

# Public Document Pack



**TRAFFORD**  
**COUNCIL**

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

**Date: Thursday, 13 May 2021**

**Time: 6.30 pm**

**Place: Members' Suite, Lancashire County Cricket Club, Talbot Road,  
Manchester M16 0PX (attendance via registration only)**

### **AGENDA**

### **ITEM**

#### **5. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT**

To consider the attached report of the Head of Planning and Development.

**5**

**SARA TODD**  
Chief Executive

#### Membership of the Committee

Councillors A.J. Williams (Chair), B. Hartley (Vice-Chair), Dr. K. Barclay, D. Bunting, T. Carey, M. Cordingley, D. Jerrome, M. Minnis, D. Morgan, K. Procter, E.W. Stennett, S. Thomas and B.G. Winstanley.

#### Further Information

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

Michelle Cody, Governance Officer  
Tel: 0161 912 2775  
Email: [michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

## AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 13<sup>th</sup> May 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="#">101470/FUL/20</a>	Land At The Rear Of 3 Cromwell Road/Edge Lane, Stretford, M32 8GH	Longford	1	✓	
<a href="#">101651/FUL/20</a>	Site Of Former MKM House, Warwick Road Stretford, M16 0XX	Longford	29	✓	✓
<a href="#">102117/FUL/20</a>	Bowdon Lawn Tennis Club, Elcho Road, Bowdon, WA14 2TH	Bowdon	86	✓	✓
<a href="#">102361/HHA/20</a>	37 Tintern Avenue, Flixton, M41 6FH	Flixton	111		✓ Cllr. Walsh
<a href="#">102432/FUL/20</a>	77 Lytham Road, Flixton, M41 6WJ	Davyhulme West	120		✓ Cllr, Carter
<a href="#">103162/HHA/21</a>	9 Wilford Avenue, Sale M33 3TH	Brooklands	131	✓	✓
<a href="#">103666/FUL/21</a>	Stamford Square, Stamford Quarter Shopping Centre, George Street, Altrincham, WA14 1RJ	Altrincham	140		✓

**Page 1**                    **101470/FUL/20: Land At The Rear Of 3 Cromwell Road/Edge Lane, Stretford, M32 8GH**

**SPEAKER(S)**        **AGAINST: Sam Thompson  
(B/h of Neighbours)**

**FOR:**

**Page 29**                    **101651/FUL/20: Site Of Former MKM House Warwick Road, Stretford, M16 0XX**

**SPEAKER(S)**        **AGAINST: Grant Hughes  
(B/h of Neighbours)**

**FOR: Neil Lucas  
(Agent)**

### **APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

The applicant has requested a number of minor amendments to conditions and that a number of other points are clarified.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

Draft Civic Quarter Area Action Plan

For clarification the Draft Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (AAP) is at 'Regulation 19' draft stage and can be afforded considerable weight in the determination of this application, with the exception of Policy CQ11 (Infrastructure and Obligations) which has been the subject of a number of representations.

Crime Prevention and Security

Condition 24 as recommended in the report requires the development to be designed and constructed in accordance with the recommendations and specifications set out in the submitted Crime Impact Statement (CIS). The plans have been amended since the CIS was prepared and so differ to those which GMP originally considered and on which they have based their recommendations. To avoid any potential conflict between the recommendations in the CIS and the submitted plans and to ensure the applicant can comply with the requirement for development to be in accordance with the recommendations in the CIS, an amendment to the condition is proposed that requires submission and approval of an updated CIS and which can then be based on the amended plans.

Amenity Space

Paragraph 86 of the report summarises the proposed external amenity space to be provided for residents. The applicant has highlighted that internal communal

amenity areas would also be provided (comprising a gym on the ground floor and home working lounge/social space on the 12th floor).

### Accessible Parking

Paragraphs 98 and 109 of the report state that 1 accessible car parking space is proposed. The applicant has since advised that 2 accessible parking spaces are in fact proposed. The Council's parking standards for accessible parking are minimum standards, however in the case of residential development no specific standard is required and the guidance states this is to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. As set out in the report, Officers consider that for this scheme 3 accessible spaces would be appropriate and a condition to this effect is recommended. The applicant has confirmed that 3 accessible spaces can be accommodated.

