme.

Condition 14 already sets out the requirement for the proposed bathroom windows to be fitted with obscure glazing and non-opening lights.

## HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

Paragraph 51 to be amended as follows:

It is proposed to provide the single dwelling with three spaces, with the site plan indicating sufficient internal space will be provided to the front of the building to accommodate additional parking if required. Each of the proposed four new build dwellings will have access to two spaces directly fronting their property with a

further four spaces provided in a separate parking area opposite the houses. It is understood the four spaces will be for communal use. Balancing the car parking provision with the ratio of hard to soft landscaping and the impact on the setting of the non-designated heritage asset, and also having regard to the accessibility of this site, it is considered that the car parking provision is acceptable.

## ECOLOGY, BIODIVERSITY AND LANDSCAPING

### Paragraph 60

Add the following sentence:

A total of 21 trees are proposed in the submitted planting scheme to mitigate the loss of existing trees.

## EQUALITIES

Paragraphs 76 and 77 to be replaced as follows:

76. Case law has established that appropriate consideration of equality issues is a requirement for local authorities in the determination of planning applications, and with this requirement directly stemming from the Equality Act 2010. The applicant has confirmed that the dwellings will comply with the Building Regulations Part M 4(1) (Visitable dwellings) which requires that reasonable provision should be made for people, including wheelchair users, to gain access to and use the dwelling and its facilities. Consideration is also given to the impact of the loss of the established GP practice on neighbouring residents that are currently registered here. As mentioned earlier in this report, the GP practice is to be relocated to the new library development in the centre of Timperley (ref 93987/FUL/18) and the loss of the existing practice is already established. Notwithstanding this, the new medical centre would be less than 1 mile and approximately 15 minutes walking distance from the application site. The new medical practice is also accessible by bus from Park Road involving just a short walk from the bus stops at either end.

77. Having regard to these material considerations, it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in this respect. Whilst some disadvantages of the scheme, namely the relocation of the existing medical practice have been identified it is considered that the new facility would remain accessible to all and there would therefore be no discrimination on these grounds. As such, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable with regard to Policy L7 of the Core Strategy.

## RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged however condition 2 is amended to reflect the updated revised plans, condition 7 is updated to amend the period of the landscape maintenance to the lifetime of the development and condition 14 is amended to include the study windows to Plots 1 and 2 as per the recommendations within the report.

These amended conditions are shown in full below.

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the amended plans, numbers:

- 3006-PL-0101-A
- 3006-PL-0600-I
- 3006-PL-0601-F
- 3006-PL-0602-D
- 3006-PL-0605-B
- 3006-PL-0606-B
- 3007-PL-0701-A
- 3006-PL-0702-A
- 3006-PL-0700-E
- 3006-PL-0801-D
- 01 F
- 02 B

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and protecting the character of the area having regard to Policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a schedule of landscape maintenance for the lifetime of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

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, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) upon first installation ground floor utility and first floor bathroom windows in the side elevations of Plots 1 to 4 and the first floor rear study windows to Plots 1 and 2 shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.



**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**