



**TRAFFORD
COUNCIL**

**AGENDA PAPERS FOR
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date: Wednesday, 9 July 2014

Time: 6.30 pm

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

A G E N D A

ITEM

1. ATTENDANCES

To note attendances, including Officers and any apologies for absence.

2. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

To note the membership, including Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson, of the Planning Development Control Committee for the Municipal Year 2014/2015, as agreed by Council on 11th June, 2014.

2

3. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee is asked to appoint the Planning Development Control (Tree Preservation Order) Sub-Committee comprising the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson or their nominees for the Municipal Year 2014/2015.

4. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee is asked to appoint the Town/Village Green Sub-Committee comprising the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson or their nominees for the Municipal Year 2014/2015.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE

To note the terms of reference for the Planning Development Control Committee.

5

6. MEETING DATES

To note the following scheduled meeting dates for the Committee during the 2014/2015 Municipal Year, as agreed by Council on 11th June, 2014.

14th August, 2014
11th September, 2014
9th October, 2014
13th November, 2014
11th December, 2014
8th January, 2015
12th February, 2015
12th March, 2015
9th April, 2015
14th May, 2015

7. MINUTES

To receive and, if so determined, to approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 5th June, 2014.

To Follow

8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

To consider a report of the Head of Planning Services, to be tabled at the meeting.

9. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP ETC.

To consider the attached reports of the Head of Planning Services.

9

10. URGENT BUSINESS (IF ANY)

Any other item or items which by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered at this meeting as a matter of urgency.

THERESA GRANT

Chief Executive

Membership of the Committee

Councillors Mrs. V. Ward (Chairman), D. Bunting (Vice-Chairman), Dr. K. Barclay, R Chilton, N. Evans, T. Fishwick, P. Gratrix, D. O'Sullivan, B. Sharp, J. Smith, E.W. Stennett, L. Walsh and M. Whetton

Further Information

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

Michelle Cody, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 0161 912 2775

Email: michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 1 July 2014** by the Legal and Democratic Services Section, Trafford Council, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford M32 0TH.

Agenda Item 2

TRAFFORD COUNCIL

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES 2014/15

Note on Membership: It is advisable that the number of members serving on both the Planning Development Control and Licensing Committees in each political group is kept to a minimum to ensure that the potential for conflicts of interest is kept to a minimum.

COMMITTEE		NO. OF MEMBERS
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL		13 (plus 7 Substitutes)
CONSERVATIVE GROUP	LABOUR GROUP	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP
Councillors:-	Councillors:-	Councillors:-
Dr. Karen Barclay Daniel Bunting V-CH Rob Chilton Nathan Evans Bernard Sharp Mrs. Viv Ward CH Michael Whetton	Philip Gratrix Dolores O'Sullivan John Smith Whit Stennett Laurence Walsh OS	Tony Fishwick
TOTAL	7	5
		1

Substitute Members:

Mrs. Pamela Dixon
Brian Rigby
Matthew Sephton
Brian Shaw

(4)

Catherine Hynes
Denise Western

(2)

Mrs. Jane Brophy

(1)

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Terms of Reference

1. To exercise powers in relation to planning and development control over development proposals in the Borough in the context of Government and Council policies and guidance in order to maintain and improve the quality of life and the natural and built environment of the Borough.
2. To exercise powers in relation to the following functions as specified in schedule 1 to the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000:
 - (i) town and country planning and development control;
 - (ii) the registration of common land or town and village greens and to register the variation of rights of common; and
 - (iii) the exercise of powers relating to the regulation of the use of highways.

Delegation

In exercising the power and duties assigned to them in their terms of reference, the Planning Development Control Committee shall have delegated power to resolve and to act on behalf of and in the name of the Council.

This page is intentionally left blank



PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 9th JULY 2014

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC.

PURPOSE

To consider applications for planning permission and related matters to be determined by the Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As set out in the individual reports attached.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None unless specified in an individual report.

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

None unless specified in an individual report.

PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

None unless specified in an individual report.

Further information from: Mr. Rob Haslam, Head of Planning Services
Proper Officer for the purposes of the L.G.A. 1972, s.100D (Background papers): Mr. Rob Haslam, Head of Planning Services

Background Papers:

In preparing the reports on this agenda the following documents have been used:

1. The Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy.
2. The GM Joint Waste Development Plan Document.
3. The GM Joint Minerals Development Plan Document.
4. The Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (2006).
5. Supplementary Planning Documents specifically referred to in the reports.
6. Government advice (National Planning Policy Framework, Circulars, practice guidance etc.).
7. The application file (as per the number at the head of each report).
8. The forms, plans, committee reports and decisions as appropriate for the historic applications specifically referred to in the reports.
9. Any additional information specifically referred to in each report.

These Background Documents are available for inspection at Planning and Building Control, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, Manchester M32 0TH.

TRAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 9th July 2014

Report of the Head of Planning Services

INDEX OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOPMENT etc. PLACED ON THE AGENDA FOR DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE

Applications for Planning Permission				
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Recommendation
71614	158 Broad Road, Sale, M33 2FY	Sale Moor	1	Grant
74382	130a Flixton Road, Urmston, M41 5BG	Urmston	17	Minded to Grant
77850	122 Seymour Grove, Old Trafford, M16 0FF	Longford	29	Grant
81735	Land to the north of Dartford Road, Urmston, M41 9DE	Urmston	31	Grant
81768	21 Little Ees Lane, Sale, M33 5GT	Ashton on Mersey	38	Grant
81952	Land adjacent to the Manchester Ship Canal M60 and Trafford Boulevard	Davyhulme East	48	Grant
81973	Clay Lane Nurseries, Clay Lane/Thorley Lane, Timperley, WA15 7AF	Hale Barns	64	Refuse
82046	Former Kratos site, Mercury Way, Davyhulme, M41 7BZ	Davyhulme East	76	Grant
82214	Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ	Stretford	79	Refuse
82243	Hillside, 4 The Springs, Bowdon, WA14 3JH	Bowdon	90	Grant
82313	Central Island of Junction 10, M60/Trafford Boulevard, Barton Road, Trafford Park, M41 7JE	Davyhulme East	97	Grant
82644	46 Hermitage Road, Hale, WA15 8BW	Hale Central	104	Grant

WARD: Sale Moor

H/71614

DEPARTURE: No

CONVERSION OF EXISTING DWELLINGHOUSE TO PROVIDE 4 NO. TWO BEDROOM APARTMENTS AND 1 NO. ONE BEDROOM APARTMENT WITH ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO ALL ELEVATIONS, INCLUDING INSERTION OF NEW WINDOWS AND CREATION OF BASEMENT LIGHTWELLS. CREATION OF CAR PARKING FOR FIVE VEHICLES AND ERECTION OF NEW BIN STORE ENCLOSURE.

158 Broad Road, Sale, M33 2FY

APPLICANT: Beckhall

AGENT: N/A

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

This application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee meeting on the 13th August 2009 where Members resolved to approve the application, subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement to secure a contribution of £8,596.01 towards outdoor sports and play facilities in accordance with the Council's SPG 'Informal/Children's Playing Space and Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision and Commuted Sums' and £1,175.00 towards off-site tree planting in accordance with the Council's SPG 'Developer Contributions towards Red Rose Forest'.

After receiving the minded to grant resolution the applicant did not pursue the section 106, however after being contacted by the Local Planning Authority earlier this year they have now advised that they want to see the application through to a conclusion.

Given the amount of time that has passed since the application was considered by the Planning Development Control Committee it is necessary to revisit the proposal in order to determine whether there have been any changes on site and/or in the planning policy framework that would result in the Local Planning Authority making a different recommendation on the application. This will be done in the observations section below.

Councillor Freeman has requested that this application be determined by the Planning Development Control Committee for the reasons set out within the report.

SITE

This application relates to 158 Broad Road in Sale, which forms the left hand portion of a pair of three storey Victorian properties located on the southern side of Broad Road. The property, which is currently rented as a single dwelling, has a tarmaced driveway capable of accommodating 2 cars, together with a reasonable sized side/rear garden.

There are a number of trees on site, including a mature copper beech tree and two semi mature limes within the front garden area, which are protected by Tree Preservation Order No. 61.

The application site is located within a predominantly residential area being bounded on all sides by residential properties in a variety of styles.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks consent to convert the property into 5 apartments; four two bed apartments and one 1 bed apartment. Accommodation would be provided over all 4 levels of the building including the basement, with both duplex apartments and single level apartments being provided.

In order to facilitate the conversion it is proposed to introduce a series of lightwells at the front, side and rear of the building in order to provide light and a recessed seating area for the two flats with accommodation in the basement. The lightwells would be enclosed using railings.

It is also proposed to undertake a number of minor alterations to the building. The proposed works include; the introduction of two new windows on the side elevation at basement level and the modification of a door at basement level to provide another window; the introduction of two first floor obscurely glazed windows in the side elevation; the modification of an existing first floor window opening in the side elevation; the bricking up of a door in the side elevation; the introduction of a set of patio doors at basement level of the rear outrigger; the removal of a door and a ground floor window in the rear of the outrigger and their replacement with a set of double doors with a Juliet balcony; the introduction of a new first floor window in the rear elevation of the two storey outrigger; and the insertion of velux rooflights in the front and rear roof of the main dwelling and the roof of the outrigger.

A parking court containing 6 spaces would be created at the front of the building. Access to the parking would be via the existing access point off Broad Road, which would be widened to 4.5m in order to allow simultaneous access and egress to the site. A separate pedestrian access would be created from Broad Road in order to avoid pedestrian and vehicular conflict.

A bin store will be provided to the side of the property, behind the proposed car parking spaces. Cycle parking would also be provided.

The rear and side garden will be retained and landscaped in order to provide an area of communal amenity space for future residents.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- **The Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF)

development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.

- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes

L2 – Meeting Housing Needs

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L5 – Climate Change

L7 – Design

L8 – Planning obligations

R2 – Natural Environment

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/OUT/59828 - Retention and conversion of existing pair of houses at 156 to 158 Broad Road and erection of three-storey extensions to form 17 apartments. Provision of basement parking for 18 cars and surface parking for 7 cars (total 25 cars). Retention of existing vehicular accesses to Broad Road. Provision of amenity space and landscaping of site – Refused 01/10/2004.

H/58303 - Demolition of existing buildings at 156 and 158 Broad Road and erection of a 3-storey block of 17 apartments. Provision of basement parking for 15 cars and surface parking for 10 cars (total 25 parking spaces). Closure of existing vehicular

access and alterations to one vehicular access to Broad Road – Refused on appeal 19/05/2005

H/56940 - Demolition of existing buildings at 156 and 158 Broad Road and erection of a four-storey block of 25 apartments. Provision of basement parking for 18 cars and surface parking for 17 (total 35 spaces). Retention of one and alteration to one vehicular access to Broad Road – Withdrawn from consideration 14/10/2003

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement which is summarised below:

- The existing building envelope is unchanged other than adaptations to windows etc. allowing the architectural character and the streetscape to be retained;
- The addition of lightwells will provide a good level of natural light, views out for the basement apartments;
- External parking has been laid out to the front and use of bound gravel will provide a quality and subtle appearance to this area;
- Parking is well set back from the side boundary with planting in between to limit impact upon the neighbours;
- The level of parking is felt to be appropriate for this location and apartment size, balancing the needs of residents with the desire to limit areas of hardsurfacing.

CONSULTATIONS

The responses below were received in response to the original consultation on the application –

Built Environment: Recommend standard drainage conditions

LHA: Advised that in order to meet the Council's parking standards the provision of 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit is required, however in this case they confirm that they will accept the provision of 1 car parking space per residential unit and therefore the provision of five spaces is acceptable.

Expressed initial concerns of the proposed parking layout and access, but after having received amended plans the LHA confirmed that the revisions had addressed their concerns re maneuvering space and width of the vehicular access and consequently they confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal.

Renewal and Environmental Protection: No objection.

Housing Standards: The conversion constitutes over occupation as some kitchens and bedrooms are extremely small and do not meet minimum room size requirements. If these undersized rooms proved unworkable due to their size, action could be taken by the Council in future to rectify this.

All parties originally consulted on the application were re-consulted in February 2014.

The following additional consultee comments have been received –

Pollution and licensing – Confirm that they have no objections to the proposal

LHA – Raised an initial objection regarding both the level and layout of parking.

Amended plans have been submitted in response to the initial objections and the Highway's officer has now confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal on highway grounds – adequate parking, appropriate vehicular and pedestrian access and suitable manoeuvring space would be provided.

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Freeman has requested that the application is referred to the Planning Committee for a decision in order that Members of the Committee can consider the issues raised by neighbouring residents in relation to the over-development of the site, the lack of on-site parking and the impact the additional traffic flow generated from the development will have on the highway network, the loss of an existing dwelling and the fact that the additional flats are not required in Sale as there is an existing over-supply of flats and the impact the scheme would have on the trees on site.

Neighbours

16 letters of objection, from 16 different addresses, were received in response to the initial neighbor consultation on the application. The main points raised by the objectors were noted in the report to committee as:

- Still feel development represents overdevelopment of the site, given the number of flats proposed;
- Residents of Old Hall Road and visitors to local shops already park on-street making it difficult for residents to access driveways and causing highway safety problems and a danger to children walking to nearby schools/nurseries. The proposal will only exacerbate this;
- This part of Broad Road is populated by large family houses, a 5 block apartment is completely out of character and the property should be retained as a large Victorian family home;
- The Broad Road/Old Hall Road junction is already busy and at morning rush hour is almost gridlocked, the proposal will only increase traffic;
- Development represents pure greed of developer making maximum profit with the least consideration for local residents;
- Proposal will result in additional noise from vehicles arriving and leaving the premises;
- Development will result in greater overlooking to neighboring properties;
- The property is not vacant as stated on the application form, but has recently been refurbished and is currently rented out to several people. Property is also currently being marketed for sale at an over inflated price;
- Size of second bedrooms seems disproportionate and no thought has been given to disabled access to the property;

- There are many properties in Sale available to rent or buy and we feel that this development would only add to the oversupply of flats when family houses are needed;
- The tree survey shows trees on both 156 and 158 Broad Road. This reflects previous proposals for the site and is out of date.

In addition to the 16 letters of objection a further letter was received in response to the original neighbor consultation from a local resident who did not object to the application, requesting that the two lime trees on the common boundary with no. 160 are removed as they are affecting the foundations of adjoining properties.

All neighbours originally notified of the application were re-consulted in February 2014.

6 letters of representation have been received in response to the re-consultation letter; all from households that had objected to the original consultation. The following issues have been raised –

- There is an oversupply of flats within Sale, with many flats in the area lying vacant
- The failure of the developer to proceed in a timely manner has resulted in the property falling into a state of disrepair, resulting in neighbouring residents experiencing problems in selling their houses
- Inadequate parking would be provided for the proposed apartments and any visitors – there are existing issues with on street parking in this area, which the proposal will exacerbate, giving rise to an increased chance of accidents, particularly at the busy Broad Road/Old Hall Road junction. The existing parking problems will be made even worse once the Metrolink park and ride facility is completed.
- The proposal will change the nature, use and look of a single family dwelling, creating a development that will be out of place in this area of Broad Road – apartments are more likely to attract professional individuals as opposed to families, thereby changing the dynamic of a family orientated area.
- The conversion of large properties such as this is reducing the number of large family homes in the area.

One of those writing in requests that the resolution of Committee to attach an additional condition for soundproofing between the application property and 156 Broad Road is carried forward should officers still be minded to approve the application.

Several of those writing in response to the re-consultation had objected previously, requesting in their most recent letters that the concerns that they raised previously are taken into account when a decision is being made on the application.

All neighbours and objectors were notified of amended plans on the 15th May 2014 being given 10 days to submit any additional comments.

One additional letter of representation has been received. The writer reiterates their concerns with the proposal and highlights a number of statements within the

applicant's submission which they feel are inaccurate namely those relating to the in-occupation of the dwelling, the impact upon the trees and the fact that the elevations do not accurately show the extension at 156 Broad Road

OBSERVATIONS

CHANGES ON SITE

1. Since the application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in August 2009 there have been no changes in the circumstances on or within the vicinity of the application site that would result in the Local Planning Authority coming to a different view on acceptability.

CHANGES IN THE PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

2. Since the application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in August 2009 the planning policy framework has changed in a number of ways.
3. At the National Level the National Planning Policy Framework was published on the 27 March 2012.
4. At the regional level the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West has been revoked.
5. At the local level the Trafford Core Strategy was adopted on the 25th January 2014, partially superseding the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
6. The following supplementary Planning Documents are also relevant –

SPD1 – Planning Obligations

SPD3 – Parking Standards and Design

7. The revisions to planning policy have not altered the approach toward this type of development in this location and consequently it is not considered that the revisions to the planning policy framework would result in a different view on acceptability. However, for completeness and the avoidance of doubt the initial report to Committee has been updated in the light of the current planning policy framework, with an assessment of why the development is still in accordance with the planning policy framework being set out below -

PRINCIPLE

8. Under the current planning policy framework the principle of schemes involving new residential development are considered against policies L1 and L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF advises that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.
10. Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, which relates to Land for New Homes, sets an indicative 80% target proportion of new housing provision to use brownfield land and buildings over the Plan period. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy, which is entitled "Meeting Housing Needs", states that all new residential development proposals will be assessed for the contribution that will be made to meeting the housing needs of the Borough and the wider aspirations of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy. It requires new development to be (a) On a site of sufficient size to accommodate adequately the proposed use and all necessary ancillary facilities for prospective residents; (b) Appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to the social infrastructure (schools, health facilities, leisure and retail facilities) to ensure the sustainability of the development; (c) Not harmful to the character or amenity of the immediately surrounding area and; (d) To be in accordance with L7 and other relevant policies within the Development Plan for Trafford.
11. The application site is currently in use as a single family dwelling. The proposal involves the conversion and re-use of the existing unit, with minor alterations being proposed to allow conversion of the property into four 2 bed apartments and one 1 bed apartment. Having regard to this and the fact that the application site is considered to be located within an accessible location being sited within walking distance to Northenden Road which provides access to a number of bus routes, close to the proposed metrolink stop for Sale Water Park/Northern Moor and within a reasonable distance to Sale Moor District Centre and Sale Town Centre it is considered that subject to the development being acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character of the area, neighbouring properties and highway safety the principle of converting the property into 5 self-contained flats is acceptable and in accordance with the NPPF and the Core Strategy – the proposal would provide additional residential accommodation and contribute towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough by diversifying the mix of property types within the locality.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

12. Under the current planning policy framework the acceptability of the proposal in visual amenity terms is assessed against policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to design and the design policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
13. One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future

occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17). Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment - good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

14. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states that in considering applications for development within the Borough, the Council will determine whether or not the proposed development meets the standards set in national guidelines and the requirements of Policy L7. The relevant extracts of Policy L7 require that development is appropriate in its context; makes best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, layout, elevation treatment, materials, landscaping; and is compatible with the surrounding area.
15. In order to facilitate the proposed conversion a series of lightwells would be installed at the front, side and rear of the building in order to provide light and a recessed seating area for the two flats with accommodation in the basement. The lightwells would be enclosed using railings.
16. It is also proposed to undertake a number of minor alterations to the building. The proposed works include; the introduction of two new windows on the side elevation at basement level and the modification of a door at basement level to provide another window; the introduction of two first floor obscurely glazed windows in the side elevation; the modification of an existing first floor window opening in the side elevation; the bricking up of a door in the side elevation; the introduction of a set of patio doors at basement level of the rear outrigger; the removal of a door and a ground floor window in the rear of the outrigger and their replacement with a set of double doors with a Juliet balcony; the introduction of a new first floor window in the rear elevation of the two storey outrigger; and the insertion of velux rooflights in the front and rear roof of the main dwelling and the roof of the outrigger.
17. Having regard to the minor nature of the external alterations that would be undertaken to facilitate the conversion of the building and the fact that the alterations would be carried out using materials that match those used in the construction of the existing building it is not considered that the proposed alterations to the elevations and the introduction of the lightwells would detract from the character of the building, nor would they have an adverse impact upon the visual amenities of the area generally.
18. A parking court would be created at the front of the building. Access to the parking would be via the existing access point off Broad Road, which would be widened to 4.5m in order to allow simultaneous access and egress to the site. A separate pedestrian access would be created from Broad Road in order to avoid pedestrian and vehicular conflict. A bin store will be provided to the side of the property, behind the car parking spaces.