### Cycle Parking

Paragraph 111 of the report states that 104 cycle spaces are proposed, plus two visitor cycle stands at the front of the building. The applicant has clarified that the proposals would provide 104 cycle spaces in total, with 102 internal cycle spaces and two visitor spaces. Condition 10 requiring the provision of the cycle parking is to be amended accordingly.

It is considered that two visitor cycle spaces wouldn't be sufficient given the number of apartments, also taking into account the lack of visitor car parking, and therefore a further amendment to the condition is recommended to require a scheme for visitor cycle spaces to be submitted and agreed rather than specifically require only two spaces in accordance with the submitted plan.

### Flood Risk and Drainage

Condition 14 as recommended in the report requires the submission and approval of a drainage scheme and which shall include provision of a minimum 35.1m<sup>3</sup> of attenuation flood storage on the site to a 1 in 100 year + 40% CC standard. The applicant has advised that this minimum attenuation storage volume is a preliminary assessment and has already been reduced during the design development so flexibility on this requirement is requested. To date however, the applicant hasn't demonstrated that a reduced attenuation flood storage volume would be acceptable and the submitted Drainage Strategy assessed by the LLFA specifically identifies that 35.1m<sup>3</sup> is required, therefore it is considered the condition as drafted and specifying this minimum volume is necessary. In the event a reduced storage volume is proposed the applicant would need to submit an updated Drainage Strategy or further information for consideration and this would require an application to vary the condition.

### Scheme Benefits

The applicant has requested that the benefits that would be secured over and above the extant / implemented permission are made clear. These benefits are

set out in the report at paragraphs 161 to 163. In addition to the benefits identified in the report it is considered that the provision of larger homes than the approved scheme and which are in line with the Nationally Described Space Standard is a further benefit of the scheme.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

As per the report with the following amended conditions:

10. Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development, 102 cycle spaces for residents in accordance with approved drawing no. J477 layout fig 1 – Proposed General Arrangement Plan External and Ground Floor and cycle spaces for visitors in a convenient location close to the building entrance in accordance with a scheme which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be provided. The cycle parking shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory cycle parking provision is made in the interests of promoting sustainable development, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards and Design and the National Planning Policy Framework.

24. No above ground construction works shall take place unless and until an updated Crime Impact Statement has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To reduce the risk of crime and in the interests of the enhancement of community safety pursuant to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and to reflect the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Trafford Council Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Crime and Security'.

**Page 86**                      **102117/FUL/20: Bowdon Lawn Tennis Club**  
**Elcho Road, Bowdon, WA14 2TH**

**SPEAKER(S)**            **AGAINST: Emma Shaw**  
**(B/h of Neighbours)**

**FOR: David Odling**  
**(B/h of Applicant)**

### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM APPLICANT**

The current grassed courts have been included in the description of development and advertised as Nos '10-13 (previously courts 1-4).' The applicant has now confirmed that the correct current numbering for the grassed courts is in fact Nos.

1-4, rather than 10-13, and has submitted an amended plan of the all the tennis courts with correct and final numbering.

The applicant has also forwarded amended plans to account for the removal of tree (T1) adjacent to the Elcho Road entrance, the removal of which has been agreed by the LPA's arborist as per the separate s211 notification, reference 100280/S211/20. [N.B. A S211 notification is the statutory means by which to advise the Local Planning Authority of the intention to fell or carry out works to trees in a conservation area, which are not covered by a Tree Preservation Order. There is no means by which the notification can be 'refused' and if the LPA objects to the works then it must serve a TPO on the affected trees. If acceptable, the LPA can confirm in writing the works are approved, but otherwise after a six week period permission is deemed to be granted].

### **Representation**

An additional comment has been received. This comment raises similar concerns raised by previous objectors including an objection to the removal of the tree T1 adjacent to Elcho Road; the fact that the proposal would result in an unacceptable visual/heritage impact; the proposal would result in an intensification of the site thereby resulting in an unacceptable amenity impact;

the applicant has misled the LHA consultee through claiming no additional parking is required because they are not admitting new members, which is contrary to the Club's latest newsletter stating the contrary;

the advertised site address is incorrect in referring to Elcho Road when this should be Green Walk; and that the applicant does not have the necessary rights of access/legal rights to carry out all of the proposed works.

