

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 11th July 2013

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	For
75930	Land known as Trafford Quays, bound by Trafford Way & Trafford Boulevard, Urmston. M41 7JE	Davyhulme East	1		
75931	Land known as Trafford Quays, bound by Trafford Way & Trafford Boulevard, Urmston. M41 7JE	Davyhulme East	20		
78785	Unit 3, 285 Talbot Road, Stretford. M32 0YA	Longford	42		
78787	Unit 1, 285 Talbot Road, Stretford. M32 0YA	Longford	49		
80110	Bridgewater Retail Park, Manchester Road, Broadheath. WA14 5PZ	Broadheath	56		
80446	1 Parkside Road, Sale. M33 3HT	Brooklands	72		
80537	The Life Centre, 107 Barton Road, Stretford. M32 9AF	Stretford	82		
80650	SAICA, 144 Manchester Road, Carrington. M31 4QN	Bucklow St Martin's	88		
80663	Manorhey Care Centre, 130 Stretford Road, Urmston. M41 9LT	Urmston	97		
80697	67-69 Norwood Road, Stretford. M32 8PN	Longford	105		

80712	St. Paul's Vicarage, 15 Springfield Road, Sale. M33 7YA	Priory	112		
80742	St. Paul's Vicarage, 15 Springfield Road, Sale. M33 7YA	Priory	119		
80729	4 Teesdale Avenue, Davyhulme. M41 8BY	Davyhulme West	127		
Agenda Item No. 5					
79984	Lyon Industrial Estate, Atlantic Street, Broadheath, Altrincham. WA14 5FY	Broadheath			
Agenda Item No. 6					
80577	B & Q Plc, Atlantic Street, Broadheath, Altrincham. WA14 5BW	Broadheath			

Page 42 78785/FULL/2013: Unit 3, 285 Talbot Road, Stretford.

OBSERVATIONS:

It is recognised that the application states that there are four full-time employees at the site and that these jobs could be lost if enforcement action were to be taken to require the cessation of the use. Nevertheless, it is considered that this potential loss is outweighed by the harm identified within the main report, and summarised in its conclusion section.

Page 56 80110/FULL/2013: Bridgewater Retail Park, Manchester Road, Broadheath.

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:**

FOR: **Stephen Morgan-Hyland (Agent)**

Page 72 80446/FULL/2013: 1 Parkside Road, Sale.

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:** **Ms C Travis (Neighbour)**

FOR: **Mr Gerard Gornall (Applicant)**

REPRESENTATIONS

The occupants of 6 Parkside Road have requested that the determination of the application be deferred, on the grounds that the second round of consultation has not provided neighbouring residents with sufficient time to submit further representations. Following receipt of amended plans neighbours were re-notified, with letters being sent out on 25th June. This period of additional consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's normal procedures for amendments of this nature.

This resident has also expressed concern that an amended site plan, showing a reduction in the proposed number of vehicular access points from two to one, was not placed on the website sooner for neighbours to comment on. The alteration shown on this amended plan addressed an existing issue raised by neighbours and did not raise any new issues. As such this would not normally warrant further formal consultation with neighbours.

Page 82 80537/FULL/2012: The Life Centre, 107 Barton Road, Stretford.

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	
	FOR:	Paul Guest (Applicant)

OBSERVATIONS

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The applicant states that the food bank would operate on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays between 10am-2pm. Following further discussions, it has been established that the applicant considers the hours sought will be appropriate for their needs. On this basis, it is recommended that a condition is attached to the permission restricting hours of operation to Monday-Friday between 10:00-14:00.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions;

1. Temporary permission expiring 3 years from date of permission
2. List of amended plans
3. Material samples including colour of unit and details of fencing and cladding
4. No public access to the storage unit – all food to be collected from within the main church building
5. Details of the green roof
6. Restriction of opening hours 10:00-14:00

Page 88 80650/FULL/2013: SAICA, 144 Manchester Road, Carrington.

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	
	FOR:	Dave Spacey (Agent)

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

As explained in the original report, the applicant submitted a supporting statement requesting that the financial contributions in respect of highways and public transport should not be applied in this case due to the specific way that the site would operate. The applicant also considered that the green infrastructure contribution could be secured by a landscaping condition.