19. In terms of the creation of an area of car parking and the introduction of a bin storage unit to the front of the building there are a number of protected trees along the front boundary of the site and there is also additional tree and shrub planting running along the front portion of the sites eastern and western boundaries. The majority of the existing trees and landscaping along the site's boundaries would be retained and added to as part of the proposed development. Consequently, subject to the use of appropriate materials, which can be secured via condition, it is considered that the introduction of the proposed parking court and bin storage area would not detract from the streetscene or character of the area generally – the landscaping would provide adequate screening and soften the impact of the car park.
20. For these reasons, subject to the attachment of conditions to ensure the use of satisfactory materials and appropriate landscaping, the proposed development would make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the area, providing an opportunity to restore a property that has fallen into disrepair. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the thrust of the NPPF and the design policy within the Trafford Core Strategy.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

21. The impact that the proposed conversion of 158 Broad Road into 5 apartments would have on neighbouring residents and the level of residential amenity future occupants of the proposed dwellings would enjoy is considered against policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to Design and the amenity policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
22. One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17).
23. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states that in relation to matters of amenity protection development must not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking, visual intrusion, noise or disturbance, odour or in any other way.
24. The property is adjoined on all sides by residential properties including an adjoining dwelling and various pairs of semi-detached units to the north, south and east.
25. There are no extensions proposed in order to facilitate the proposed conversion and consequently the proposal does not raise any issues in terms of loss of light and or overbearing impact for neighboring residents.
26. In terms of privacy the application proposes introduction of two new windows on the side elevation at basement level and the modification of another basement window; the introduction of two first floor obscurely glazed windows in the side elevation; the modification of an existing first floor window opening in

the side elevation; the introduction of a set of patio doors at basement level of the rear outrigger; the removal of a door and a ground floor window in the rear of the outrigger and their replacement with a set of double doors with a Juliet balcony; and the introduction of a new first floor window in the rear elevation of the two storey outrigger.

27. As a result of their below ground nature it is not considered that the introduction of the basement level windows and doors raise any issues regarding loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.
28. It is not considered that the revisions to the existing window opening in the side elevation raises any privacy issues either as these works would not introduce a new window; they would simply remove a window with a horizontal emphasis and replace it with one that would have a vertical emphasis.
29. Similarly given that there would be approximately 10m from the proposed rooflights in the two storey outrigger and the common boundary with 160 Broad Road it is not considered that the insertion of these rooflights raises any privacy issues.
30. In terms of the two new first floor windows in the side elevation these would be secondary windows and consequently they will be fitted with obscure glazing. Subject to the attachment of a condition to secure the installation and retention of the obscure glazing it is not considered that the introduction of these windows would raise any privacy issues for those at 160 Broad Road.
31. Furthermore it is not considered that the introduction of a Juliet balcony and a first floor bedroom window on the rear outrigger would result in any loss of privacy to neighbouring residents as the property at 156 Broad Road has a 3m long (approx.) single storey extension running along the common boundary which would restrict views from these elements into the garden of the adjoining property. The proposed windows/doors would be set approximately 17.5m from the sites rear boundary thereby ensuring that their introduction would not raise any overlooking issues for the occupants of the properties on Skaife Road and Old Hall Road.
32. With regard to noise and disturbance the only property that could be affected by internal noise is the adjoining Victorian semi which is currently used as a family dwelling. It is acknowledged that the conversion of the property into 5 apartments is likely to result in an increase in the number of occupants however subject to the attachment of the condition recommended by Committee members in August 2009 for the introduction of soundproofing between the application property and the adjoining unit at 156 Broad Road it is not considered that the increase in occupants would result in those at 156 Broad Road experiencing an unacceptable level of noise transference from the converted property.
33. In terms of the noise and disturbance created from the comings and goings of occupants and by the use of the proposed parking and amenity space having regard to the location of the application property on a main road, where existing

activity results in a level of background noise and given that the existing and proposed landscaping along the site's boundaries would provide a buffer that would reduce the level of noise emanating from the site it is not considered that the comings and goings of occupants and/or the use of the parking areas and amenity space would adversely affect the level of amenity neighboring residents can reasonably expect to enjoy.

34. With regard to the level of amenity future occupants of the proposed apartments would enjoy each apartment would be provided with adequate light and outlook from their habitable room windows. The proposed apartments would also be provided with an area of useable private amenity space in the form of a communal garden, which measure approximately 260sqm, significantly more than the 90sqm required under the Council's Guidelines for new residential development which recommends the provision of 18sqm of communal space per apartment.
35. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the thrust of the NPPF as it would not adversely affect the level of residential amenity neighbouring residents can reasonably expect to enjoy and the development would provide future occupants with a satisfactory standard of living.

HIGHWAYS AND CAR PARKING

36. When the scheme was previously considered at Committee the acceptability of the level of parking provision proposed and the impact that the proposal would have on highway safety was assessed against policies D1 and D2 of the Revised Trafford UDP, which required a maximum of 7.5 parking spaces to be provided, and the guidance set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 on Transport. The UDP policies have now been superseded by policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to sustainable transport and accessibility and the accompanying car parking standards set out in appendix 3. The NPPF has replaced PPG13.
37. Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy seeks to ensure that all new developments do not adversely affect highway safety, with each development being provided with adequate on-site parking, having regard to the maximum standards set out in appendix 3.
38. Under the scheme originally considered at Committee a parking court with 5 spaces would have been created at the front of the building. Access to the parking would have been via the existing access point off Broad Road, which would be widened to 4.5m. A separate pedestrian access would be created from Broad Road.
39. According to appendix 3 of the Trafford Core Strategy a 1 bed apartment in this location should be provided with 1 parking space and a 2 bed apartment should be provided with 2 parking spaces. A maximum of 9 parking spaces should therefore be provided for the 5 apartments proposed. The current parking standards require a greater level of parking provision than was required when

the scheme was originally considered at Committee in 2009, when a maximum of 7.5 spaces were required.

40. In an attempt to provide a level of parking closer to the maximum standards the applicant has revised the proposal in order to provide 6 parking spaces. Parking would be provided at 66% of the maximum. The works to widen the access to 4.5m would still be undertaken and a separate pedestrian access would be provided from Broad Road.
41. Having regard to the fact that the parking requirements set out in appendix 3 of the Core Strategy are maximum standards, the highways officer's previous acceptance of parking being provided at 66% of the maximum standards (i.e. 5 spaces when a maximum of 7.5 spaces could be provided) and the relatively accessible nature of the site which is located within walking distance to Northenden Road which provides access to a number of bus routes and within a reasonable distance to Sale Moor District Centre and Sale Town Centre, it is considered that the level of parking proposed is reasonable for the development; any on-street parking resulting from the development would be limited and dispersed throughout the area.
42. The width of the proposed access would allow for simultaneous access and egress to the site and satisfactory maneuvering space would be provided within the site to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. Having regard to these facets and given that a separate pedestrian access would be provided, it is considered that satisfactory vehicular and pedestrian access would be provided.
43. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to sustainable transport and accessibility – the proposed conversion of 158 Broad Road would not raise any issues from a highway safety perspective.

TREES

44. Policy R2 requires development to protect and enhance the landscape character of an area.
45. There is a mature copper beech tree and two semi-mature lime trees within the front garden which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. These are supplemented by an overgrown hedge along the front boundary, several shrubs and grassed areas. The proposed plans show the majority of the trees and planting being retained, with additional supplementary landscaping being undertaken.
46. Subject to the attachment of conditions to secure the protection of the trees during construction and the use of appropriate materials and construction techniques for the proposed parking area, it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the trees on site. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

47. The revisions to the planning policy framework, specifically those relating to developer contributions, do mean that the level and type of developer contribution has altered from that required when the scheme was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in August 2009.
48. In August 2009 the following contributions were required under UDP policies ENV16 (Red Rose Forest), OSR3 (Standards for Informal Recreation and Children's Play Space Provision), OSR4 (Standards for Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision) and OSR9 (Open Space in New Housing Development) and the accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance, 'Developer Contributions towards Red Rose Forest' and 'Informal/Children's Playing Space and Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision and Commuted Sums' –

£1,175.00 towards off-site tree planting
£8,596.01 towards outdoor sports and play facilities
49. UDP policies ENV16, OSR3, OSR4 and OSR9 and the accompanying supplementary planning guidance documents have now been superseded by Core Strategy Policy L8 (Planning Obligations) and the planning obligations SPD (SPD1). The Community Infrastructure Levy is however being implemented in Trafford on the 7th July 2014, along with a revised SPD 1 on Planning Obligations and consequently at the time the application will be determined the level of developer contribution payable will be based upon the CIL charging schedule and the revised SPD on Planning Obligations.
50. The development involves the conversion of an existing dwelling within a moderate charging area to 5 apartments and consequently the proposal does not trigger the requirement for any payment under CIL.
51. However, in accordance with Policy L8 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the revised SPD 1 on Planning Obligations it is necessary to provide an element of specific green infrastructure and it is also necessary to provide 1 affordable unit as part of the proposed development.
52. The applicant has submitted a draft landscape scheme with their application in order to demonstrate that 5 trees can be planted on site, thereby meeting the requirement for the provision of specific green infrastructure. In order to secure the 5 trees a landscape condition will be attached which makes specific reference to the need to provide 5 trees on site as part of the landscape proposals.
53. With regard to the requirement to provide 1 affordable unit, as a result of the small size of the development and given that the development comprises solely of flats the Council's Housing Strategy Team have requested that a commuted sum is secured to pay for one off-site affordable unit as opposed to one affordable unit being provided on site as part of the development. The level of commuted sum required has been agreed between all parties as £50,000.

54. The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal with their application in order to demonstrate that the requirement for the payment of a commuted sum towards the provision of an off-site affordable unit would render the proposed development unviable.
55. The viability appraisal has been reviewed by colleagues in Asset Management and they have confirmed that the scheme is already financially unviable without the requirement to pay a commuted sum towards the provision of an off-site affordable unit. It is therefore considered reasonable to waive the requirement for affordable housing in this instance.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT

Grant subject to the following conditions: -

1. Standard time limit condition
2. Materials condition
3. Landscaping condition including provision of 5 trees, retention of front boundary wall, gateposts and hedge
4. Tree protection – condition 1
5. Tree protection – condition 2
6. Amended plan condition
7. Provision of access facilities – condition 2
8. Retention of access facilities condition
9. Obscure glazing condition – allowing the upper half of the proposed side windows to open for ventilation
10. Details of bin store to be submitted and agreed in writing
11. Scheme for sound insulation between application property and 156 Broad Road

NT



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - H/71614

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

WARD: Urmston

74382/FULL/2009

DEPARTURE: No

ERECTION OF A PART THREE STOREY, PART TWO STOREY BUILDING TO ACCOMMODATE FIVE FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING AFTER DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS.

130A Flixton Road, Urmston

APPLICANT: Black or White Ltd

AGENT: Heslip Architects

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

This application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee meeting on the 8th July 2010 where Members resolved to approve the application, subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement to secure a contribution of £9,624.53 towards open space provision and tree planting in accordance with Trafford's adopted SPG's; 'Informal/Children's Playing Space and Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision and Commuted Sums' and 'Developer Contributions Towards Red Rose Forest'.

After receiving the minded to grant resolution the applicant did not pursue the section 106, however after being contacted by the Local Planning Authority they have now advised that they want to see the application through to a conclusion.

Given the amount of time that has passed since the application was considered by the Planning Development Control Committee it is necessary to revisit the proposal in order to determine whether there have been any changes on site and/or in the planning policy framework that would result in the Local Planning Authority making a different recommendation on the application. This will be done in the observations section below.

SITE

This application relates to a 0.065 hectare site located on the northern side of Flixton Road in Urmston.

The site is currently occupied by a two storey detached residential property with a large rear garden, together with an area of onsite parking which is accessed from Flixton Road.

The application site is located within a mixed use area – there is a nursery at 130 Flixton Road and there is a medical centre at 132 Flixton Road. The remainder of the neighbouring properties are in residential use.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks consent to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a part two, part three storey building containing five, 2 bedroom apartments.

The proposed apartment block, which would measure a maximum of 7.4m in height at the eaves and 10.6m in height at the ridge, would be of a brick built construction. The building would be would present an active frontage to Flixton Road, being sited so it would respect the established building line along Flixton Road.

The apartments would be provided with 5 on-site parking spaces, located within a parking court at the front of the building. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site would be from Flixton Road.

An area of useable amenity space would be provided at the rear of the building.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

- L1 – Land for New Homes
- L2 – Meeting Housing Needs
- L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- L5 – Climate Change
- L7 – Design
- L8 – Planning obligations

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/OUT/67795 – Outline application for demolition of existing dwellinghouses and erection of 12 affordable two bedroom flats with associated parking (consent sought for layout, scale and access with all other matters reserved) – Withdrawn October 2007

CONSULTATIONS

The responses below were received in response to the original consultation on the application –

Local Highways Authority – No objection subject to submission of detailed parking plan outlining the car parking layout, access and proposed landscaping area.

Environmental Protection – No objection subject to a condition requiring an investigation into land contamination.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – No objection

Built Environment (Drainage) – No objection

Built Environment (Highways) – No objection

Built Environment (Street Lighting) – No objection

Built Environment (Public Rights of Way) – No objection

All parties originally consulted on the application were re-consulted in December 2013.

The only response that has been received in relation to the further consultation is from the Local Highways Authority. They have advised that under the Council's current parking standards a development of five 2 bed flats would require the provision of 10 parking spaces together with 2 allocated or 1 communal cycle parking space per flat. The application only proposes 5 parking spaces. Despite this they advise that given that the same proposal has been considered acceptable with just 1 space per flat they do not consider that the refusal of the scheme on highway grounds would stand up at appeal. Consequently they have confirmed that they do not raise any objections to the proposal subject to the spaces being of a sufficient

size, adequate cycle parking being provided and appropriate surface treatments being used to ensure that localised flooding would not occur as a result of the proposals.

REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of objections, from two different addresses, were received in response to the initial neighbour consultation on the application. The main points raised by the objectors were noted in the original report to committee as:

- The proposal contains insufficient parking.
- The proposed development will result in inconsiderate parking blocking footpaths and accesses.
- The area has lost too many parking spaces recently.
- The new parking will mean the loss of the planting on site.

All neighbours originally notified of the application were re-consulted in December 2013.

No letters of representation have been received in response to the re-consultation letter.

OBSERVATIONS

CHANGES ON SITE

1. When the application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in July 2010 the property at 132 Flixton Road was vacant, having formally been used as a large detached dwelling. The property had permission under planning approval H/68958 to be used as a doctor's surgery.
2. Since the application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in July 2010 the property at 132 Flixton Road has been converted to a doctors surgery with an on-site pharmacy (application 78266/COU/2012 which was approved in June 2012 gave consent for the mixed use of the property in this way). It is not considered that the change of use of the property at 132 Flixton Road to a doctors with an on-site pharmacy would result in the Local Planning Authority coming to a different view on acceptability as this use is a less sensitive use than a residential property.
3. There have been no other changes in the circumstances on or within the vicinity of the application site that would result in the Local Planning Authority coming to a different view on acceptability.

CHANGES IN THE PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

4. Since the application was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in July 2010 the planning policy framework has changed in a number of ways.

5. At the National Level the National Planning Policy Framework was published on the 27 March 2012.
6. At the local level the Trafford Core Strategy was adopted on the 25th January 2014, partially superseding the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
7. The following supplementary Planning Documents are also relevant –

SPD1 – Planning Obligations
SPD3 – Parking Standards and Design
8. The revisions to policy have not altered the approach toward this type of development in this location and consequently it is not considered that the revisions to the planning policy framework would result in a different view on acceptability. However, for completeness and the avoidance of doubt the initial report to Committee has been updated in the light of the current planning policy framework, with an assessment of why the development is still in accordance with the planning policy framework being set out below -

PRINCIPLE

9. Under the current planning policy framework the principle of schemes involving new residential development are considered against policies L1 and L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF advises that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.
11. Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, which relates to Land for New Homes, sets an indicative 80% target proportion of new housing provision to use brownfield land and buildings over the Plan period. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy, which is entitled “Meeting Housing Needs”, states that all new residential development proposals will be assessed for the contribution that will be made to meeting the housing needs of the Borough and the wider aspirations of the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy. It requires new development to be (a) On a site of sufficient size to accommodate adequately the proposed use and all necessary ancillary facilities for prospective residents; (b) Appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to the social infrastructure (schools, health facilities, leisure and retail facilities) to ensure the sustainability of the development; (c) Not harmful to the character or amenity of the immediately

surrounding area and; (d) To be in accordance with L7 and other relevant policies within the Development Plan for Trafford.