### **ADDITIONAL OBSERVATION**

#### **Court Numbering**

Officers note that whilst the court numbering in the advertised development description is incorrect, in that it refers to the current grassed courts as Nos. 10-13, this is nevertheless considered to be acceptable because the development description also refers to these courts as formerly Nos. 1-4, and the latter numbering is correct, with several neighbour objections stating the correct numbering was Nos. 1-4. A correct existing court numbering plan has been uploaded to the file on the Council's planning website on 12 May 2021, thereby being made accessible to the public. The location of the courts is clear on the submitted plans. It is not considered any parties have been prejudiced by this change to the court numbering.

#### **Tree Removal**

The tree adjacent to the Elcho Road boundary (T1) has been approved for removal through the separate s211 application, reference 100280/S211/20.

Following this approval the agent has provided amended plans for the current planning application to account for the loss of this tree, as well as an amended tree protection plan which has removed T1.

Officers note that the published Committee report includes a tree protection condition (No. 8) which states that no development or works of site preparation shall take place until all trees to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with the required temporary protective fencing, and this condition would continue to apply to the retained trees.

The arborist has requested that two replacement trees are provided following removal of T1, and the hard and soft landscaping condition shall be amended to explicitly refer to this requirement.

### Representations

Officers note the additional comment largely raises issues which have been addressed though the Committee report. Whilst the Club's postal address may differ from that advertised (which is the address provided for the application) it is clear from the submitted plans and documentation which site the application relates to. Matters regarding land ownership and right of access over land are matters separate to planning permission.

The proposal if approved would not result in the provision of additional facilities such as courts which would require additional parking provision. The club has a natural capacity due to the number of courts and whilst the proposal may allow for a greater amount of court use throughout the year due to the change in surface, the number of courts is as existing. It is therefore not considered necessary to provide additional parking.

The Committee report's Representations section mistakenly refers to a single letter of support which relates to a different application. This should be disregarded. The letter of support has now been removed from the list of documents relating to the current application and added to the correct application.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation is unchanged with the approved plans condition No. 2 amended to reflect the updated plans uploaded to the Council's Planning website on 11 May 2021, and the hard and soft landscaping condition No. 7 amended to require two replacement trees in place of removed tree T1.

### Condition 2 Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, location plan received 26 February 2021; [1453] 03 Rev D, 05 Rev F, 06 Rev D, received 10 March 2021; and 02 Rev I, 04 Rev E, 07 Rev F and 08 Rev E, received 11 May 2021.

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

Condition 7 Hard and Soft Landscaping

a) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use 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 the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks, boundary treatments, materials for all hard surfaced areas planting plans (including two replacement trees in place of the removed tree T1 adjacent to the Elcho Road boundary), 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 111                    102361/HHA/20: 37 Tintern Avenue, Flixton, M41 6FH**

**SPEAKER(S)            AGAINST:**

**FOR:            Bhavesh Varsani  
                         (Applicant)  
                         Councillor Walsh**

**Page 120                    102432/FUL/20: 77 Lytham Road, Flixton, M41 6WJ**

**SPEAKER(S)            AGAINST:**

**FOR:            Colette O'keefe  
                         (Applicant)  
                         Councillor Carter**

## **BACKGROUND**

The proposed description has been amended with the applicant's agreement to: *Erection of an outbuilding within rear garden to provide a Beauty Salon (part-retrospective).*

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

One objection has been received in relation to this application since the Committee report was published. No address was given by the objector. The concerns are summarised as follows:

- Inaccuracies with planning application
  - Proposal description states change of use but the outbuilding is very recent
  - Plans described it as 'existing' this is wrong as it is a new building
  - Application form states that "existing WC connects to local drain" but WC is not existing as it's a new building
  - Drains should be shown on plan
  - No Design and Access Statement available to view, although box ticked in application form
  - Agent has stated it cannot be seen from public domain, this is wrong
- Residential amenity
  - The hours of opening are too long when a business is in the middle of a housing estate in a back garden.
  - It is proposing to open on a weekend also.
  - With visitor's cars and all comings and goings for the business, the neighbouring houses and residents should not have to endure the disturbance on a weekend and late into an evening as I am sure customers will call after their work hours which could be standard type working hours.
  - Too much disturbance could occur.
- Traffic and parking issues – all parking will be on-street and it is a busy road
- As a new shop [beauty salon] it must provide access for people and customers who have to get to the building from the public footpath from bus, taxi, car and on foot
- The proposal currently discriminates against disabled persons
- Waste
  - Applicant has stated no trade waste to dispose of
  - It is illegal to put business waste into domestic waste bins or local refuse tip
  - The services will have human nails, skin, hair etc and this should be classed as such and be disposed of by a legal method, not as this proposal states it will
  - Chemicals and foul water will arise from the processes
- The outbuilding does not satisfy building regulations as it is timber clad and positioned close to the boundary