On the basis of the information submitted by the applicant in respect of the proposed use of the extension, it is accepted that there would be no increase in vehicle movements and no additional staff and the proposal would prevent additional trips to and from an off-site storage warehouse. It is therefore considered that the contributions that would normally be applicable in respect of highways and public transport (£7,227 towards highways and active travel infrastructure and £10,366 towards public transport schemes) should not be required in this case as long as the use operates in accordance with the applicant's submission. If however, the use of the extension were to change in future in a manner that would be likely to generate additional trips on the highway and public transport networks, the contributions should be sought. It is therefore considered appropriate that the applicant enters into a s106 agreement containing a clause to this effect.

The specific green infrastructure contribution amounts to £28,520 or 92 trees and it is considered that this should be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. The applicant has agreed to provide an appropriate scheme of landscaping to meet the green infrastructure requirements. A landscaping scheme would be required by condition and it is anticipated that this landscaping would be incorporated into both areas of the application site. Any trees planted on site in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme would be offset against the total contribution.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

- (a) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site on completion of a legal agreement, which would require a contribution of £28,520 towards specific green infrastructure (to be reduced by £310 per tree planted on site in accordance with an approved landscaping scheme) but subject to a clause to ensure that contributions in respect of highways and active travel infrastructure (£7,227) and public transport schemes (£10,366) can be secured in the event that the use of the extension were to change in a manner that would be likely to generate additional trips on the highway and public transport networks;
- (b) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer;
- (c) That upon satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the committee report.

Page 97 80663/FULL/2013: Manorhey Care Centre, 130 Stretford Road, Urmston.

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

FOR:

**Paul Carr
(Agent)**

Page 112 80712/FULL/2013: St Paul's Vicarage, 15 Springfield Road, Sale.

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**FOR: Mrs P.Garbett
(Deputy-Head of Springfield Primary School)**

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

R2 – Natural Environment

CONSULTATIONS

GMEU: Following the submission of daytime and night-time bat surveys, GMEU have raised no objections, but have recommended that, in accordance with best practice guidelines, a second dusk survey be carried out to confirm the findings from previous visits.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT

(I) Add the following condition:

7. Notwithstanding the findings contained within the bat surveys submitted to date, a second evening bat survey should be conducted and submitted to the Council for their written agreement prior to the building being demolished.

Reason: In order to protect any bats that may be present on the site, and having regard to Policies R2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

Page 119 80742/LB/2013: St Paul's Vicarage, 15 Springfield Road, Sale

CONSULTATIONS

ENGLISH HERITAGE: The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the LPA's expert conservation advice. If the Authority is minded to grant consent then the Secretary of State should be notified in accordance with Circular 08/2009.

Page 127 80729/HHA/2013: 4 Teesdale Avenue, Davyhulme.

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Mr Unsworth
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

**Mr Riley
(Applicant)**

Agenda Item No. 5 79984/FULL/2013: Lyon Industrial Estate, Atlantic Street, Broadheath.

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Mark Rebbeck (Marloneview)
	FOR:	John Clarke (Applicant)

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

The applicants have submitted a Summary and Responses to the Planning Officers report covering the following issues:-

Quantitative and Qualitative Need

Raises no substantial additional issues not already covered in the main report
Public consultation on the PAG (and Morrisons) proposals has demonstrated very strong public support for a new supermarket in the Broadheath area

Sequential Assessment

Reinforces the previously expressed view that the Sale site is not available or suitable. It has not been brought forward before and it is unlikely that the redevelopment would be viable now.

In conclusion on this issue, notwithstanding significant concerns over the ability to deliver a new food store in Sale town centre due to availability and viability issues, PAG and their advisors are firmly of the view that The Square Shopping Centre is not suitable as it will not cater for residents in the Broadheath/Altrincham area, will not reduce levels of over trading and will not provide a qualitative improvement in the provision of convenience shopping floorspace.

The applicants also seriously question the ability of Maloneview or Mar Properties to deliver the development. Credit check reports for the two companies have been submitted which the applicant says demonstrate serious financial concerns about the abilities of the two companies can be considered to be a 'going concern'. Mar has a debt of £40million and Maloneview a debt of £19million.

Retail Impact

Morrisons has confirmed they are prepared to open a store in both Broadheath and Sale as has Asda

Tesco has also indicated they would look at extending or replacing their Sale store
PAG acknowledges some impact on Altrincham and has put forward a package of mitigation measures to enhance the town centre to the tune of £1.4m

The PAG store would not have any significant adverse effect on the vitality or viability of any of the Borough's town centres including Sale.

The PAG store is not on or adjacent to the retail park and has no potential to create a major distraction from Altrincham town centre, unlike the Morrisons proposal.

Loss of Employment Land

Reiterate points already made on this issue.