12. The application site is currently occupied by a two storey detached residential property with a large rear garden, together with an area of onsite parking which is accessed from Flixton Road. The existing dwelling does not have any features of architectural or historic merit that would warrant its retention. Consequently there are no in principle issues with the demolition of the existing building to facilitate the redevelopment of the site.
13. In terms of developing the site via the erection of a part three, part two storey building containing five 2 bedroom apartments the application site is considered to be located within a sustainable location being sited within walking distance to Urmston Town Centre which provides access to a range of goods and services and the site is also considered to be well served by public transport as there are a number of bus stops on Flixton Road and Urmston train station is located within walking distance. Consequently it is considered that subject to the development being acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character of the area, neighbouring properties and highway safety the principle of erecting a new build apartment building containing 5 self-contained flats is acceptable and in accordance with the NPPF and the Core Strategy – the proposal would represent a sustainable form of development that would provide additional residential accommodation and contribute towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough by diversifying the mix of property types within the locality.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

14. Under the current planning policy framework the acceptability of the proposal in visual amenity terms is assessed against policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to design and the design policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
15. One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17). Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment - good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
16. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states that in considering applications for development within the Borough, the Council will determine whether or not the proposed development meets the standards set in national guidelines and the requirements of Policy L7. The relevant extracts of Policy L7 require that development is appropriate in its context; makes best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area by appropriately addressing scale,

density, height, layout, elevation treatment, materials, landscaping; and is compatible with the surrounding area.

17. The proposed apartment block would be three stories in height measuring a maximum of 7.4m in height at the eaves and 10.6m in height at the ridge with a pitched roof. Having regard to the varied building heights within the locality which includes bungalows, two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced properties and a three storey block of flats it is considered that the scale and massing of the proposed apartment block is acceptable.
18. The proposed apartment block would be of a brick construction, being designed in such a way that it would reflect the style and character of the two adjacent properties, incorporating bay windows at ground and first floor which serve to break up the façade and give it a similar vertical emphasis to the adjacent properties.
19. The apartment building would present an active frontage to Flixton Road, being sited so it would respect the established building line along Flixton Road. The development would also have a plot layout that is comparable to the other properties in the immediate vicinity incorporating an area of car parking to the front of the building and a rear garden area, which would provide a shared garden area. In order to soften the impact of the parking court it is proposed to introduce a landscape buffer to Flixton Road.
20. Overall it is therefore considered that the proposal would be in keeping with the development it will be seen in context with and consequently, subject of the attachment of a condition to ensure the use of satisfactory materials and appropriate landscaping, the proposed development would make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the area by bringing a vacant site into use. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the thrust of the NPPF and the design policy within the Core Strategy.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

21. The impact that the proposed conversion of 158 Broad Road into 5 apartments would have on neighbouring residents and the level of residential amenity future occupants of the proposed dwellings would enjoy is considered against policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to Design and the amenity policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
22. One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17).
23. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states that in relation to matters of amenity protection development must not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking, visual intrusion, noise or disturbance, odour or in any other way.

24. The property at 130 Flixton Road is being used as a nursery, while 132 Flixton Road is being used as a doctors surgery with an on-site pharmacy and therefore the two adjacent units are considered to be non sensitive land uses. It is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse impact upon the level of amenity the users of 130 and 132 Flixton Road can reasonably expect to enjoy.
25. The land to the rear of the application site is occupied by part of the garden area of the residential property at 35 Glenhaven Avenue, with the property at 35 Glenhaven being sited so its rear elevation fronts the shared boundary with 132 and 132a Flixton Road, not the common boundary with the application site. The part two part three storey building would be located at least 16m from the rear boundary of the site. Having regard to the relationship between the proposed development and 35 Glenhave Avenue it is not considered that the proposal would result in those at 35 Glenhaven Avenue experiencing a loss of light, privacy and/or any overbearing impact.
26. There is a two story block of flats on the opposite side of Flixton Road at 1-6 Longwood Court. There would be approximately 40m maintained between the main front elevation of the proposed apartment block and the front elevation of the flats. It is therefore considered that adequate separation would be provided to ensure that the introduction of the proposed apartments would not adversely affect the level of residential amenity the occupants of 1-6 Longwood Court can reasonably expect to enjoy.
27. With regard to the level of amenity future occupants of the proposed apartments would enjoy each apartment would be provided with adequate light and outlook from their habitable room windows. The proposed apartments would also be provided with an area of useable private amenity space in the form of a communal rear patio area and garden, which measures approximately 200sqm, significantly more than the 90sqm required under the Council's Guidelines for new residential development which recommends the provision of 18sqm of communal space per apartment.
28. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the thrust of the NPPF as it would not adversely affect the level of residential amenity neighbouring residents can reasonably expect to enjoy and the development would provide future occupants with a satisfactory standard of living.

HIGHWAYS AND CAR PARKING

29. When the scheme was previously considered at Committee the acceptability of the level of parking provision proposed and the impact that the proposal would have on highway safety was assessed against policies D1 and D2 of the Revised Trafford UDP, which required a maximum of 7.5 parking spaces to be provided. The UDP policies have now been superseded by policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to sustainable transport and accessibility and the accompanying car parking standards set out in appendix 3.

30. Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy seeks to ensure that all new developments do not adversely affect highway safety, with each development being provided with adequate on-site parking, having regard to the maximum standards set out in appendix 3.
31. According to appendix 3 of the Trafford Core Strategy a development of five 2 bedroom apartments in this location should be provided with a maximum of 10 parking spaces.
32. Notwithstanding the revisions to the parking standards, having regard to the fact that the standards are maximum not minimum standards, the accessible nature of the site which is well located in terms of access to public transport and goods and services and given that the highways officer has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal it is considered that the level of parking proposed is still satisfactory, with any on street parking that is created by the proposed development being dispersed in neighbouring streets.

ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

33. In order to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon bats, which are a European Protected Species, a bat survey has been submitted with the application.
34. The bat survey has been reviewed by the Greater Manchester Ecological Unit who have confirmed that they concur with the findings of the bat survey – there were no signs of bats found in the building and none of the structures to be demolished are conducive for bats to use for hibernation or roosting at any time. Consequently, they have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal on nature conservation grounds.
35. Having regard to the comments from GMEU it is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse impact upon any ecological interest.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

36. The revisions to the planning policy framework, specifically those relating to developer contributions, do mean that the level and type of developer contribution has altered from that required when the scheme was considered at the Planning Development Control Committee in July 2010.
37. In July 2010 the following contributions were required under UDP policies ENV16 (Red Rose Forest), OSR3 (Standards for Informal Recreation and Children's Play Space Provision), OSR4 (Standards for Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision) and OSR9 (Open Space in New Housing Development) and the accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance, 'Developer Contributions towards Red Rose Forest' and 'Informal/Children's Playing Space and Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision and Commuted Sums' –

£5,767.74 towards informal/children's play space

£2,916.79 towards outdoor sports facilities provision

£940 towards off site tree planting

38. UDP policies ENV16, OSR3, OSR4 and OSR9 and the accompanying supplementary planning guidance documents have now been superseded by Core Strategy Policy L8 (Planning Obligations) and the planning obligations SPD (SPD1). The Community Infrastructure Levy is however being implemented in Trafford on the 7th July 2014, along with a revised SPD 1 on Planning Obligations and consequently at the time the application will be determined the level of developer contribution payable will be based upon the CIL charging schedule and the revised SPD on Planning Obligations.
39. The development involves the demolition of an existing dwelling within a moderate charging area and the erection of a new building containing 5 apartments. Consequently the proposal does not trigger the requirement for any payment under CIL.
40. However, in accordance with Policy L8 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the revised SPD 1 on Planning Obligations it is necessary to provide an element of specific green infrastructure and it is also necessary to provide 1 affordable unit as part of the proposed development.
41. The applicant has submitted a draft landscape scheme with their application in order to demonstrate that 5 trees can be planted on site, thereby meeting the requirement for the provision of specific green infrastructure. In order to secure the 5 trees a landscape condition will be attached which makes specific reference to the need to provide 5 trees as on site as part of the landscape proposals.
42. With regard to the requirement to provide 1 affordable unit, as a result of the small size of the development and given that the development comprises solely of flats the Council's Housing Strategy Team have requested that a commuted sum is secured to pay for one off-site affordable unit as opposed to one affordable unit being provided on site as part of the development. The level of commuted sum required has been agreed between all parties as £38,000.
43. The applicant has agreed to enter into a S106 agreement in order to secure a £38,000 commuted sum in lieu of providing on site affordable unit.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT


The application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon completion of an appropriate legal agreement to secure a £38,000 commuted sum in lieu of providing one on site affordable unit.

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

1. Time limit
2. Material samples
3. Landscape scheme, including the provision of at least 5 trees

4. Landscape maintenance scheme
5. Details of bin store
6. Details of boundary treatment
7. Details of meter boxes
8. Details of fenestration, reveals, head and cills to windows
9. Access and parking arrangements to be implemented prior to first occupation and retained thereafter
10. Obscure glazing to first and second floor windows on the east and west elevations
11. Compliance with plans
12. Standard contaminated land condition.
13. Cycle parking
14. Drainage scheme

NT



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 74382/FULL/2009

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

WARD: Longford

77850/FULL/2011

DEPARTURE: No

PROPOSAL: Change of use from public house to no.15 self-contained apartments, including excavation of ground to expose basement level, creation of steps at ground floor to rear elevation and insertion of new doors and windows at basement, ground and first floor levels to all elevations.

122 Seymour Grove, Old Trafford, M16 0FF

APPLICANT: Mr Basharat Iqbal

AGENT: RA Design & Project Management

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

ADDENDUM REPORT

Committee were minded to approve the application on 12th December 2013 subject to contributions of £29,278.11 being secured through the use of a S106 legal agreement, comprised of:-

- **£18,172.68 for Spatial Green Infrastructure**
- **£11,105.43 for Education Facilities**

However it will not be possible to complete the legal agreement prior to the introduction of Trafford's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 07 July 2014. Therefore in line with the CIL Charging Schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014), this proposal will be subject to CIL at the relevant rate per square metre, and a section 106 agreement will no longer be required.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard Time Limit
2. List of Approved Plans
3. Materials
4. Colour Treatment of Railings
5. Landscaping including layout of amenity space and approved amenity space to be retained thereafter
6. Landscape Maintenance
7. All areas of the manoeuvring and parking of vehicles shall be made available for such and retained at all times.
8. Provision of cycle parking

VW



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 77850/FULL/2011

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

WARD: Urmston

81735/FULL/2013

DEPARTURE: No

DEMOLITION OF DOUBLE GARAGE AND ERECTION OF A TWO-STOREY, THREE-BEDROOM DWELLINGHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING WORKS.

Land to north of Dartford Road, Urmston, M41 9DE

APPLICANT: Mr Kevin Quinn

AGENT: Howard & Seddon ARIBA

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Councillor Catherine Hynes has requested that this application be determined by the Planning Committee for the reasons outlined within this report.

SITE

The application site relates to a small parcel of land situated at the head of Dartford Road, a quiet residential cul-de-sac. The operational Manchester – Liverpool railway line runs within a cutting immediately adjacent to the northern/rear edge of the site. To the east and west is land which appears to fall within the ownership of properties fronting Dartford Road and Carisbrook Avenue respectively. The southern boundary to the application site is separated from the rear gardens belonging to the terraces of Carrisbrook Avenue by a narrow vehicular access track.

The site itself is currently enclosed by timber fencing and appears to have historically been used as a builder's yard. It currently accommodates a small garage and a metal storage container.

The surrounding cul-de-sacs are characterised by a series of handsome late-Victorian terraces, with each one demonstrating an alternative building style to its neighbours.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to remove the existing structures on the site and erect a detached dwellinghouse that fronts onto, and is accessed from, the head of the Dartford Road cul-de-sac. It would be two-storeys in height with open-plan living accommodation on the ground-floor and three bedrooms and a bathroom above. The new property would benefit from a private garden area to its western side, and an area of hardstanding reserved for car parking to its east.

Following amendments to the scheme, the development seeks to adopt a similar design approach to the existing row of terraces closest to the site, namely those of 36-42 Dartford Road.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes
L2 – Meeting Housing Needs
L7 – Design
L8 – Planning obligations

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/55071 – Retention of existing steel storage container within builders yard – Approved with Conditions, 18th November 2002

H32019 – Erection of a detached double garage – Approved with Conditions, 12th September 1990

CONSULTATIONS

Pollution & Licensing (Contaminated Land): No objections, standard condition recommended.

Pollution and Licensing (Nuisance): No objections subject to measures identified within submitted Noise Assessment being implemented.

Network Rail: Any comments received shall be included within the Additional Information Report.

REPRESENTATIONS

Three letters of objection have been received in response to the plans originally submitted with this application. The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:

- The development would lead to overlooking/loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens and would have an overbearing and overshadowing impact.
- The proposed dwelling would be out-of-keeping with the historic character of the surrounding properties on Dartford Road.
- A new-build detached dwelling would destroy all of the charm and character of this street.
- The site access proposals would lead to potential safety hazards.
- The parking situation on the road is already at breaking point and the development would compound the problem even further;

Councillor Catherine Hynes has also written to support the concerns of local residents, stating that, although the development will provide some parking on the site, any further housing in the area will cause parking problems in an already congested area. Furthermore the dwelling is potentially out of character with a road that contains period properties dating back to 1886.

One letter of support has been received from the occupants of 36 Dartford Road. This states that the application site has been an eyesore for some time and that the development will make the whole road look better.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of development

1. The application site is situated in an established residential area and has good access to public transport in the form of bus routes (Church Road 150m to the south) and rail links (Urmston Station 500m east). Urmston Meadows represents a significant area of green-space and is situated 400m to the south of the site, whilst future residents would be able to top-up on all of their day-to-day amenities within Urmston Town Centre which is also 500m to the east. Therefore the development is considered to be in a sustainable location and in-line with the provisions of Policies L1 and L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

2. The rooms proposed at first-floor level within the development will achieve an outlook and direct sunlight via windows positioned on the rear elevation, which backs onto the railway line, and the principal elevation, which faces down Dartford Road and towards the rear garden of No.29.
3. Those neighbouring gardens located to the north of the site, on the opposite side of the railway line, are 28m away and therefore will not be overlooked by the development. On the front elevation, a window to bedroom 1 faces directly southwards down the Dartford Road highway, but also provides a view, at an angle, of the rear garden associated with 29 Dartford Road. The level of overlooking resulting from this window though is considered to be limited and not serious enough to warrant a refusal of planning permission. Other first-floor windows within this elevation would face the garden of No.29 more directly, at a separation of 7.2m, however they serve non-habitable rooms and thus can be fitted with obscured-glazing. Whilst the ground-floor windows on the front of the proposal would remain clear-glazed, views into the garden of No.29 would be restricted by the 2m high fence that encloses its garden. The rear windows within the property of No.29 look towards the application site, but a separation of 29m would remain between the two dwellings which comfortably complies with privacy distances recommended within the Council's SPG: New Residential Development. Therefore the development will not give rise to undue overlooking from its forward-facing windows.
4. It is considered that the remaining ground-floor windows to the development will not lead to interlooking with other houses due to the height and siting of the proposed boundary treatments to the site, and those that already enclose its nearest neighbours.
5. The two-storey dwellinghouse is set back within its plot and is separated from the rear gardens to Carisbrook Avenue by an access track. This siting, coupled with its orientation, will prevent it from having an unacceptable impact, with respect to visual intrusion and overshadowing on the facing terrace to the south.
6. The land to the east of the application site appears to have been taken into the curtilage of 42 Dartford Road. This side garden area, which is not the only

amenity spaces associated with the property, measures approximately 250sqm in size. The new dwelling would be approximately 3.5m from this boundary and will therefore have some limited impact on the western end of No.42's large garden area, however not to a degree that would justify refusal of planning permission.

7. The 57sqm private garden area proposed for the new dwelling is considered to be sufficient for a three bedroom property in this area.
8. A noise assessment has been submitted with this application, in relation to the impact that the operational Manchester-Liverpool railway line would have on the amenity of the future occupants of the proposed dwellinghouse. This reveals that 'good' internal noise standards, and 'low' vibration levels could be secured providing that a number of measures relating to the glazing and vents installed in the property are implemented. The Council's Pollution and Licensing Officer is in agreement with the conclusions of the report and has requested that the measures recommended within it to mitigate noise and vibration disturbance are secured by condition.

Design and Street Scene

9. Dartford Road is unusual in that it is a residential cul-de-sac which is not terminated by a dwellinghouse at its head. The proposed development would provide a residential presence at the end of this street and its siting is considered to be appropriate as it directly addresses the highway.
10. The historic character of the surrounding housing stock is considered to be a positive feature of the area and any new development in the area should pay regard to it. The design of the proposed dwellinghouse has been amended so that its proportions and elevational detailing closely reflect those of the nearby terrace of 36-42 Dartford Road. This approach is considered to be appropriate, as the two developments will be seen in the same context. It is considered that the gable feature proposed will provide additional interest for this stand-alone dwelling situated at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Access, Highways and Car Parking

11. A driveway has been shown to the eastern side of the dwellinghouse, which is capable of accommodating two cars, parked in tandem. This provision is in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards for a three-bedroom property and as such the development should not lead to an increase in demand for on-street parking. Furthermore whilst there is no obligation to protect opportunities for residents to park on-street, it is considered that the difference in available space along Dartford Road as a result of this proposal will be very limited.

PLANNING CONTRIBUTIONS

12. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and where applicable, may be liable to a CIL charge at the rate of £40 per square metre.


CONCLUSION

13. Overall, the benefits associated with achieving an additional unit of housing within the Borough, and from introducing a well-designed property at the head of this cul-de-sac, are recognised. The development also results in the introduction of a use that is considered to be more compatible with the surrounding area than the builder's yard which currently occupies the site. These benefits are considered to outweigh any limited harm that might be caused to surrounding residential amenity, or from the loss of any on-street parking spaces on Dartford Road. For these reasons it is recommended that planning permission be granted for the development, subject to the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time;
2. Compliance with all plans;
3. Materials;
4. Landscaping;
5. Boundary treatment;
6. Obscured-glazing (including restricted opening) – details to be submitted and those rooms to which they relate to be retained as bathrooms;
7. Provision and retention of parking spaces;
8. Porous material for hardstanding;
9. Contaminated Land;
10. Measures identified within Noise Assessment to be implemented;
11. Removal of PD rights (dormers; first-floor windows; side extensions; outbuildings)

JK



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 81735/FULL/2013

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

**WARD: Ashton on
Mersey**

81768/VAR/2013

DEPARTURE: No

AN APPLICATION TO REMOVE CONDITION 7 OF PLANNING PERMISSION H/64515 (ERECTION OF A BUNGALOW), TO ALLOW THE BUNGALOW TO BE OCCUPIED INDEPENDENTLY FROM THE KENNELS AND CATTERY BUSINESS.

