

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 9th February 2017

ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

1.2 Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chairman.

2.0 ITEM 4 – APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC.

REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against RECOMMENDATION	For REC.
89213	7 Kirkby Avenue, Sale, M33 3EP	Brooklands	1	✓	✓
90074	Broadheath Primary School, Sinderland Road, Altrincham, WA14 5JQ	Broadheath	12		

Page 1 89213/HHA/16: 7 Kirkby Avenue, Sale

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

Mrs Julie Maxfield
(Neighbour)

FOR:

Mrs Ruth Ande
(Applicant)

REPRESENTATIONS

Two additional representations have been received (from 8 Windermere Avenue and 5 Kirkby Avenue) raising the following issues:

- The Council's guidelines imply that, if the street scene is preserved, no regard will be paid to the rear or sides of the properties. This particular proposal is a step beyond the previous extensions at 3 Kirkby and 3 Westmorland, which do not impinge on their neighbours to the rear.
- The rear windows at nos. 6 and 10 Windermere do not protrude as the proposed extension will. There is no loss of light, space, or privacy. Had we been asked for an opinion we would have made no objection.
- No 10 does not have a two storey extension and its windows are fairly flat with the original roof.
- The first floor extension will leave the requisite 10.5 metres but the ground floor doesn't.
- SPD4 says that extensions which would result in habitable room windows being less than 10.5 metres from the boundary are not likely to be considered acceptable unless there is adequate screening. A condition should be attached requiring that adequate screening be put in place.
- SPD4 says that the distance between habitable room windows should be at least 21 metres. If a similar extension is built at No. 8 Windermere Avenue, leaving 10.5 m within the garden this would bring the two houses very close together and have a negative impact on the area.
- The proposal will set a bad precedent for the future development of Brooklands and the Lakeside estate, which was designed to provide secluded gardens to compensate for the lack of privacy to the side where the original windows were located.
- No. 5 was not notified of the revised recommendation.
- There are 111 properties in this area of which 90 (81%) are of the Dutch style, which characterises and defines the area.
- 2.35m has been acknowledged as the depth of the first floor rear elevation rather than 1.9m as previously reported. No apology or explanation has been offered for this error.
- Neither 3 Westmorland Road nor 3 Kirkby Drive are relevant as they involve different circumstances.

- The report fails to identify the true extent of the first floor rear projection as it does not point out that the roof has to be extended by 4.67m because of the unique roof design.
- References to dormers are not relevant to the application.
- Whilst the proposal has been reduced in scale, the Committee will be familiar with the practice of submitting initial plans that are in excess of the requirements so that amended plans then seem more reasonable.
- Measurements have been taken using the hedges as a reference point but these are not the legal boundaries of the plots and cannot be used to take reliable measurements or as the basis for planning decisions.
- No. 5 reiterates their previous comments.

OBSERVATIONS

In relation to the further representations, the Residential Guidelines for Brooklands seek to preserve the spacious character of the streetscene and to ensure that extensions have regard to the original character of the dwelling. The SPD4 Supplementary Planning Document sets out specific guidelines for side and rear extensions. This application complies with the Council's guidelines for house extensions and is considered acceptable for the reasons outlined in the report. The SPD4 guidelines require a minimum distance of 21m between habitable room windows, which would be met in respect of the first floor windows. There is an established hedge on the rear boundary of the site which provides screening in respect of the ground floor windows. The references made in the report to Nos. 6 and 10 Windermere Avenue were primarily in relation to the fact that these properties include rear first floor windows. Both 3 Westmorland Road and 3 Kirkby Drive are considered to be relevant material considerations as they both exemplify two storey rear extensions to this property type, although it is recognised that each site has individual characteristics and that 3 Westmorland Road was approved under a different policy context. References have been made to dormers to illustrate that first floor (dormer) windows have been added to other properties or could be added under permitted development rights.

Measured at the level of the existing eaves on the side elevation, the roof would project approximately a further 4.5m to the rear. Measured at the level of the existing eaves on the rear elevation, it would project approximately a further 3.1m. However, the SPD4 guidance in relation to the rear projection of two storey extensions is intended primarily to protect windows on the rear elevation of neighbouring properties (and adjacent garden areas) and the two storey extension would project only 2.35m to the rear of the neighbour's rear elevation (meeting the guidelines when the gap of approximately 2m to the boundary with No. 5 is taken into account). Furthermore, the extended roof form has been

considered as part of the assessment of the application and, due to the subservient nature of the extended roof and the fact that the roof slopes away from the common boundary, this is considered to be acceptable in relation to the first floor bedroom window on the side of number 5. The Planning Authority does not hold information about land ownership or legal boundaries but Planning Officers are satisfied that the measurements taken on site are sufficiently accurate to be relied upon in terms of the recommendation and can confirm that the required 10.5m would be met to the applicant's side of the hedge on the rear boundary.

Page 12 90074/FUL/16: Broadheath Primary School, Sinderland Road, Altrincham

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

A Bat Survey has been submitted for consideration which concludes with the following recommendations:

'As the building proposed for demolition has been assessed as having 'low' potential to support roosting bats and no evidence of bat activity was found, combined with the low value habitat surrounding the building, it is recommended that the proposed works are undertaken under supervision of a bat licensed ecologist and with a soft demolition Precautionary Method Statement (to cover activities with Low Risk of Disturbance to Roosting Bats). If in the unlikely event that a bat is found during the soft demolition the demolition shall cease and surveys to inform an application for a derogation licence from Natural England will be required, starting in May 2017. The demolition will not be allowed to recommence until a derogation licence from Natural England has been obtained.'

CONSULTATIONS

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – Confirm that they are happy with the findings of the bat report and that pre-cautionary measures will suffice. A condition is recommended to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the pre-cautionary measures for bats contained in the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Survey Report.

GMP Design for Security - Comment that a Crime Impact Statement is required due to the size and nature of the proposals

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the above comments by GMP Design for Security and the GM Ecology Unit it is considered that the following conditions should be added to those already recommended in the Committee report:

11. No above ground construction shall commence until a Crime Impact Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority in relation to the development hereby approved. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme. Thereafter the measures outlined in the agreed scheme must be kept operational at all times unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a safe and secure environment for users in accordance with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the precautionary measures for bats set out in section 4 of the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Survey by Amey, Ref. CO36800146/06 February 2017.

Reason: In order to protect any bats that may be present on the site having regard to Policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Agenda Item 5 - Planning Performance: Criteria for Designation to Special Measures

Paragraph 2.12

Replace '*must be above*' with '*must be less than*' within point 4) and 5).

**HELEN JONES, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:

**Rebecca Coley, Head of Planning and Development, 1st Floor, Trafford
Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH. Telephone 0161 912 3149**