**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Louisa Fielden  
(Agent)**

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Greater Manchester Police Design for Security** – No objections to the proposals

**Trafford Council Pollution and Licensing (Nuisance)** – No objections, subject to conditions in relation to a 1 year permission, hours of use/operation, and a Noise Management Plan (NMP).

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society have withdrawn their request to speak against the application at the meeting, since meeting with interested parties. Additional comments were made and are summarised as follows:

- Their major concerns were with the licencing application which asked for much later hours than the planning application
- There is already noise nuisance with the present operator in the Square and local residents.
- Temporary toilets are welcomed.
- Maintain concern with regard to access to and from the Interchange especially for the disabled and whether the new surface will work.
- The thousands of information leaflets do not seem to have been delivered and this is being investigated.
- Lighting is inadequate and the area feels unsafe at night.

Two letters of objection have been received in relation to this application, since the Committee Report was published. The concerns are summarised as follows:

- Pedestrian access
  - a clear pathway across or around the space must be established and clearly marked
  - Limited width of space left for pedestrians (3 metres), particular hazard for those who are wheelchair users, have visual impairments or mobility issues
- Trip hazard and uncomfortable to walk on artificial grass
- Waste will substantially increase – a waste management plan should be published in advance
- Noise from amplified music or speech could impact on local residents
- Structures will be an attraction to vandalism – is CCTV in the area?
- The removed planters must be replaced at the end of the planned period

- The proposals may encourage drinking of alcohol elsewhere within town centre, which is currently controlled via a PSPO – this must be tightly controlled
- Toilets recently placed on Stamford Street are unattractive and better signage is required from Stamford Square
- Lighting could be improved
- Furniture (bean bags and deck chairs) requires a management plan
- If ball games are provided, adequate protection is required to prevent balls from going down the slope towards the Interchange
- Hours of operation include school hours but it is focused on families, children and teenagers
- What happens to site outside hours of operation
- Already more than enough food and beverage vendors in Altrincham
- The planning applications mentions 'solar panels' to power the temporary facility; just where are these to be located?

A number of conditions have also been recommended as part of the objection letter, which are in relation to: clear public access routes; CCTV; reinstatement of current status after use period; waste management plan; management of alcohol consumption; toilets; nuisance [noise] plan; furniture should be made safe and secure after events; safety around the slope to Stamford New Road is addressed and managed.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### **Residential amenity**

The Pollution and Licensing team have reviewed the proposals and raised no objection subject to conditions. Two of the three conditions are already recommended as per the Officer's report, however the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) also recommended a condition requiring a Noise Management Plan (NMP) to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. However, it is considered that given the proposed hours of use, which would be no later than 7pm on the latest days (Thursday to Saturday) and its town centre location, that this condition is not necessary. Public representations have been duly noted in this assessment. The proposed temporary change of use is considered in line with policy L7 of the Core Strategy, subject to the conditions recommended as per Committee Report.

### **Crime & Security**

Greater Manchester Police: Design for Security have reviewed the application and have not raised any objections and provided informal advice to the applicant in relation to sight lines, CCTV and lighting. It is therefore recommended that an informative added to any permission would be acceptable.

## **Other matters**

The proposals include festoon lighting within the artist's impression, which would increase the lighting of this area. Furthermore, appropriate lighting has been advised by GMP Design for Security and is recommended as an informative with any permission.

In relation to solar panels, the submission advised that solar festoon lighting would be utilised and solar panels to power the temporary facilities where possible. The solar panels used to operate the lighting are small scale and battery operated. A range of solar panels are available, which could be suitably placed on temporary structures.

The representations have not raised any other material considerations that have not already been considered within the Officers report.

## **CONCLUSION**

The additional information does not alter the Officer's recommendation to grant permission subject conditions, as detailed within the Committee Report.

**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**