21 Little Ees Lane, Sale, M33 5GT

APPLICANT: Firtree Kennels and Cattery

AGENT: N/A

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

THIS APPLICATION WAS CONSIDERED AT THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING ON THE 10TH APRIL 2014. THE APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED IN ORDER TO ALLOW FURTHER NEGOTIATION WITH THE APPLICANT.

In discussions held since the Committee meeting on the 10th April the applicant has advised that the redline location plan initially submitted with the application was incorrect as it included land outside their control and ownership. The applicant has therefore submitted a revised redline plan, which shows a reduced site area by virtue of the exclusion of the tree covered field to the west of the kennel buildings, together with an updated ownership certificate.

As set out in the observations section of the initial report to Committee it is not considered that the removal of the condition would in itself result in any harm to the openness of the Green Belt nor would it conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt as the dwelling is already in situ.

Furthermore given that with the exception of the re-establishment of the kennel business any new development at the site would require planning permission the Local Planning Authority would retain control over how the site develops in the future with the Local Planning Authority being able to consider the planning merits of any new use or buildings at the time at which a new application is received– if a development was inappropriate and harmful to the Green Belt the Local Planning Authority could refuse a proposal on this basis.

Having regard to these facts and given that the revisions to the site boundary have reduced the site area to the extent that it is not considered that the site is of a sufficient size to accommodate the existing dwelling, the kennel business and an additional dwelling and comply with the Council's minimum separation distances it is not considered that there is any planning reason to resist the removal of condition 7 on planning approval H/64515 in order to allow any individual to occupy the dwelling at 21 Little Ees Lane.

The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the Recommendation section of the report to Committee on the 10th April 2014 – see below.

SITE

This application relates to a 0.3hectare site located on the western side of Little Ees Lane in Sale. The application site comprises a detached dwelling, a series of detached outbuildings, which formerly provided a kennels, cattery and dog grooming area and a tree covered field. The kennels and cattery are no longer operational; however the dog grooming area is still in use.

The application site is located within the Green Belt, on land that is also identified as a wildlife corridor and an area where the landscape character should be preserved.

The site is also located within flood zone 2/3, with the area also being identified as a critical drainage area.

The application site is located on the northern fringe of Sale; to the east the site adjoins Dunbar Farm, which has its fields wrapping round to the north of the site; to the south, the site is bounded by fields associated with an equestrian centre; and there are further fields located to the west of the application site. On the opposite side of Little Ees Lane there is a detached dwelling and fields associated with Trafford Metrovicks Rugby Football Club.

PROPOSAL

In March 2007 planning permission was granted under planning application H/64515 for the erection of a detached bungalow at the site.

The approval was given subject to conditions, including condition 7 which restricted the occupation of the bungalow to those employed or last employed at the onsite kennels and cattery. The condition read as follows –

“The occupation of the bungalow hereby permitted shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed or last employed in the business as a kennels and cattery conducted on the site edged red on the attached plan, or a widow or widower of such a person, or any resident dependants”.

The reason for attaching the condition was given as “To prevent the establishment of a separate dwelling which would be unacceptable in this Green Belt location having regard to Proposals C4, C5 and D1 of the Adopted Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan”.

This application seeks to remove this condition in order to allow occupation of the bungalow by any individual.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

R2 Natural Environment

R4 Green Belt, Countryside and other protected open land

L5 Climate change

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Green Belt (C4)

Wildlife Corridor (ENV10)

Protection of Landscape Character (ENV17)

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/64515 - Erection of a bungalow - Approved with conditions 19/03/2007

H/REN/61009 - Renewal of planning permission under H/53407 for the siting of mobile home in connection with existing kennels and cattery – Approved with conditions 24/01/2006

H/56118 - Erection of single storey buildings to form 14 per cattery block with kitchen, 2 per cat isolation block, 3 kennel dog isolation block and extensions to existing kennel block to form 4 additional kennels and kitchen; conversion of existing cattery building into small dog kennels – Approved with conditions 24/10/2003

H/53407 - Siting of mobile home in connection with existing kennels and cattery (resubmission of H/52923) – Approved with conditions 07/05/2002

H/52923 - Siting of mobile home in connection with existing kennels and cattery – Refused 11/01/2002

H45287 – Continued use of land for the stationing of a caravan for residential purposes for a temporary period of 5 years – Refused 20/05/1998

H41626 – Retention of a storage building – Refused 17/01/1996

H41042 – Erection of detached house and garage – Withdrawn August 1995

H37032 – Continued use of land as a boarding kennels and cattery and retention of two single storey buildings – Approved with conditions 30/06/1993

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted supporting information with their submission which outlines the site history and seeks to justify why the condition should be removed. They have confirmed the following-

- The kennel business that operated from the site has, as a result of the changes in the licencing regime which required the provision of larger pens, been scaled down with the number of dogs that could be housed at the kennels falling from 36 to 13. Consequently the business started to become unviable and started to fail.
- As a result of the business failing the property/business was placed on the market, being advertised for sale between October 2012 and early 2014. The site was marketed on a Price on Application basis.
- The marketing agent, Bridgefords, have confirmed in writing the period of marketing, advising that despite a number of individuals expressing an interest no offers were made. They attribute the lack of offers to the clause/condition attached to the property, stating that lenders are dubious about financing a property with conditions/ties.
- The kennel business finally closed in August 2013.
- There is a dog grooming salon/pet grooming academy remaining at the site. The applicant advises that this is not a new business with dog grooming occurring at the site when they took occupation of the site in June 2000; however they have advised that the nature of the business has changed – it no longer just offers dog grooming, since 2007 it has been used as a base to teach the practical element

of animal care qualifications, including City and Guilds. They advise that the pet grooming academy, which treats 5-6 dogs per day, each for approx. 2 hours, operates between 10am and 3pm Monday to Friday, employing 4 members of staff (the applicant and 3 other, non-family members).

- They want to invest further in the dog grooming salon/pet grooming academy by expanding the number of qualifications taught; they estimate that this will result in one additional member of staff and an apprentice being employed. In order to do this and improve the facilities available to staff and pupils they plan to relocate the dog grooming/pet grooming academy into the area occupied by the kennels.
- In order to allow them to invest in the dog grooming salon/pet grooming academy the applicant is looking to re-mortgage the dwelling, however many of the major lenders have been unwilling to lend with the restrictive occupancy condition in place.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – No comments received to date

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Brian Rigby has expressed his support for the removal of the condition, stating that the kennel business has closed and unless the condition is removed the applicant would be in breach of the conditions attached to the consent for the dwelling. Councillor Rigby states that he does not consider that having a disused and abandoned property at the site is desirable – the site could fall into disrepair and become an eyesore should the applicant have to vacate the dwelling.

Councillor John Lamb has also expressed support for the removal of the condition on the basis that the kennel business is no longer operational and the restrictive clause is having a negative impact upon the applicant's plans to invest in the pet grooming academy, with the retention of the condition having the potential to result in the dwelling being incapable of occupation.

Neighbours –

No letters of representation have been received in response to this application.

OBSERVATIONS

Background

1. This application seeks consent to remove condition 7 on planning approval H/64515 which gave consent for the erection of the dwelling at 21 Little Ees Lane in March 2007. This condition restricts the occupation of the dwelling to those employed or last employed at the onsite kennels and cattery. The condition read as follows –

“The occupation of the bungalow hereby permitted shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed or last employed in the business as a kennels and cattery conducted on the site edged red on the attached plan, or a widow or widower of such a person, or any resident dependants”.

2. The reason for attaching the condition was given as “To prevent the establishment of a separate dwelling which would be unacceptable in this Green Belt location having regard to Proposals C4, C5 and D1 of the Adopted Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan”.
3. Having regard to the reason that the condition was attached it is considered that the main issue to consider in determining this application is what harm, if any, there would be to the Green Belt if the condition was removed thereby allowing the dwelling at 21 Little Ees Lane to be occupied by any individual.

Green Belt Policy

4. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF identifies the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
5. Paragraph 80 notes that Green Belt serves five purposes:
 - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
6. Paragraph 89 establishes the principle of inappropriate development stating that “A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt”. It goes on to outline a series of exceptions to this, noting that the following forms of development should not be considered to represent inappropriate development –
 - buildings for agriculture and forestry;
 - provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
 - the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
 - limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
 - limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

7. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF advises that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are:
- mineral extraction;
 - engineering operations;
 - local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
 - the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; and
 - development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order.
 - Trafford Core Strategy policy R4 relates to land in the Green belt, Countryside and Protected Open land.
8. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances, with paragraph 88 stating that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
9. Policies R4.1 and R4.2 of the Trafford Core Strategy advise that the Council will protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development, advising that new development, will only be permitted within the green belt where it is for one of the appropriate purposes specified in National Guidance, where the proposal does not prejudice the primary purposes of the Green Belt set out in national guidance by reason of its scale, siting, materials or design or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated in support of the proposal.

Implications of the removal of the condition

10. A site visit by the case officer and ward councillor, John Lamb, confirmed that the kennel business was no longer operational on site. Notwithstanding this the wording of the condition is such that the closure of the business does not prevent the dwelling being occupied by the applicant and their dependants given that the applicant was formerly employed at the kennel business.
11. However, the applicant contends that the condition is restricting their ability to re-mortgage the property to invest in the dog grooming salon/pet grooming academy. They also contend that the condition is restricting their ability to sell the property, with Bridgefords, the estate agent who marketed the property between October 2012 and early 2014, attributing the lack of offers to the fact that lenders are dubious about financing a property with conditions/ties.
12. Having regard to the fact that the kennel business has ceased to exist on site the retention of the restrictive condition seems perverse as it would render an existing dwelling incapable of occupation by any individual other than the applicant and their family, with them only being able to occupy the dwelling while the kennels remain the last source of employment for either the applicant

or their partner – if both the applicant and their partner found alternative employment and the condition retained the dwelling would become incapable of occupation by any party.

13. Having regard to this and given that the dwelling is already in situ which means that the removal of the condition would not in itself result in any harm to the openness of the Green Belt nor would it conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt it is not considered that there is any planning reason to resist the removal of condition 7 on planning approval H/64515 in order to allow any individual to occupy the dwelling at 21 Little Ees Lane.
14. The Local Planning Authority would retain control over how the site develops in the future as with the exception of the re-establishment of the kennel business any new development at the site would require planning permission; with the Local Planning Authority being able to consider the planning merits of any new use or buildings at the time at which a new application is received– if a development was inappropriate and harmful to the Green Belt the Local Planning Authority could refuse a proposal on this basis.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modifications
 - (i) No extensions shall be carried out to the dwelling
 - (ii) No garages or carports shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling
 - (iii) No buildings, gates, walls, fences or other structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling

Other than those expressly authorised by this permission unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason – To protect the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt having regard to policy R4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the NPPF.

2. The residential use of the site shall be limited to the area identified on drawing 6010.01 as garden area and there shall be no encroachment at any time onto the adjoining land outside the defined curtilage.

Reason – In the interests of the openness and amenities of the Green Belt where the policy of the Local Planning Authority is not to permit the type of development hereby permitted and the condition is designed to restrict the residential part of the site having regard to policy R4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the NPPF.

NT



This material has been reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 81768/VAR/2013

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

WARD: Davyhulme
East

81952/VAR/2013

DEPARTURE: No

VARIATION OF CONDITION 5 (LIST OF APPROVED PLANS) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 79746/VAR/2013 (CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CANAL ROAD CROSSING AND ASSOCIATED ROADS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING ROADS AS PART OF THE WESTERN GATEWAY INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEME (WGIS)) TO INCLUDE REVISED PLAN OF FULL WGIS (BOTH PHASES OF THE WGIS DEVELOPMENT) SHOWING AMENDMENTS TO HIGHWAY WORKS INCLUDING ALTERATIONS TO THE OFF SLIP ROAD FROM JUNCTION 10 OF THE M60 ONTO TRAFFORD BOULEVARD TOGETHER WITH CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES TO THE ROADS IN THE VICINITY OF JUNCTION 10

Land adjacent to the Manchester Ship Canal, M60 and Trafford Boulevard, Urmston

APPLICANT: Peel Investments (North) Ltd.

AGENT: N/A

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application site is located around and including Junction 10 of the M60 and includes land between the Manchester Ship Canal (to the north), the M60 (to the west and south-west) and Trafford Boulevard (to the east).

The land in the centre of the proposed roads and highway works is allocated in the Unitary Development Plan as a Regional Sports Complex and has been developed in recent years with a number of leisure developments including the JJB Soccer Dome, the golf driving range and the Chill Factor e ski slope.

The Manchester Ship Canal is the administrative boundary between Trafford and Salford. The original WGIS application formed part of a wider set of proposals that also included land within Salford.

PROPOSAL

The Western Gateway Infrastructure Scheme (WGIS) is intended to provide additional local road capacity parallel to the M60 and a crossing over the Ship Canal as well as improvements to some local roads. The scheme would therefore reduce local trips on a section of the M60 and provide development opportunities in the area.

The original application, H/58904, formed part of a wider set of development proposals, which also included that part of the Western Gateway Infrastructure Scheme (WGIS) within Salford as well as Port Salford – a multi-modal freight

terminal to be located to the north of the Ship Canal (opposite Davyhulme Sewage Works). The Salford WGIS proposal included new roads and road improvements between Junction 12 in the north and the proposed canal crossing in the south.

In addition to the Port Salford development, the wider WGIS road scheme is also designed to allow additional highway capacity for further development including major office and residential development at Trafford Quays.

The Trafford section of WGIS included a new bridge providing a road crossing over the Manchester Ship Canal and associated highway works including: -

- a link road (referred to as the parallel collector road) running parallel with the M60 to the east of the motorway and to the west of Chill Factor-e – the road would carry local traffic currently using the motorway between Junctions 10 and 11; the central section of this road (including the new canal bridge) was proposed to be a two way dual carriageway;
- alterations to the slip roads to and from the M60 at Junction 10 including the closure of the anti-clockwise exit slip road onto Trafford Boulevard - the parallel collector road would be connected into the roundabout in place of this slip road;
- alterations to the motorway between Junctions 9 and 10 including an additional lane anticlockwise;
- a link road running along the northern side of the JJB Soccer Dome and joining up with the existing access road at Trafford Way, which links to Trafford Boulevard;
- facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the Ship Canal and for the Metrolink to be extended over the Ship Canal into Salford;
- local road improvements to Bridgewater and Ellesmere Circles.

The current application proposes an amendment to the approved WGIS scheme to replace the existing off-slip road at Junction 10 with one with a longer diverge capacity off the motorway mainline for vehicles turning left from the M60 onto Trafford Boulevard together with consequential changes to the roads in the vicinity of Junction 10. The amended scheme is referred to as “Super-WGIS”. The proposed slip road would bridge over the WGIS link road, which runs between the Ship Canal and Junction 10. The amended scheme allows the link road to be reduced in width to a standard single carriageway as the slip road would take traffic heading for Trafford Park from the north that, in the approved scheme, would have used the new link road. The proposed slip road would be restricted to having only a left turn onto Trafford Boulevard. As in the consented scheme, traffic from the north heading for Urmston would be catered for by the link road between Junction 11 and Junction 10.

The current proposal is also part of a wider set of amendments that includes alterations to Junction 11 within Salford but these are outside the scope of this application.

The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement and a Transport Statement.

The original application was supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment. The conclusions of the Environmental Statement have been reviewed and it has been determined that there are no environmental effects that have not already been assessed and there is no need for any further or additional mitigation measures.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford comprises:

The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.

The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.

The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning application.

The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L5 – Climate Change

L7 – Design

W1 - Economy

W2 – Town centres and Retail

SL4 – Trafford Centre Rectangle

R1 – Historic Environment

R2 – Natural Environment

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Trafford Centre and its Vicinity (TCA1)

Regional Sports Complex (TCA1(a))

Mixed Use Development (TCA1(b))

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/ PROPOSALS

T8 – Improvements to the Highway Network

T9 – Private Funding of Development Related Highway and Public Transport Schemes

T18 – Providing for Pedestrians, Cyclists and the Disabled

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

80881/VAR/2013 - Variation of Condition 5 (list of approved plans) of planning permission 79746/VAR/2013 to include revised plan of Part WGIS (first phase of development) showing amendments to highway works within the boundary of the M60 – Approved – 30th June 2014

80829/FULL/2013 - Construction of new permanent access road to Davyhulme Waste Water Treatment Works – Current application

79746/VAR/2013 – Variation of Conditions 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 19, 20, 23 and 24 of planning permission H/58904 – to amend the requirements of the conditions in terms of the timing of the submission of details and removal of Condition 15 (relating to the provision of double glazing) – Approved – 11th April 2013. (The double glazing was no longer required because the dwelling to which this related has now been demolished).

H/58904 – Construction of new canal road crossing and associated roads and improvements to existing roads as part of the Western Gateway Infrastructure Scheme (WGIS) – Approved 18th February 2009

Related Planning Application in Salford

03/47344/HYBOUT – Port Salford - Multi-modal freight interchange comprising rail served distribution warehousing, rail link, canal quay and berths, inter-modal and ancillary facilities, vehicle parking, landscaping and canal crossing and associated roads as part of the Western Gateway Infrastructure Scheme – land between the Manchester Ship Canal and the A57 (Liverpool Road) between Eccles Sewage Works to the east and Makro to the west, together with a corridor to the Trans-Pennine rail line east and north of Barton Aerodrome – Approved - DATE

CONSULTATIONS

Highways Agency: No objections, subject to conditions: -

1. Submission of full design and construction details including all geotechnical and structural design requirements including:

How the scheme interfaces with the existing highway alignment, details of the carriageway markings and lane destinations;

Full signing and lighting details;

Confirmation of full compliance with current Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Policies (or approved relaxations / departures from standards).

An independent Stage One and Two Road Safety Audit (Stage Two Road Safety Audit taking account of any Stage One Road Safety Audit recommendations) carried out in accordance with current Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Advice Notes.

2. Highway improvements in accordance with Condition 1 above to be implemented

The proposed works at Junction 10 of the M60 will need to meet the design, construction, geotechnical and structural requirements of the Agency and be fully compliant with current Departmental Standards (DMRB). The applicant is therefore advised to pursue the detailed design and commence discussions with the Agency as early as possible to ensure there are no delays to the intended opening of the development.

LHA: No objections but request that a condition is attached to ensure that all junction designs should be assessed by GMUTC.

Pollution and Licensing: No comments received.

Environment Agency: No comments received.

Transport for Greater Manchester: No comments received.

GM Ecology Unit: No comments received.

Salford City Council: No observations.

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of objection received making the following comments: -

- Object to the proposals on the grounds that a more long-term strategy is required for the area. Rather than drip-feeding applications through, residents need to know the wider picture.
- Residents also need to know the likely extent of disruption as a result of the works and a guarantee that there will be no work at night.
- There are very few tactile crossings in the area. This needs to be rectified.

OBSERVATIONS

BACKGROUND

1. At the time of the original application, H/58904, it was recognised that the lack of capacity at certain times of the day on the M60 in the vicinity of the Barton High Level bridge and on the surrounding local road network was a serious constraint on the future development potential of major sites within Trafford and Salford. Transportation modelling was carried out by the applicant in close liaison with the two local highway authorities (Trafford and Salford Councils), the Greater Manchester Transportation Unit and the Highways Agency, taking into account future traffic growth and future development in the area. The impact of the Western Gateway Infrastructure Scheme (WGIS) was compared with a do-minimum scenario and this clearly demonstrated that the WGIS scheme provides additional road capacity when compared with the do-minimum scenario resulting in increased throughput of traffic and reduced congestion.
2. Planning permission H/58904 was granted for the WGIS development on 18th February 2009 and, more recently, a revised permission, 79746/VAR/2013, has been granted, which introduced different timescales in relation to the submission of information in respect of some of the conditions.
3. It is intended that WGIS will be provided in two stages. The first, known as Part WGIS is now under construction and primarily involves changes to the local highway network including the new bridge over the Ship Canal. The second stage, Full WGIS, adds to Part WGIS, predominantly with changes to the motorway network and its connections.
4. The approved Full WGIS scheme includes the closure of both motorway slip roads at Junction 11 and the anti-clockwise off slip road at Junction 10 thus removing weaving traffic on Barton Bridge between the closely spaced junctions. However, further discussions have taken place between the applicant and the two highway authorities and the scheme has been amended with the objective of maintaining a motorway slip road entry into Trafford Park. The intended benefits include: -
 - less traffic passing through Junction 11;
 - less weaving on the M60 anti-clockwise between Junction 12 and Junction 11, and simpler signing requirements;
 - maintaining the absence of weaving on Barton Bridge; and
 - providing a direct motorway entry into Trafford Park to supplement the constrained Junction 9.
5. The amendment would allow the link road to be reduced in width to a standard single carriageway as the proposed slip road would take traffic heading for Trafford Park from the north that, in the consented scheme, would have used the new link road.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

6. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. Paragraph 7, identifies three dimensions to sustainable development, economic, social and environmental, which give rise to the need for the planning system to perform economic, social and environmental roles. The economic role includes *“identifying and co-ordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure”*.
7. Paragraph 31 of the NPPF states that *“local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including...transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of...major generators of travel demand in their areas”*. It is considered that the approved WGIS scheme and the proposed amendments would comply with these objectives.
8. The route of the proposed new road and Ship Canal crossing is identified as a safeguarded route on the Revised Trafford UDP Proposals Map under Proposal T8 – Improvements to the Highway Network. The route is also shown on the Draft Land Allocations Plan.
9. It is considered that, subject to the traffic impacts considered below, the proposed amendments would comply with Policy L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility – of the Trafford Core Strategy. In particular, L4.1 states that *“To facilitate the delivery strategy the Council will promote the development and maintenance of a sustainable integrated transport network that is accessible and offers a choice of modes of travel to all sectors of the local community and visitors to the Borough by:*

...(b) Bringing forward new highway and public transport infrastructure schemes that will improve accessibility and provide additional capacity and / or address identified congestion, access, safety and environmental impact problems to facilitate the continued safe, efficient and environmentally sustainable operation of the networks.”
10. In addition, the provision of WGIS is identified as a Development Requirement in respect of the Core Strategy proposals for the Trafford Centre Rectangle, which is designated as a Strategic Location under Policy SL4. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, subject to the consideration of the detailed highway and traffic impacts below.

HIGHWAY IMPACTS

11. The submitted Transport Assessment concludes that the proposed amendment would have strategic and local benefits when compared with the approved WGIS scheme and that there are no transport related reasons why the amendment should not be incorporated into the consent.

12. The LHA comments that, in the proposed scheme, the Junction 10 slip road only allows vehicles to exit east onto Trafford Boulevard in the direction of the Trafford Centre and Trafford Park. All other traffic from the north that is intending to exit west onto Barton Road has to exit the M60 earlier on the new low level local road that is being installed. As part of the amendments to the slip road, a longer diverge lane capacity is being provided, which will provide 130 metres extra length to cater for an additional 22 pcu's (passenger car units) per lane.
13. The slip road will take traffic heading for Trafford Park from the north off the consented new local highway network by keeping these vehicles on the M60 going over Barton Bridge and therefore the width of the WGIS link road can be reduced between the Ship Canal and Junction 10.
14. In the consented scheme, the link road comprises one lane northwards and two lanes southwards. In the proposed scheme, the southbound lanes become a single carriageway lane with a flared entry into the Junction 10 signal controlled junction with tapered exit.
15. The LHA concludes that the proposals will have little impact on the average journey times for the existing consented scheme and the proposed journey times and both average journey time and average delay will reduce with the proposed amendment. The additional entry arm on Junction 10 is designed to run on green at the same time as the WGIS link entry so there is no significant additional lost time.
16. The submitted TA has assessed the queue lengths and has noted a general reduction in the am peak queue length when compared with the consented WGIS scheme. The only increase would be on the Barton Road entry into Junction 10 with an average increase in queue length of 25 metres (approximately 4-5 car lengths) in the am peak hour forecast.
17. At the Bridgewater Circle, there is a significant redistribution of entry demand when compared with the consented WGIS scheme, particularly between the Trafford Boulevard (south) and Trafford Way entries into the roundabout. This results in a small queue increase on the Trafford Way and Trafford Boulevard entries.
18. Whilst the wider amendments to the scheme would result in some alterations to Junction 11, these do not fall within the scope of this application within Trafford.
19. The consented scheme has a planning condition that restricts the times when the new WGIS bridge can be opened for the Ship Canal. This was required as the removal of the Barton Bridge anti-clockwise slip road combined with the alternative new bridge over the Ship Canal being closed to traffic would create difficult traffic conditions at peak times. The proposed amendment will

improve this as anti-clockwise traffic heading towards Trafford Park is not impeded by the opening of the WGIS bridge.

20. The LHA has therefore raised no objections to the proposed amendments but has requested that a condition is attached to ensure that all junction designs should be assessed by GMUTC (Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control Unit).
21. The Highways Agency has raised no objections to the amended proposals in terms of the impact on the strategic highway network but has directed that conditions should be attached to the permission requiring the submission and implementation of full design and construction details.
22. It is considered that the amended proposals accord with Policies L4 and SL4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and in particular L4.1b, which seeks to bring forward new highway and public transport infrastructure schemes that will improve accessibility and provide additional capacity and/or address identified congestion, access, safety and environmental impact problems to facilitate the continued safe, efficient and environmentally sustainable operation of the networks.”

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

23. The approved WGIS scheme includes the provision of a Metrolink / public transport corridor that runs across the proposed canal bridge into Salford as well as details of bus priority lanes in the vicinity of Bridgewater Circle. However, it was recognised that the detailed design of the road layouts was likely to change over the life of the permission and a condition was therefore attached requiring further details and implementation of public transport routes. It is considered that the proposed amendments do not raise any new issues in terms of public transport provision, subject to the retention of the above condition.

PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLING LINKS

24. The approved plans also show pedestrian and cycle routes running alongside the proposed roads and pedestrian and cycle crossings at two locations within the Trafford application site – one at Junction 10 and one at the new roundabout within the leisure complex area. A condition was attached to the permission requiring the detailed design of these routes and crossings. It is considered that the proposed amendments do not raise any new issues in terms of pedestrian and cycle accessibility subject to the retention of the above condition.

OTHER ISSUES

25. It is not considered that the amended scheme will have any significant additional impacts in terms of visual amenity, noise, air quality, ecological, archaeological or heritage impacts when compared with the approved scheme. All conditions attached to the previous permission, 79746/VAR/2013,

would be repeated on any new permission, except where variations are required because details have already been approved.

CONCLUSION

26. The acceptability in principle of the WGIS proposal has already been confirmed by the existing planning permissions. The proposed amendment, which involves retaining an off slip road from Junction 10 of the M60 to access Trafford Park is also considered to be acceptable. The development accords with the Trafford Core Strategy and would deliver strategic highway improvements, bringing additional capacity to the highway network, producing improved operational conditions and providing infrastructure to accommodate future development in the area. It is considered that, subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development would be acceptable in policy terms and in terms of traffic modelling, highway safety and all other matters considered previously at the time of application H/58904. It is therefore recommended that planning permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions: -

1. Time Limit Condition (commencement by 18th February 2019)
2. Detailed design of bridge and samples and details of materials to be submitted.
3. Landscaping (for the areas of structural planting shown on drawing numbers 01022/PL14 and PL15 and for all other incidental open spaces).
4. No phase of development (as defined in a phasing plan that has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall commence until details of all re-grading work and details of existing and proposed ground levels within that phase of development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
5. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the application plans 010041/SLP1 Revision C, M35036 210D, M08098-A-189, M05013-A-041C Revision C, M05013-A-033F, M05013-A-092A, M05013-A-105A, M05013-A-106A, M05013-A-107A, M05013-A-108A, M05013-A-109A, 010022/PL/05A, 010022/PL14, 010022/PL15, 0905/02 and M08098-A-180-Part WGIS Revised Plan A, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
6. Remediation measures set out in site investigation for contaminated land and landfill gas approved in relation to Discharge of Conditions application 79872/COND/2013 to be implemented and a site completion report to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
7. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development/demolition shall take place within the application site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
8. Details of surface water drainage

9. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no piling work through areas of the site that may have the potential for cross contamination to deeper levels shall commence until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
10. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no phase of development alongside the Manchester Ship Canal shall commence until temporary protective metal fencing has been erected along the boundary with the Manchester Ship Canal, the details and precise position of which shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fencing shall be retained in position for the duration of the construction period.
11. Implementation of scheme for the storage, handling, loading and unloading of fuels, oils, chemicals and effluents during construction approved in relation to Discharge of Conditions application 79872/COND/2013
12. Implementation of scheme for storage of chemicals during construction approved in relation to Discharge of Conditions application 79872/COND/2013
13. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no phase of development (as defined in a phasing plan that has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall commence until the detailed design of the pedestrian and cycle routes as illustrated on plan number M05013-A-041C Revision C (including width, typical sections, surfacing materials) and details of the design and width of pedestrian crossings, details of pedestrian barriers, street furniture, street lighting and the design and materials of retaining walls relating to development within that phase of development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with these details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
14. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the first opening for public use of any part of the road network hereby approved, routes for public transport and bus priority lanes shall be provided in accordance with details that shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these routes shall be safeguarded thereafter, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
15. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of the phases of development relating specifically to the junctions of Bridgewater Circle and Ellesmere Circle, details of the design of the those respective junctions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with these details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
16. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, within three months of the date of this permission, the applicant shall set up and hold an initial meeting of a Port Salford / WGIS Highway Design Group. This

grouping shall meet regularly based upon a frequency agreed by all parties at the first meeting.

17. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of the development pursuant to this planning permission, the developer shall set up the Port Salford Transportation Steering Group (PSTSG) by meeting with, as a minimum, representatives of the two local highway authorities (Salford and Trafford), the Highways Agency and the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive.
18. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency, no construction (beyond site remediation measures) of any phase of development (as defined in a phasing plan that has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority), shall be commenced unless and until:

the detailed design, construction details and traffic management details broadly in accordance with the highway works set out in Plan A ('Part WGIS') have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency;

None of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until:

- a) the statutory orders necessary under the Highways Act 1980 (or any other Act) required for the construction of the additional crossing of the Manchester Ship Canal (MSC) have been confirmed;
 - b) details of the periods of closure to vehicular traffic of the proposed additional crossing of the Ship Canal set out in Plan A have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency;
 - c) the necessary harbour revision orders, (should such an order be necessary) under the Harbours Act (or other such necessary Act) to limit the navigable rights of way of water based traffic passing along the MSC through the proposed additional crossing shown in Plan A to the times specified in part(c) above have been confirmed;
 - d) details of a traffic management and advanced driver information strategy to inform drivers and the Highways Agency's Regional Control Centre (RCC) of the occurrence of the swing bridge shown on Plan A (as part of Part WGIS) being closed to vehicular traffic has been agreed;.
 - e) the necessary Transport and Street Works Act order or orders (should such orders be necessary) required to implement the rail connection to the development have been confirmed.
19. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development pursuant to this planning approval shall be brought into use unless and until the highway works as agreed in Condition 18 (Part WGIS) have been fully implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.
 20. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency, no development pursuant to this

planning permission beyond site remediation measures, shall be commenced unless and until:

- a) the detailed design, construction details and traffic management details broadly in accordance with the highway works set out in Plan C ('Full WGIS') have been approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency;
 - b) the highways orders necessary under the Highways Act 1980 required for the mitigating highway works as identified in Plan C namely:
 1. the closure of the M60 Junction 11 southbound on slip;
 2. the closure of the M60 Junction 11 northbound off slip;
 3. The closure of the M60 Junction 10 southbound off-slip;have been confirmed;
 - c) agreement of the periods of closure to vehicular traffic of the proposed additional crossing of the Ship Canal set out in Plan C has been reached with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency;
 - d) the necessary harbour revision orders, (should such an order be necessary) under the Harbours Act (or other such necessary Act) to limit the navigable rights of way of water based traffic passing along the MSC through the proposed additional crossing shown in Plan C (as part of Full WGIS) to the times specified in part(c) above have been confirmed;
 - e) details of a traffic management and advanced driver information strategy to inform drivers and the Highways Agency's Regional Control Centre (RCC) of the occurrence of the swing bridge shown on Plan C being closed to vehicular traffic has been agreed.
21. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency, no development of the Full WGIS scheme pursuant to this planning permission shall be brought into use unless and until:
- a) the works as agreed in Condition 20(a) above (Full WGIS) have been fully implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.
22. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development of the proposed WGIS scheme pursuant to this planning permission shall be brought into use unless and until:
- a) any phasing of any parts of the scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority;
 - b) the detailed design, construction details and traffic management details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority;
 - c) details of the periods of closure to vehicular traffic of the proposed additional crossing of the Manchester Ship Canal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority;

d) the necessary Harbour Revision Orders under the Harbours Act (or other such necessary Act), should such orders be necessary, to limit the navigable rights of way of water based traffic passing along the Manchester Ship Canal through the proposed additional crossing to the times specified in part c) above have been confirmed;

e) details of a traffic management and advanced driver information strategy to inform drivers of the occurrence of the swing bridge crossing of the Manchester Ship Canal being closed to vehicular traffic have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved in relation to part a) above, the hours of closure of the Ship Canal bridge shall be limited to those approved in part c) above and the approved traffic management and advanced driver information strategy in relation to part e) above shall be operated thereafter. No part of the proposed WGIS scheme pursuant to this planning permission shall be brought into use unless and until the works approved in relation to part b) above have been fully implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority;

23. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the details submitted in relation to part a) of Condition 20 above shall include public transport measures to ensure that the approved scheme can contribute to the longer term public transport infrastructure requirements of the area and a timetable for implementation of the measures. The approved public transport measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

24. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development shall commence unless and until the following full design and construction details of the required improvements to Junction 10 of the M60 shown in outline on drawing M05013-A-092 Revision A (including all geotechnical and structural design requirements) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Secretary of State for Transport. The details to be submitted shall include:


- How the scheme interfaces with the existing highway alignment, details of the carriageway markings and lane destinations;
- Full signing and lighting details;
- Confirmation of full compliance with current Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Policies (or approved relaxations / departures from standards);

- An independent Stage One and Two Road Safety Audit (Stage Two Road Safety Audit taking account of any Stage One Road Safety Audit recommendations) carried out in accordance with current Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Advice Notes.

The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until the highway improvements have been implemented in accordance with the approved details to the satisfaction of the local planning authority in consultation with the Secretary of State for Transport.

25. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to commencement of development, confirmation to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA that all junction designs have been assessed by GMUTC

SD



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 81952/VAR/2014

Scale 1:90000 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, Trafford Town Hall, 1st Floor, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

CHANGE OF USE FROM GARDEN NURSERY TO AIRPORT CAR PARKING.

Clay Lane Nurseries, Clay Lane/Thorley Lane, Timperley, WA15 7AF

APPLICANT: Day by Day Parking

AGENT: Urban Roots

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED FROM 12TH MARCH 2014 PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT SUFFICIENT TIME TO ADDRESS REPRESENTATIONS AND SUGGESTED REASONS FOR REFUSAL.

SITE

The application site is located on the south-east side of Thorley Lane, and was formerly used for the purposes of cultivating garden plants (agriculture). Approximately half the site is open land and the other half contains two large detached glass house buildings. Glass House A is located to the north side of the site and Glass House B to the south-east side. The site is accessed from Thorley Lane and also by a second access from Clay Lane to the north. The site measures approximately 0.7ha in size and is located within the Green Belt.

To the east side of the site is Altrincham Masonic Hall, to the south is Thorley Lane Farm which is accessed through the application site, this particular site is used in association with a landscaping business. No. 2 Clay Lane is a bungalow which is immediately to the west side of the application site boundary. To the north side of the site are poly-tunnels. The site is located close to wider residential areas on Clay Lane; Wellfield Lane and Wood Lane.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks a temporary use of the site for a period of three years for airport car-parking. The unauthorised use of the site for airport car-parking commenced on site in May 2013; following initial letters requesting cessation of the unauthorised use, the Council issued an enforcement notice (dated 3rd December 2013) requiring the owner to cease the unauthorised use of the land and revert it back to its lawful use. The owner of the site proceeded to submit the current planning application to seek to regularise the planning status of the site. Whilst the

enforcement notice took effect from the 3rd January 2014, enforcement proceedings have been temporarily suspended until such time that the current application is determined.

The operation of the business involves the staff of the company picking the clients car up at the airport and driving it to the site, the applicant has referred to this activity as 'meet and greet' parking, with the cars then returned to the airport by the company staff on the date of the clients return flight.

The cars are reversed into rows within the glass houses and it is suggested by the applicant that they are organised in such a manner that they can be taken out in date order to minimise any disruption. The submitted plans would suggest that 42 cars can be parked within Glass House A and 46 cars in Glass House B.

The applicant has suggested that they wish to only have a temporary use for a period of three years, and that the long term use of the site is to remain as a garden nursery (agriculture) use. The application proposes the use of the Thorley Lane access only.

Following the deferral from the March 2014 Planning Committee the applicant has submitted supporting information which is summarised in the Applicant's Submission section of the report. Neighbours were reconsulted on the additional supporting information. The following information has been submitted in support of the development proposal:

- Planning & Business Operational Statement
- Structural Survey of Glasshouses
- Highways and Transportation Report
- 2x Planning appeal statements regarding a site outside Trafford.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy** adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.

- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 Design

R2 – Natural Environment

R3 – Green Infrastructure

R4 – Green Belt, Countryside and Other Protected Open Land

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Green Belt

Area of Landscape Protection

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

C4 – Green Belt

ENV17 – Areas of Landscape Protection

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/52635 – Erection of a three span poly-tunnel greenhouse for production of bedding plants – Approved November 2001

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The following supporting information has been received and summarised as follows:-

Applicant's Planning & Business Operational Statement

The business operates at two locations; a holding compound at the airport, and the application site. Day by Day Parking offers a pre-arranged meet and greet airport parking system. Customers must book the required service in advance, which principally involves meeting the customer at the airport, collecting their car, storing their car for them while they are away, and returning their car to them when they return to the airport. The car is then moved to the holding compound at the airport,

the principal business location. If the customer is only away for a short period of time, the car will remain at the holding area. For those vehicles that require longer term storage, Day by Day parking make use of the application site.

Vehicles are stored at the application site within the existing glasshouses. The physical structure of these glasshouses means the cars have to be stored in rows. The vehicles are stored in batches in relation to their return date, this avoids unnecessary manoeuvring.

Vehicle movements only take place between the hours of 0700 hours and 1700 hours; five members of staff move the vehicles en-masse between both sites. This is the most effective system to ensure the planned storage sequence/system is achieved. The bay that a car is stored on is relevant to the day which it must be returned. For example the car of a customer who has been away two weeks and the car of a customer who has been away one week will be stored together when they are both returning on the same day. Customers cars collected at night will be stored at the airport.

The washing and valeting of vehicles only takes place at the airport site, no washing and valeting takes place at the application site.

No storage of cars will take place outside the glasshouses and can be controlled by condition.

No requirement for external lighting nor any vehicle movements on a 24/7 basis which can both be controlled by condition.

Containers on site are not the applicants and were not brought onto site by the applicant.

Maintenance of surfacing may take place within the site; however it is not proposed to undertake any resurfacing.

The use is proposed for a period of three years.

Applicant's Structural Survey

The northern glasshouse (glasshouse A) measures approximately 1,200m² in area over 8 bays. Only the western portion of the southern glasshouse (glasshouse B) is being utilised for vehicle storage, and the area used for cars is approximately 1,000m², over 8 bays.

The buildings are of typical design and constructed of galvanised steel and aluminium frame which supports glazing units. The glasshouses are of a

straightforward tied frame construction resulting with multiple ridgelines and internally a series of linear spaces with limited ability for lateral movement given the nature of the construction.

The northern building (Glasshouse A) is constructed on a series of raised concrete foundations, the box steel columns of the superstructure secured through bolted connections. The aluminium glazing structure is also supported by concrete dado walls, to north, east and western elevations. The building has a bare earth floor, with Terram (weed control sheeting) laid over the floor to prevent plant growth.

The southern building (Glasshouse B) is constructed on a series of strip foundations. The building has tubular steel diagonal bracing and dwarf brick/block walls sit beneath the external glazing. The floor is constructed in concrete.

In each case the foundations are well constructed and have provided adequate structural support for a period of in excess of 40 years. The fabric of the buildings remains intact, there are no signs of obvious or immediate deterioration that would render them unusable and they remain secure. With continued maintenance this will remain the case.

Applicant's Highways and Transportation Report

The site has the ability to securely store a maximum of around 120 vehicles. The main hours of operation are from around 0700 hours to 0800 hours in the morning and from around 1000 hours to 1500 hours. The applicant does not transport vehicles to this facility within the traditional peak times between 0800 hours and 0900 hours or between 1630 hours and 1830hours.

The access to site is generally well laid out and visibility within required standards. The access could be slightly modified and improved including minor works such as lining and signing, but in its current form there are no highways or pedestrian concerns.

Trip rate analysis of the current use class and the proposed use would suggest that a garden nursery daily trip rates of 114 two way vehicle movements per 12 hour day. Log sheets from March for the airport car-parking use indicate that there is no more than 30 two way traffic movements generated from the site over a greater time span. This equates to around 70% less of traffic impact to that of the potential traffic if the site remained as a plant nursery/small garden centre.

Suggested conditions to manage the use of the site include:-

- Amount of vehicles using site
- Hours of use for vehicle movements

- Register of vehicles available for inspection
- No public access to the site.

Applicant's Appeal Statements

Two supporting appeal statements relating to the same site in Styal, Wilmslow, Cheshire relate to the use of horticultural glasshouse being used for storage of cars for airport car-parking, similar to the proposed development. The earlier appeal allowed in 2004 stated that the building is a 'large glass and steel structure'; this is also true of the glasshouses the subject of this application. The Inspector concludes on the matter that the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the glasshouse being of 'reasonable substantial construction'. The latter of the two appeals determined in 2009 concluded that the airport car-parking would not amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Highway Authority – Following submission of the Highways and Transportation Report, there are no objections in highway terms subject to the following conditions:-

- The amount of vehicles permitted to use the facility must not exceed 15 movements in and 15 movements out per 24 hour day (with exceptions)
- Vehicles should not be permitted to enter or exit the site between the hours of 0800 hours-0900 hours or between the hours of 1700 hours or 1800 hours Monday – Friday.
- The applicant must keep an up to date register of all vehicles using the facility and make it available for inspection by the Council
- There should be no public access permitted to the site at any time. All vehicles accessing and egressing the site must be driven by the staff of this operation.

Pollution & Licensing - Whilst the number of car parking spaces would normally require an air quality assessment, as the spaces are going to be used for long term parking, it is considered that the traffic flow in and out of the premises would be low. Therefore an air quality assessment is not required to be undertaken for this development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Butt has objected to the proposal for the following reasons:-

- The mass storage, processing and movement of vehicles is inappropriate for this location and would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt.

- The site being covered with vehicles, equipment, containers and temporary buildings would be detrimental to the environmental amenity of residents and the public.
- Despite what the applicant has suggested, there is no significant level of anti-social behaviour at this site and this cannot be a justification for the business.
- Despite the closure of the nursery business, it is not for the local planning authority to facilitate income generation for the landowner to the detriment of the Green Belt and the local community.
- Unauthorised use by the owner
- The use of security lighting around the site will be inevitable for so many parked vehicles – This would cause light pollution
- The restricted access and narrow country lanes between the airport and the Clay Lane site are not suitable for ferrying cars back and forth on a 24/7 basis.

Neighbours: - 29 letters of objection have been received from local residents and members of the public (including one from Timperley Civic Society) citing the following reasons for objection:-

- Out of keeping with the surrounding area
- Too close to residential properties
- Cars coming and going at late hours
- Car park will be floodlit
- Increase in car movements on narrow roads – proximity to Thorley Lane/Clay Lane roundabout potential hazard to road users
- Will decrease property values
- Adverse impact on local wildlife
- Use not compatible with Green Belt
- Will result in noise and air pollution
- If approved would be a precedent for such development within the Green Belt
- Appropriate parking at the airport
- Applicant overstates the incidence of ant-social behaviour at the site.
- Potential for chemical pollution from the valeting service.
- Potential for criminal interest in the site
- Hardsurfacing will result in flooding issues

Following consultation with neighbours on the additional supporting information submitted by the applicant; the following six letters of objection were received, five of the addresses have previously made representations outlined above; additional comments include:-

- Car alarms going off
- Staff shouting to one another
- Car engines left running with car stereos left on, car doors being slammed
- Cars are move 7 days a week including Christmas day and Boxing day
- Police have been called following a car being stripped down by thieves which is intimidating.
- Contrary to Green Belt policy
- Increase in traffic on country roads

- Loss of privacy
- No details provided about the holding compound at the airport
- No details regarding the preferred vehicle route between sites
- Two Major employers in the area Manchester airport and Wythenshawe Hospital mean local roads are busy from 0700 hours.
- Movement of vehicles is extremely noticeable when headlights are in use in winter months
- Conditions would be difficult to police
- It is time the Council supported its constituents.

OBSERVATIONS

GREEN BELT

1. National Policy regarding Green Belt is contained within the NPPF. Para.87 of the NPPF states *that 'inappropriate development is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in special circumstances.'* The guidance goes onto list (para.90) certain forms of development that are not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. Of these exceptions of particular relevance to this application is the *'the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction'*.
2. The current development plan for the Borough, The Trafford Core Strategy includes policy R4 *Green Belt, Countryside and Other Protected Open Land*, which is the relevant policy when considering development within the Green Belt. The contents of policy R4 reiterate what was previously included in policy C5 *Development in the Green Belt* of the UDP. Policy R4 states: - R4.1 - *The Council will continue to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. R4.2 New development, including buildings or uses for a temporary period will only be permitted within these areas where it is for one of the appropriate purposes specified in national guidance, where the proposal does not prejudice the primary purposes of the Green Belt set out in national guidance by reason of its scale, siting, materials or design or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated in support of the proposal.* Paragraph 24.2 within Policy R4 of the Core Strategy states *'Within the Green Belt, development will be restricted to those uses that are deemed appropriate in the context of national guidance and which maintain openness. For all other types of development it will be necessary for the applicant to demonstrate very special circumstances to warrant the granting of any planning permission for development.'*
3. The applicant's justification for this development within the Green Belt relies on the advice contained with the NPPF with regards promoting economic development and the re-use of existing buildings. The applicant suggests that the development will have no impact on the openness of the Green Belt as there isn't any new operational development being proposed. In addition, the applicant states that the proposal does not conflict with the purposes of

including land within the Green Belt and as the parking will be contained within the existing buildings there will be no encroachment on undeveloped land.

4. With regard to the issue of using existing buildings, the crucial wording within the guidance relates to buildings being of a '*permanent and substantial construction*'. The applicant as previously indicated has provided a Planning Inspector's decision notice for a proposed scheme which is similar to the current proposal. The Inspector concluded that the glasshouse structure in the appeal case which had been in-situ since approximately 1960 (a similar time period to the glasshouses on the application site) was of a 'reasonably substantial structure'. Whilst each proposal is assessed and judged on its own merits, the similarity between the glasshouse construction is a material consideration given the Inspector's conclusion. In addition, the condition of the glasshouses has been found to be robust following the structural survey undertaken by the applicant. Taking the above into account, it is therefore concluded that a case to establish that the glasshouses are not of 'a permanent and substantial construction' would be difficult to uphold at appeal. Therefore, the reuse of the glasshouse buildings in themselves would not be considered as inappropriate development in Green Belt.
5. Whilst the proposal includes the use of Glass House A and B, the applicant has strenuously denied that the external area (an area over 2600sq metres) between the buildings will be utilised for parking. However, the parking of cars in this area has been recorded by the resident of 2 Clay Lane who has provided photographs as evidence. This activity has also been witnessed by the case officer on site visits. When the unauthorised use commenced in May 2013, the external area was regularly used for parking cars.
6. Notwithstanding the applicant's stated intention that the open area will not be used for parking, it is clear that this area forms a significant proportion of the application site, and in reality the operation of the business cannot function without cars being manoeuvred within and temporarily parked on the external area. Glasshouse B cannot be accessed other than through the open area. The applicant's operation requires manoeuvring within the site to ensure that cars are positioned within the glasshouses in such a manner that they are ready to be moved off site for collection by owners. At the time of the planning officer's visit in June, both glasshouses were almost at capacity. The manoeuvring of cars within and those parked on this external area, results in encroachment into an open area of Green Belt, and impacts in a harmful way on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt, regardless of whether the parking is for a temporary period or not. The use of the site therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Such development should only be approved were the applicant can demonstrate very special circumstances; in this case no very special circumstances have been demonstrated to overcome the harm to the Green Belt. Control of vehicular activity within this external area could not be reasonably conditioned as it would be difficult to monitor and enforce on a regular basis. Moreover, the applicant could not operate the business without using this area.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

7. The nearest dwelling to the application site is 2 Clay Lane, a detached bungalow, the curtilage to which is positioned adjacent to the application site along the western boundary. The front elevation of the bungalow faces towards the area of open space between both glass houses. The access lane from Thorley Lane to the application site is shared by the applicant, the occupants of 2 Clay Lane and the landscaping business to the south side of the site. Other nearby residential properties are located along Clay Lane to the north and north-east of the site.
8. The proposed use, and particularly the movement of cars within the external area has already created substantial disruption to the occupants at 2 Clay Lane with cars parked as close as 5 metres away from the front elevation of the bungalow. Whilst the applicant has indicated that cars will not be parked permanently on this external area, and notwithstanding the fact that the cars are proposed to be stored within the two glasshouses for most of their time on site, external parking and manoeuvring is nonetheless bound to take place within the site. This general activity on site, at such an intense level, seven days per week, with cars arriving and leaving frequently, with associated noise and disturbance, (which has been documented by the occupant of 2 Clay Lane), is considered to be unacceptable with regards residential amenity. As a result of seasonal demands this activity will intensify during summer and other holiday periods. The applicants Highways consultant suggests that at full capacity, the site could accommodate approximately 120 cars, although the eastern half of glasshouse B is outside the application site and is still used for horticulture.
9. The manoeuvring and temporary parking of cars in such close proximity to 2 Clay Lane is also considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the occupants.
10. The proposed use of the site for airport car-parking, even for a temporary period of three years, is considered to be unacceptable in this location due to the adverse impact on residential amenity arising from comings and goings and activity within the site. The applicant has suggested the use of conditions to restrict the parking of cars externally. This would be extremely difficult for the Council to monitor and enforce.

HIGHWAYS

11. The proposed use of the Glasshouses for the parking of vehicles is not considered to result in any adverse impact on the local highway network or highway and pedestrian safety in principle, although the LHA suggest a number of conditions would need to be attached should planning permission be granted.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

12. The proposed development which constitutes a change of use of the activity on site is unlikely to be liable to CIL.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE, for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development is located within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development and where development will only be allowed if it is for an appropriate purpose or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated. The proposed development is considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there are any very special circumstances to warrant an exception being made to this established policy. The development, by reason of the manoeuvring and parking of vehicles in an open area of the site will also result in encroachment into and impact adversely on, the character, openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt. As such, the proposed development is contrary to policy R4 of the Trafford Core Strategy; Policy C4 of the Revised Unitary Development Plan and advice contained within the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF).
2. The proposed airport car-parking use, by reason of the manoeuvring and parking of vehicles within the site and the general noise and disturbance associated with the business seven days per week, in close proximity to 2 Clay Lane, would be unduly detrimental to the amenity and quietude that the occupants could reasonably expect to enjoy. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

CM



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 81973/COU/2013

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

**WARD: Davyhulme
East**

82046/FULL/2013

DEPARTURE: No

PROPOSAL: Erection of a six storey, 203 bedroom hotel with associated car parking and landscaping and access from Mercury Way.

Former Kratos site, Mercury Way, Davyhulme, M41 7BZ

APPLICANT: Peel Holdings (Leisure) Ltd

AGENT: KKA

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

ADDENDUM REPORT

Committee were minded to approve the application on 12th March 2014 subject to contributions of £135,772.00 being secured through the use of a S106 legal agreement, comprised of:-

- **£18,270.00 for Highways and Active Travel Infrastructure**
- **£39,382.00 for Public Transport Schemes**
- **£78,120.00 for Specific Green Infrastructure**

However it will not be possible to complete the legal agreement prior to the introduction of Trafford's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 07 July 2014. Therefore in line with the CIL Charging Schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014), this proposal will be subject to CIL at the relevant rate per square metre, and a section 106 agreement will no longer be required.

As indicated in the original report discussions are still on-going with regard to the applicant's request that a transfer of an area of land between the former Kratos site and Barton Dock Road be made by the applicant to assist in the delivery of the Metrolink line and that the value of that land may be offset against any required contributions under CIL.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time
2. Compliance with plans
3. Materials samples
4. Landscaping
5. Landscape Maintenance
6. Provision of parking, turning and servicing areas
7. Retention of parking, turning and servicing areas
8. The hotel hereby permitted shall not be open to the public unless or until an additional 95 car parking spaces have been provided and marked out in accordance with the details shown on drawing ref. A02A with additional details to

be submitted for approval prior to commencement of development in relation to the surfacing materials proposed. These spaces, in combination with those within the red edged site, shall be retained thereafter at all times for the use of the hotel unless and until the 95 spaces are replaced with equivalent provision within the site edged blue, in accordance with details to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

9. The landscaping proposals along the southwestern edge of the application site shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on Site Layout plan (ref. SK51) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with TfGM.
10. Travel Plan prior to first occupation
11. Provision of cycle parking
12. Contaminated Land
13. Development to include the mitigation measures set out in the Flood Risk Assessment
14. Drainage scheme to be submitted and approved (and to meet Strategic Flood Risk Assessment objectives with regards surface water run-off)
15. Development to be carried out in accordance with the Air Quality Assessment
16. Acoustic Assessment to be submitted and approved
17. Wheelwashing
18. Drainage on an separate system

JJ



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 82046/FULL/2013

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

CONVERSION OF FORMER HEALTH CENTRE INTO A HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (11-BED) WITH 2NO. RETAIL UNITS (USE CLASS A1) FRONTING KINGSWAY. EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO ALTER WINDOW ARRANGEMENT.

Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ

APPLICANT: Acamba Systems

AGENT: One Architectural Ltd

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

SITE

The application relates to a single storey building, which was formally occupied as a health centre with ten consultant rooms and a dental suite. The building fronts Mitford Street and Kingsway is situated to the south of the site. Residential properties on Mitford Street are situated opposite to the site, to the north. A former doctors surgery, which is now vacant and a large electricity substation are situated to the west of the site and an open public garden is situated to the east. Stretford Mall and a pedestrian subway underneath Kingsway are situated to the south of the site. Public footpaths are situated immediately adjacent to the building to the east and west of the site.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the change of use from a health centre to a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) with 11 bedrooms and two small retail units (Use Class A1); one of the retail units would have a floor area of 52m² and another would have a floor area of 46m². The HMO would also comprise of two kitchens, a lounge and a dining room. The bedrooms would range in size from 13.9m² to 28.1m², which would include en-suite facilities. An existing internal courtyard within the building would serve the proposed HMO.

The application also proposes the replacement of three existing windows on the south elevation with larger windows. These windows serve the proposed retail units.

During the course of this planning application, the proposed works have been completed, the retail units are now occupied and the majority of the bedrooms have been let. This application is therefore now retrospective.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes

L2 – Meeting Housing

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

W2 – Town Centres and Retail

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Unallocated

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement and a Supporting Statement. The information provided within these statements is referred to where relevant within this report.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – Object to the proposal. There is no parking or cycle parking proposed. The proposed uses would generate the highest demand for parking in the evening and overnight periods when on-street parking pressures in the area are at their most acute and when roads that are restricted in the daytime as residents only become unrestricted out of these hours. The proposal has the potential to create disamenity for surrounding residents and lack of adequate detail in regards to servicing of the retail units could result in congestion and highway safety issues. Full comments are discussed in the Observations section of this report.

Pollution & Licensing – No objections.

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security – Object to the proposal. They raise a number of concerns which are summarised below and discussed in more detail in the Observations section of this report: -

- Do not consider that security has been greatly considered when preparing the application. Unfortunate as houses in multiple occupation with their, usually, transient occupiers, who typically have less interest in the well-being of an area and who are more likely to behave in an un-neighbourly manner, can become focal points for anti-social behaviour.
- Lack of defensible space to side elevations leaving residents and property vulnerable.
- Frosted glass in the windows of residential rooms prevents residents contributing to natural surveillance of the site and surrounding streets and pathways.
- Lack of off-street parking is likely to lead to further pressures on-street. Cars parked on-street are more susceptible to crime, which is especially true for cars not readily supervised by the owners i.e. parking remotely.
- Lack of adequate storage for bins within the site makes the street and development look untidy. Adoption of low environmental standards from the outset can lead to further deterioration in standards, coupled with low security, such premises may easily attract criminal behaviour, including anti-social behaviour.

Electricity North West - No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

8 letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents of Mitford Street, which raise the following concerns: -

- The application does not supply any supporting documentation that details a real need for this type of accommodation in this location. Local estate agents are clear that the overwhelming demand in this location is for low cost, high quality family homes not multi occupancy single person dwelling.
- Lack of car parking provision. Mitford Street already has dedicated resident parking as the Council has understood that this Street already faces parking pressures. The proposal would exacerbate this issue.
- The proposal is retrospective and tenants have moved in. Residents were not asked their opinion prior to the work being carried out.
- The street is permanently full of litter as residents of the site do not have enough bins and do not use them properly, which is unsightly and unhygienic. The bins are left on the street causing an obstruction and are overflowing.
- Occupants are causing anti-social behaviour.
- The building has a lot of security lighting outside which is on all night and glows constantly through their curtains.
- The proposal is not in keeping with the rest of the properties on the street. It is a quiet family street with older residents, this development will lead to a significant change to the peace and quiet and community feel of the street.
- The application does not mention whether the HMO is for the care of re-offenders, alcoholics or similar people needing major care programmes.
- Question the applicant's financial ability to maintain the site in the future and their experience in managing similar HMOs which is targeted at the most vulnerable end of the residential letting market.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF PROPOSAL

1. The application proposes the creation of residential accommodation and retail floor space. The application site is not specifically allocated in the Revised Adopted Trafford Unitary Development Plan (2006) although it is identified in the Consultation Draft Land Allocations Plan (January 2014) under Policy TC1 as being within the Stretford Town Centre boundary and under Policy STR1.2 – Land at Bennett Street Action Area as being suitable for residential development. While this plan is still at the very earliest stage of production and consultation, the identification of this site under the above policies should be regarded as a material consideration, albeit of limited weight.
2. Policy L1 of the Core Strategy seeks to release sufficient land to accommodate 12,210 new dwellings (net of clearance) over the plan period up to 2026. Regular monitoring has revealed that despite maintaining a five year housing land supply in accordance with government guidance, the actual rate of building is failing to meet the housing land target as expressed in Table L1 of the Core Strategy. Therefore, there exists a significant need to not only

meet the level of housing land supply identified within Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, but also to make up for a recent shortfall in housing completions. It is considered that this proposal will make a positive contribution to the Council's housing land supply and in addition the proposal will contribute to meeting targets for the development of brownfield land (Policy L1.7).

3. Policy L2.6 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that proposals contribute to meeting the housing needs of the Borough. Whilst the proposal is for a very large House in Multiple Occupation, it is considered that it will go some way to meeting a need in the Borough, albeit one that is not specifically identified in the Core Strategy. The principle of residential development on the site is therefore considered acceptable.
4. In regards to the proposed retail development, the site is not located within any of the town, district, local or neighbourhood shopping centres. Policy W2.12 states that outside of these centres there will be a presumption against the development of retail, leisure and other town centre-type uses except where it can be demonstrated that they satisfy the tests outlined in current Government Guidance. The retail units proposed as part of the development are of a modest scale and are immediately adjacent to the existing Stretford Town Centre boundary (and proposed for inclusion within in the Consultation Draft Land Allocations Plan). As such, it is considered that the proposal will support the vitality and viability of Stretford Town Centre and is consistent with Core Strategy Policy W2.12. The proposed retail units are therefore considered acceptable in principle.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

5. A minimum distance of 15.5m lies between the building and the neighbouring residential properties on the northern side of Mitford Street. The windows on the front elevation of the building closest to the neighbouring houses are obscure glazed (although this is not shown on the submitted plans), the separation distance would increase to 19.5m to the clear glazed windows on the front elevation of the building. It is also noted that this distance is across a vehicular highway. These separation distances are typical of those between terraced properties on Mitford Street and the surrounding area. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.
6. Neighbouring residents have raised concerns regarding refuse bins serving the site being left on the street and un-emptied. During the site visit this was not evident, however it was noted that the area where the bins are being stored is to the front of the building, behind a low level wall. Due to only a small area of defensible space being provided to the front of the building, the bins are situated immediately adjacent to the footway, which is considered to be unsightly.
7. The proposed retail units are situated to the south of the building, facing Stretford Mall, away from neighbouring residential properties. The units would

front a busy highway. It is therefore considered that these units would not result in undue noise and disturbance to existing neighbouring residential properties on Mitford Street. The applicant has not detailed proposed opening hours of these units, however it is considered that due to the size of the units and the close proximity of the site to Stretford Town Centre, it is also considered that the proposed commercial units would not unduly impact on the occupants of the proposed adjoining HMO. If Committee were minded to approve the application, then it is recommended that the opening hours of these retail units are restricted to prevent undue noise and disturbance to the residents of the HMO during night time hours.

8. The proposal results in 6 of the bedrooms being located immediately adjacent to the public footway, at ground floor level. The windows to these rooms are obscure glazed; two further bedrooms situated to the front of the site, facing Mitford Street, also only have obscure glazed windows. It is considered that this provides a very poor level of amenity for the occupants of these bedrooms, as little to no outlook is provided. As no defensible space is provided between the windows on the east and west elevations and the public footways, the residents are likely to experience high levels of noise and disturbance. Greater Manchester Police have also identified that this could leave residents and their property vulnerable to crime. It is considered that the installation of clear glazed windows to serve the bedrooms would not be an acceptable solution as it would result in a loss of privacy for the residents due to members of the public being able to pass immediately next to these windows. As there is only one room for each individual living unit within the HMO, which serves as a bedroom, it is a different relationship to a dwellinghouse that fronts directly onto a footpath. Residents of such dwellinghouses have other rooms within the house where they can enjoy privacy without the need for obscure glazing or having to close the curtains.
9. The proposed HMO would include a 51.5m² outside courtyard, situated centrally within the building, which would provide the only area of outdoor amenity space for the residents. Whilst the Trafford Planning Guidelines: New Residential Development advise that 18m² of adequately screened communal area per flat should be provided for flat developments, it is considered that it is not always reasonable to require this level in town centre locations. However, it is considered that this low level and poor quality of private amenity space proposed to serve the residents of the HMO combined with the lack of outlook for the majority of the bedrooms and the close proximity of the bedroom windows to the public footway, the proposal would provide a poor level of amenity for the occupants of the HMO. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy L2.2(a) of the Trafford Core Strategy, which states that new residential development should be of a sufficient size to accommodate adequately the proposed use and all necessary ancillary facilities for prospective residents. Policy L7.3 also states development must not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the development.

ACCESS AND PARKING

10. The application does not include the provision of any car parking to serve the development and no details of cycle parking for the residents or the commercial units have been submitted. The Council's car parking standards require the provision of 6 car parking spaces and 11 cycle parking spaces to serve the 11 bedroom HMO. The Council's car parking standards also require 6 car parking spaces to serve the proposed retail units, although it is considered that the existing car parking within Stretford Mall which is situated opposite the site could serve these retail units.
11. It is the LHAs view that the proposed residential use would generate the highest demand for parking in the evening and overnight periods when on-street parking pressures in the area are at their highest. It is also recognised that the roads in the surrounding area, including Mitford Street, only have restricted parking in the daytime (most commonly 9am to 5pm) and thus become unrestricted in the evenings and overnight.
12. It is considered that the lack of car parking provision to serve the development could adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents as existing residents would find it more difficult to park. It is also noted that the inadequate provision of cycle parking facilities fails to encourage sustainable forms of travel. The proposal is thus contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy which states that development must provide sufficient off-street car and cycle parking.
13. It is recognised that the existing lawful use of the site as a health centre does not benefit from on-site car parking provision, however it is noted that this is a day time activity that would have been served by the town centre car parks situated close to the site. It is also served well by public transport due to its close proximity to the town centre. The proposed residential use would generate a higher demand for car parking in the evenings and weekends and it is also recognised that whilst residents may utilise the public transport facilities for commuting to work, many residents may also own a car.
14. No details of servicing of the retail units have been submitted with the application. Servicing of these units would have to occur off Mitford Street. It is considered that inappropriate servicing of these units could result in congestion on Mitford Street and pose a danger to highway safety.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

15. The application includes the replacement of three windows on the south elevation, facing Kingsway, to provide larger openings to serve the proposed retail units. It became apparent during the site visit that the proposed windows have already been installed. The design of these windows are considered acceptable and in keeping with the host building.

16. Bin stores are provided to the front of the HMO, fronting Mitford Street. It is considered that the collection of bins to the front of the site has a visually harmful effect on the existing building and the existing street scene.

PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY

17. The application does not include a Crime Prevention Plan addressing what measures would be put in place on the site to reduce the risk of crime occurring on the site. Greater Manchester Police Design for Security have raised a number of concerns regarding the proposal. Firstly in regards to the lack of defensible space to the side of the building, this leaves residents and their property vulnerable to anti-social or criminal behaviour from passers-by.
18. Secondly the inclusion of frosted glass in the majority of the windows prevents residents contributing to the natural surveillance of the site and surrounding streets and pathways. The Police advise that their observations of the security of the communal entrance door and lack of defensible space suggest that security has not been greatly considered in this application. They consider that this is unfortunate as HMOs with their usually transient occupiers, who typically have less interest in the well-being of an area, can become focal points for anti-social behaviour.
19. Thirdly they identify that the lack of on-site car parking is likely to create further pressures on-street from residents or visitors to the site. The Police advise that cars parked on street are more susceptible to crime, in particular cars that are parked remotely and not readily supervised by their owners.
20. The Police also raise concern regarding the lack of adequate storage for refuse on the site, which makes the development and street appear untidy. They advise that the adoption of low environmental standards from the outset can often lead to a further deterioration in standards and that such premises may easily lead attract criminal behaviour.
21. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would provide a poor level of security for the residents and could lead to an increase in criminal activity in the surrounding area, to the detriment of existing and future occupants.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

22. If planning permission were to be granted, this proposal would be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and where applicable, may be liable to a CIL charge at the rate of £20 per square metre.

CONCLUSION

23. It is recognised that the proposed development has brought a vacant building back into active use and that it provides 11 residential units in the form of a

HMO and two retail units. It is also recognised that the retail and residential units are currently occupied and as such a refusal and any subsequent enforcement action could result in the eviction of existing occupants. However it is considered that the proposal provides a very poor level of amenity for the existing and future occupants of the HMO, fails to reduce opportunities for crime and will have an adverse impact on public safety. Due to the design and layout and inadequate and inappropriate refuse storage facilities the proposal would be detrimental to the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area. The proposal would also result in additional on-street car parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety and fails to demonstrate acceptable servicing arrangements for the retail units, which could also be detrimental to highway safety. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not provide a sustainable form of development and as such would be contrary to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the NPPF. A refusal is therefore recommended.


RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable level of residential amenity for future occupiers of the proposed HMO as a result of a combination of the size of living accommodation, lack of outdoor amenity space, obscure glazing to bedroom windows, restricted outlook and proximity of bedroom windows to public footway resulting in a lack of privacy, noise and disturbance. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines: New Residential Development.
2. The proposed development and occupants would be vulnerable to criminal damage and anti-social behaviour as a result of a poor level of natural surveillance due to the high level of obscure glazed windows, and lack of any defensible space due to the fact that there are public footpaths immediately adjacent on three sides of the building and due to the positioning of windows on these elevations. As such the proposed development fails to reduce opportunities for crime and would therefore have an adverse impact on public safety and the security interests of the future occupants of the proposed HMO and neighbouring residents. Therefore the development would be contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines, New Residential Development.
3. No specific provision of refuse storage for the retail units and inadequate and poorly located provision of refuse storage for the residential units would result in visual harm, detracting from the street scene and character of the area and poor environmental standards which can lead to criminal and antisocial behaviour. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines, New Residential Development.
4. The proposal fails to provide adequate off road car parking provision and cycle storage for the proposed development and thus would lead to on street

car parking to the detrimental of the residential amenity of the occupants of nearby houses. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L2, L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards.

5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed retail units could be serviced in a way that would not lead to congestion on Mitford Street, to the detriment of the free-flow of traffic and highway safety and the residential amenity of occupants of nearby houses. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

VW



This material has been reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 82214/FULL/2014

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

WARD: Bowdon

82243/HHA/2014

DEPARTURE: No

ERECTION OF A NEW BOUNDARY WALL FOLLOWING PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING WITH AN INCREASE IN HEIGHT OF 0.8 METRES FROM THE CURRENT STRUCTURE.

Hillside, 4 The Springs, Bowdon, WA14 3JH

APPLICANT: Mr Martin McMahon

AGENT: Emery Planning Partnership Ltd

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Councillor Hyman has called-in the application for consideration by the Planning Development Control Committee and objects to the proposed development for the reasons set out below.

SITE

The application site comprises a large Victorian semi-detached house located at the southern end of The Springs, a residential cul-de-sac off Park Road in Bowdon. There is a footpath from the end of The Springs linking to Bow Green Road to the south. There are a number of flats developments on the western side of The Springs. To the south of the site there is a flats development, Bow Green Mews, dating from around the 1960's. There is a significant drop in land levels from Park Road in the north to Bow Green Road to the south; the application site lies approximately 2 metres above the level of Bow Green Mews. There is also a lesser change in levels from east to west along this boundary.

This planning application relates to a boundary wall which forms a large section of the common boundary between Hillside and the flats at Bow Green Mews.

The wall in question acts largely as a retaining wall between the properties; it is a traditional brick wall that is currently painted white and has coping stones running along the top. On the Bow Green Mews side of the wall, soft landscaping at low levels has also been planted running parallel to the structure.

The site itself is located within Sub Area C of the Devisdale Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises the demolition of the majority of the existing wall followed by the rebuilding of a boundary wall in the same position but to an

increased height of some 0.8 metre higher than the existing wall. The length of wall affected would be approximately 22 metres measured from its eastern end. Approximately 1.5 metres of the wall at its western end would remain unaffected.

The newly erected wall would have a maximum height of 1.8 metres when measured from within the applicant's side of the site, at the western most point. Because of the change in levels between Hillside and Bow Green Mews, the wall would measure some 3.75 metres high from the path level within Bow Green Mews, compared to the existing height of 2.95 metres. The new wall would be constructed from reclaimed Cheshire Brick to match the existing, with coping stones on top, again to match the existing.

On the 16 June 2014, following concerns raised by officers over the potential impact on the amenities of residents at Bow Green Mews, the applicants submitted a revised scheme for the proposed new section of the boundary wall. This revision proposed a reduction in the height of the wall proposed by 0.4 metre.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 – Design

R1 – Historic Environment

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

ENV21 – Conservation areas - Bowdon

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

ENV21 – Conservation Areas

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

77540/HHA/2011 – Erection of single storey extension following demolition of out-buildings – approved with conditions – 01/05/2012.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Planning and heritage statement

CONSULTATIONS

None

REPRESENTATIONS

On the originally submitted plans:

Councillor Hyman – objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Concerned regarding the loss of amenity of the residents of Bow Green Mews following the erection of the new wall.
- Concerned that the works would lead to the loss of some of the natural landscaping which has been planted along the Bow Green Mews section of the wall.

Neighbours - 8 objections together with comments from an agent on behalf of the residents of the Bow Green Mews flats, these have been summarised in the points below:

- Concerns around the reduction in day-light that an increase in the overall height of the boundary wall would lead to. Particularly affecting the ground floor flat on the eastern most side of the site
- Highlight that the current loss of privacy was created by the removal of the trees on site.
- Residents express concerns regarding the unauthorised works that are taking place on site.

- Have concerns regarding the impacts of the new wall on the character of the wider Conservation Area and surrounding street scene.
- Concerns regarding the impacts on main habitable rooms and the loss of day light/overbearing effects caused by the proposed new high level wall.
- Object on the grounds that the new wall would lead to the need for deeper foundations being created and the impact this would have on the current landscaping that runs along the boundary wall on the Bow Green Mews side.

On the amended plans:

Comments on the amended plans will be included in the Additional Information Report.

OBSERVATIONS

Background

1. In 2012 planning permission was granted for a side extension to Hillside; this has been built. At the same time a high garden wall (approximately 3 metres high) between the main house and the boundary with Bow Green Mews was erected, this projects from the house to the common boundary wall that is the subject of this application. That wall, because of its height, is currently unauthorised and whilst neighbours have expressed concern about it, it should be considered separately from the matter of the common boundary wall.
2. The applicant has also removed some of the planting from within the garden adjacent to the boundary wall.
3. The boundary wall is subject to a party wall award which allows for the removal of the existing wall and its rebuild. This award is separate from and does not over-ride normal planning considerations. Documentation in respect of that award does though provide information regarding the stability of the wall, justifying its partial demolition.
4. The main issues to be considered in this application are the impact of the proposed wall on the amenities of occupiers of the flats at Bow Green Mews, and the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Residential Amenity

5. There are two ground floor flats and two first floor flats within Bow Green Mews that face directly onto the boundary with Hillside and would thus be directly affected by the proposed development. Whilst the main outlook from those flats is to the garden areas to the east and west, there are bedrooms and bathrooms in the northern elevation that have no other outlook. These windows are approximately 4.5 metres from the boundary wall. There is also a communal access into the flats on the northern side and the external area to this side has been landscaped.

6. The existing wall does have an impact on the outlook from the side windows of the flats (in particular those at ground floor level) and provides a sense of enclosure to the external area. The proposed replacement of the wall to an increased height (0.8 m higher than existing) would have a greater impact on those windows and external area than the existing wall.
7. The originally submitted scheme proposed a new wall some 1.2 metres higher than existing. This was considered to be too high resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and overbearing impact on Bow Green Mews. In seeking amendments to reduce the impact of the wall, officers had regard to the potential for the applicant to erect a wall or fence within his garden as "permitted development." Such a wall could be erected to a height of 2 metres from the garden level of Hillside if it were set in from the existing boundary wall by a nominal distance. An assessment of the potential impact of such a wall/fence on the outlook from the windows in the side of Bow Green Mews and on the outdoor area adjacent to the flats suggested that a reduction in the height of the proposed wall by 0.4 metre would result in an impact similar to that which may occur if the "permitted development" route were followed.
8. Regard was also given to the fact that there would be no planning control over the design and materials of such a permitted development wall/fence.
9. Following the previous removal of vegetation from the garden of Hillside, there is now a degree of interlocking between the house and garden of Hillside and the flats at Bow Green Mews. There would be some benefit to occupiers of both properties from having a slightly higher wall along the boundary, though the amended proposals would not fully remove any interlocking, which was less of an issue when the vegetation was still in place.
10. The amended proposal would have an impact on the amenities of occupiers of Bow Green Mews; having regard to the rooms affected (mainly ground floor bedroom windows), the external area not being a main part of the garden and significantly the potential impact of a "permitted development" wall or fence, it is considered that on balance the impact would not be so harmful; to justify refusal of this application.

Impact on Conservation Area

11. Tall brick walls, either garden walls or boundary walls, are not an uncommon feature in the Devisdale conservation area. The amended scheme which proposes an increased height of 0.8 metres for the boundary wall is not considered to cause harm to the Devisdale Conservation Area subject to the use of acceptable bricks and the construction of the wall with an appropriate traditional brick bond. On this basis the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

12. As with the residential amenity issue above, the potential “permitted development” fall-back permission would be less likely to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development, as amended, would have an acceptable impact on the amenities of residents of Bow Green Mews and would preserve the character and appearance of the Devisdale conservation area. As such it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time conditions
2. Materials to be agreed including brick bonding and provision of sample panel on site
3. Compliance with plans

IG



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 82243/HHA/2014

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

**WARD: Davyhulme
East**

82313/AA/2014

DEPARTURE: No

**DISPLAY OF ONE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED DIGITAL ADVERTISEMENT
PANEL ON 25.5 METRE HIGH STEEL TOWER STRUCTURE**

Central Island of Junction 10, M60/Trafford Boulevard, Barton Road, Trafford Park
M41 7JE

APPLICANT: JCDecaux UK Limited

AGENT: N/A

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application relates to the northern section of the landscaped traffic island at Junction 10 of the M60 motorway. The carriage way of the M60 passes above the traffic island. The Trafford Centre and Premier Inn Hotel are situated to the north-east of the site and a golf driving range and Chill Factor^e ski slope is situated to the north-west of the site. Residential streets, including Stroma Gardens, Benbecula Way, Barra Drive and Lewis Avenue are situated to the south-east of the junction. Trafford Retail Park is situated to the south-west of the junction.

The traffic island is currently landscaped with mature trees and bushes around the outside. Additional to directional signage, small low level non-illuminated signs are also located around the periphery.

In addition to the overhead directional signs on the motorway, there are several other relatively large advertisement structures in the immediate vicinity of Junction 10. Approximately 75m to the north of the current application site, on the Trafford Boulevard verge at the south-west corner of the Trafford Centre, there is an approximately 15m high, externally illuminated, three sided tower, which houses individual tenant signs.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks advertisement consent for the display of one internally illuminated digital advertisement panel, which would be sited on a 25m high steel tower structure that would be sited on a 0.5m high base. The tower structure would comprise of an internal steel framework, which would be externally clad in steel and alloy panels. The digital advertisement panel would measure 9m high, 6m wide and would be located 7.5m above ground level. The luminance of the sign would vary depending upon the level of natural night and time of day (i.e. greater at night), though the maximum luminance level would be 600 candelas per square metre. The proposed tower structure would be situated on a raised embankment, approximately 3.5m above the general surrounding ground level, which would result in the structure having an approximate maximum height of 29m above ground level. The proposal is

a revision to a similar proposal refused under application 81575/AA/2013 in December 2013, which included two additional advertisement panels angled towards the motorway.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 - Design

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Unallocated

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

81575/AA/2013 - Display of three internally illuminated static advertisement panels on 25.5 metre high steel tower structure – Refused 20/12/2013. The applicant has

appealed this decision and the Council is currently awaiting the determination of this appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.

H/ADV/71490 - Display of three internally illuminated static advertisement panels on 25.5 metre high steel tower structure – Refused 03/11/2010.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a supporting statement. The information provided within this statement is referred to where relevant within this report.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – The advertisement can be seen from Trafford Boulevard and it is considered that the traffic signals on the Trafford Boulevard approach would be the most directly affected by the structure, though it is felt that these are quite set back and unlikely to cause a distraction to road users, therefore no objections.

Highways Agency - No objections to the siting of the one sided tower display on land under the ownership of Trafford Council at this location. It will not interfere with the Smart Motorways works at this location. Should the Agency receive an application in the future for additional advertisement panels to be located on this tower structure facing the motorway network, then they would advise refusal for the same reasons stipulated in their original response to application ref no: 81575/AA/2013. Conditions regarding illumination are recommended. If the Council decides to grant approval then the applicant would need to submit this information to the Agency demonstrating that the advert tower has been designed and checked using appropriate loads and design standards for the particular site.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – No objections. Given the location of the structure on a busy well lighted Motorway junction, consider that the only ecological impact may be upon nesting birds. A condition is recommended regarding the removal of trees within the site.

REPRESENTATIONS

Four letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents on Benbecula Way and Barra Drive, which raise the following concerns: -

- It is only a watered down version of 81575/AA/2013. This does not have a place on the edge of a residential estate where they are already suffering visual intrusion from the M60 and Trafford Centre.
- It will be an eyesore.
- It will be a dangerous distraction to road and motorway users.
- It will add to the already high level of light pollution.
- It will result in flashing lights through their bedroom window

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF PROPOSAL

1. The application site is unallocated within the Proposals Map. There are no Policies within the Core Strategy that presume against the siting of advertisements within this location. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in principle, subject to the consideration of the impact of the sign on public safety and on amenity.

AMENITY

2. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF states that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment.
3. Policy L7.1 states that in regards to design, development must be appropriate in its context and make best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of the area. It also states that development must enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, massing, layout, elevation treatment and materials.
4. Policy L7.3 also states that in regards to amenity protection, development must be compatible with the surrounding area and not prejudice the amenity of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing or visual intrusion.
5. From all directions the advertising tower would be seen in the context of the existing motorway infrastructure. From vehicles approaching along the motorway from the south-east, it would also be seen against medium to long distance views of the Chill Factor^e ski slope. For vehicles approaching from the north-west, it would be seen against views of the Trafford Centre. It would also be adjacent to directional signage mounted on an overhead gantry spanning the motorway and would be of a similar height. From Trafford Boulevard, it would be seen against the backdrop of the motorway, which is already elevated above the Junction 10 roundabout at this point and which continues to rise to the north-west where the high level bridge carries it across the Ship Canal into Salford. Although the structure would be visible from some residential properties to the south-east, it would be on the opposite side of the elevated motorway carriageway, approximately 120m from the nearest house. It is also noted that only the tower itself would be visible from the motorway and the neighbouring properties as the proposed digital advertisement would be situated on the northern elevation of the tower, facing Trafford Boulevard.
6. The structure would be very prominent, however it is considered that, within this context of the motorway infrastructure and the very large commercial structures in the vicinity of the site, the scale of the advertisement tower would not be inappropriate and that, in this particular siting, it would also relate to the scale of the adjacent gantry signs. It is also considered that, although there is a large amount of commercial signage within the surrounding area, in particular on Trafford Boulevard and at Trafford Retail Park, this is generally

located far enough away or in such a position for it not to be seen in the immediate context and therefore not to have any significant cumulative impact in terms of visual clutter. In addition, given the distance to the nearest residential properties, the position of the structure on the opposite side of the motorway and the general commercial nature of the backdrop to the north, it is considered that it would not cause any significant harm to residential amenity.

7. The proposal is for a unique, bespoke design sited in a strategic position at the centre of Junction 10, which is a gateway location but which is also a setting that is currently dominated by the motorway infrastructure and large commercial structures. The vertical proportions of the proposed advertisement structure, together with its illumination and materials, would differentiate it from the more standard designs of hoardings.

PUBLIC SAFETY

8. The proposed digital advertisement and steel tower is a revision to a previously refused advertisement application, ref: 81575/AA/2013. This application was for a three digital advertisement panels. The previous application was refused on the grounds that the two advertisement panels facing the M60 motorway would cause an unacceptable distraction to drivers on the motorway, in close proximity to a busy junction and adjacent to highway directional signage, which could increase the potential for accidents, have a harmful impact on public safety and the free flow of traffic on the motorway network. The applicant has amended the proposal, removing the two advertisement panels facing the motorway and following advice from the Highways Agency, has repositioned the tower within the traffic island so that it would not impede the Smart Motorway signage which is due to be installed shortly on this section of the M60 motorway.
9. The Highways Agency raises no objections to this revised proposal, though recommends that conditions are attached to the advertisement consent which restrict the maximum level of luminance, require that no lighting source shall be directly visible to drivers on the M60 motorway and that the lighting of the proposed sign shall not cause a glare problem to motorists on the M60 motorway.
10. With respect to the local highway network, the LHA has raised no objections taking into account the likely speed of vehicles on Trafford Boulevard, the siting of the structure, which will be seen in the context of existing views of the motorway infrastructure, and the relatively long approach to the advert along this road, which will give drivers sufficient opportunity to assimilate the information. The LHA comments that, it is considered that the traffic signals on the Trafford Boulevard approach would be the most directly affected by the structure, though it is considered that these are quite set back and the advertisement is therefore unlikely to cause a distraction to road users.

11. It is therefore considered that with appropriate conditions, the proposed advertisement and associated tower would not distract drivers on the surrounding highways and would therefore not pose a danger to public safety.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard Advertisement
2. Amended Plans
3. The advertisement shall change no more frequently than once every 10 seconds with the transition between advertisements being a gradual and subtle process taking no more than 3 seconds.
4. In the event of a breakdown, the screens shall automatically power-off to prevent flashing error messages being shown.
5. The maximum level of luminance of the advertisement hereby approved shall not exceed the limits set out in paragraph 2 of Schedule 3 Part 11 of the Town and County Planning (Control of Advertisement Regulations 2007).
6. No lighting source shall be directly visible from the M60 motorway and the lighting shall not cause a glare problem to motorists on the M60 motorway.

Informative:

1. The applicant is advised that the advertisement display must have the appropriate Technical Approval that satisfies the Highways Agency criteria set out in the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges. This information must be submitted to the Highways Agency, demonstrating that the advertisement tower has been designed and checked using appropriate loads and design standards for the site.

RH



This material has been reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 82313/AA/2014

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

RE-MODELLING OF EXISTING DETACHED BUNGALOW INCLUDING A PART SINGLE/ PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TO CREATE A TWO STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE.

46 Hermitage Road, Hale, WA15 8BW

APPLICANT: Mr E Hampson

AGENT:

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Councillor Mitchell and Councillor Mrs. Young have called-in the application for consideration by Planning Development Control Committee and have objected to the proposal for reasons set out within the report.

SITE

The application relates to a single storey detached bungalow sited on the southern side of Hermitage Road, Hale. Situated within a large residential area the site has traditional two storey semi-detached dwellings located to the north, south and east; and to the west of the site lies a two story detached dwelling. The application dwelling itself has bay windows within the main front principal elevation and has a hipped roof design. The dwelling is sited on an elevated ground level in comparison to the neighbouring properties to the east and west; the ground level of the main street itself is also uneven with the main road sloping eastwards. There also remains a single detached garage sited to the west of the main dwelling; this has a flat roof design.

PROPOSAL

The application details the re-modelling of the existing bungalow to form a two storey dwelling with the addition of a two storey side extension following demolition of the existing detached garage.

The originally submitted scheme has been amended following concerns raised by officers in respect of the proposed design. The changes include the reduction on the overall roof height of the proposed two storey dwelling, the removal of the front porch improved detailing to front elevation and the reduction in size of the proposed garage.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 – Design

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Pre-application advice – 02/2014

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Bat Survey

CONSULTATIONS

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – no issues posed by the proposed development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Mitchell - objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The proposal would be overbearing and detrimental for the amenity of the neighbouring properties
- Would be intrusive within the wider street scene

Councillor Mrs. Young - objects to the proposal for the following reason:

- Feels the development would be out of keeping within the wider street scene

Neighbours - 4 letters were received from the neighbouring properties objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:-

- Proposal would not be in-keeping with the wider street scene.
- The proposal would appear prominent within the wider street scene.
- Loss of light from the proposed works.
- Concerns raised with regards to the proposed increase in height of the dwelling in relation to neighbouring properties.

OBSERVATIONS

1. The proposed works detail the erection of a part two storey/part single storey side extension and the raising of the overall roof height of the original dwelling to create first floor living accommodation. The works would largely retain the existing footprint of the bungalow with the exception of the part single/part two storey side extension. This however would not protrude any further to the front or to the rear than the existing bungalow and would retain a total distance of 2 metres from the western side boundary at two storey level; and 1 metre at ground floor level.
2. The erection of a second floor would increase the overall maximum height of the dwelling by approximately 600mm - 750mm. This would bring the overall height to a similar level with No.46A to the west of the site and approximately 900mm higher than number 48 to the east; it should be noted this increase is largely due to the sloping street level and the increase would not be any different to the existing situation between numbers 44A and 48. Such a drop in height is not uncommon within the street scene due to the sloping nature of Hermitage Road. It is therefore considered that this increase would not lead to the dwelling appearing out of character or over dominant within the wider street scene.
3. The proposed development incorporates a hipped roof design for the two storey dwelling; this would be in line with the existing roof design on the bungalow. Hermitage Road currently has a mix of properties from detached to

semi-detached, some of which have hipped roof designs and some which feature gabled roof designs; therefore the roof design of the proposed development would not be out of keeping within the immediate neighbouring area.

4. The proportions and design of doors, windows and eaves levels shown on the amended plans are appropriate and are considered acceptable and largely remain in keeping with nearby properties.
5. The distance to the eastern side boundary would remain unaltered at 1.5 metres. To the western side of the dwelling a distance of 2.2 metres would be retained from the proposed two storey side extension at first floor level; and a distance of 1 metre would be retained from the proposed works at single storey level. The Council's SPD 4 Householder Guidelines detail that two storey side extensions must retain a total distance of 1metre from any side boundary which the proposal would be in excess of. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed work would not harm the spaciousness of the application site or wider area.
6. It should also be noted that the neighbouring property to the west, which is also a detached dwelling retains similar distances from its side boundaries. The existing dwelling and detached garage also currently retain a 1 metre distance from the side boundary so the works would not be protruding any further to the west than the existing situation on site.
7. The existing dwelling has largely been rendered, with some brickwork being shown within the side and rear elevations. The proposed extensions would be built using matching brickwork to the existing and therefore would remain more in keeping with the neighbouring properties to either side of the application site.
8. The roof overhang at ground floor level to the rear of the dwelling would be small in size and would not run the full width of the main dwelling; and as it would not be visible from the wider street scene is considered not to pose any additional concerns.

Residential Amenity

9. The works would create a single small w/c window opening at ground floor level within the front elevation of the part single storey side extension; this would be set back from the main two storey elevation of the dwelling and is considered not to pose any additional overlooking concerns.
10. At first floor level the works would create three new bedroom openings within the main front principal elevation, these would retain a distance in excess of 21 metres from the opposite facing neighbouring properties on Hermitage Road, and as the existing dwelling has main habitable room openings within this elevation any new privacy issues are considered to remain minimal.

11. To the rear at first floor level the works would create two bedroom windows. These openings would retain a distance in excess of 3 metres from the eastern side boundary and in excess of 10.5 metres from the rear boundary; therefore any overlooking concerns are considered to remain minimal. The works would also create three bathroom windows within the rear, front and western side facing elevation, as these would be obscurely glazed any privacy issues are also considered to remain minimal.
12. At ground floor level within the rear of the dwelling two of the existing openings would be widened and a new set of by-folding doors would be created to the rear of the two storey side extension. These would be set 2 metres away from the eastern side facing boundary. The two side boundaries of the site and rear boundary are all formed from 1.8 metre fencing and mid-level planting considered adequate to remove any overlooking concerns.
13. It is considered that the proposed extensions would not pose any significant overbearing concerns for the neighbouring properties. Number 48 to the west of the site has been extended at two storey level to the rear and as the application dwelling would only be increasing its height and not increasing its footprint to the rear, any overbearing concerns are considered to remain minimal. To the east of the site the dwelling would retain a distance of two metres from the side boundary at first floor level, minimising any concerns for number 44A. The dwelling has also been extended at the rear in the form of a conservatory further reducing any such impacts.
14. The dwelling would be able to accommodate a single vehicle within the ground floor garage, there would also be adequate room to accommodate a further two vehicles within the front drive area; therefore the site complies with the councils Core strategy parking guidelines within Policy L4.
15. There would no change to the current provision for bin storage.
16. The development would not lead to a material loss of private garden space.


DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

17. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and where applicable, may be liable to a CIL charge at the rate of £80 per square metre.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard
2. Submission of materials
3. Details – compliance with approved plans
4. Removal of Permitted development rights to create first floor side facing window openings
5. Obscure glazing for all bathroom openings at first floor level
6. The garage cannot be converted into living accommodation

IG



LOCATION PLAN FOR APPLICATION No: - 82644/HHA/2014

Scale 1:1250 for identification purposes only.

Head of Planning Services, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH

Top of this page points North

This page is intentionally left blank