Accessibility and Sustainability

The site is within reasonable walking distance of some residential areas and from local businesses.

Arriva remains of the view that the extension of the 247 bus route or alternative proposals such as a shuttle bus service could serve the store and surrounding areas and link with the town centre and transport interchange.

Such a service could be an alternative to the extension to the 247 bus service.

The delivery of such an improved scheme could be controlled by s106 agreement.

Highways

There is no objection in principle and a number of matters could be dealt with by planning conditions

Developer Contributions

The level of contribution proposed is sufficient to mitigate harm caused by the PAG food store and will help draw people and trade into the town centre.

Comparison of Competing Applications

Repeats the advantages of the PAG store over the proposed Morrisons store

CONSULTATIONS

TfGM – make the following comments regarding the latest shuttle bus proposals:-

- Rather than talking to individual bus operators, TfGM would prefer to be approached directly by applicants/developers wishing to divert existing bus services or propose new services. This way an assessment can be made of the impact, of the proposals, on the wider bus network.
- As previously stated, bus service 247 is not operated by Arriva on a completely commercial basis, TfGM fund the tendered aspects of service 247 and would not support the proposed diversion for reasons already expressed.
- The alternative “Broadheath Hopper” shuttle bus service between the site and Altrincham town centre may provide some benefits by enhancing the public transport accessibility of the industrial estate and the site in particular. However it may also reduce patronage on the 247 along the A56, Sinderland Road and Craven Road which could impact on the commercial viability of the 247. **More importantly is the question of whether or not the shuttle bus proposal can be sustained as a commercially viable service when the Section 106 funding comes to an end after 3 years. At this time the service may be withdrawn leaving the proposed foodstore without a bus service.**
- Should Trafford Council be minded to approve this application, TfGM would welcome further discussions with the Council, the applicant and bus operators regarding potential options for improving bus accessibility through a Section 106 Agreement.

REPRESENTATIONS

In Support

Local business – 7 letters received (from Edwards and Co Chartered Surveyors (agents marketing nearby Edwards Court), jbt Engineering, PAD logistics, In2Corporate, Green IT Disposal, Cheshire Marble and LBM Direct Marketing) expressing support for the proposals. It will create more jobs than the proposed Morrisons bringing footfall into the industrial estate and a boost to the local economy and will be a convenient service for those employed locally. There are a great number of benefits compared to the Morrisons proposal. It will help create a growing business community and will regenerate an underused site. It will employ hundreds of people and improve transport links. Sale and Broadheath are two distinct communities.

Trafford College – Has expressed its support for the PAG proposals. The area needs regeneration and the foodstore would draw further investment into the area. New jobs would be created and subsequent training, together with highways improvements and bus route there would positive benefits for the college and the wider community

ASDA – confirms its support for the PAG proposal in Broadheath which they believe to be credible and deliverable and that along with jobs, investment and customer choice will benefit the Altrincham community considerably

Whilst ASDA continues to have a requirement for an ASDA store in Sale, they believe the Maloneview proposal in Sale is not deliverable in the short to mid-term.

Asda has also stated its intention to keep ASDA Living at the retail park open in the short to mid-term if they were to open a superstore at Broadheath.

Arriva – Continues to believe that the proposals to extend the 247 bus service has merit but also states that there are other viable options to deliver enhanced public transport provision to the area. This could include a bus shuttle service connecting the area with Altrincham including the interchange.

Precise details could be explored further but Arriva would be willing to favour the introduction of such a service.

Against

Maloneview – express surprise at Tesco's late involvement and their lack of comment on the merits of the two proposals.

Disagree with Tesco contentions as regards the bridge link in Sale.

The following comments are also made:-

MAR & Maloneview's Ability to Deliver: MAR Properties Ltd dispute the applicants assertions about their financial position and despite the findings of the credit report this statement is lacking in fact and defamatory towards the Company. The comments are therefore misleading and should be given no weight by your Council.

MAR Properties Ltd & Maloneview continue to have the full support of their key funder, NAMA, who have already outlined their knowledge and support for the redevelopment of The Square within their letter to your Council dated 24th May 2013. This position remains unchanged.

There is therefore no financial impediment on either MAR or Maloneview's ability to promote the redevelopment of The Square and they remain committed to its delivery.

MAR is seeking separate legal advice on the incorrect and misleading statement by Walsingham Planning which will be the subject of separate correspondence.

Catchment Area: the Council's retail consultant has already concluded that a store in Broadheath will serve the population of Sale given the site's location in Broadheath and the attraction a new food retailer to Trafford will have. Walsingham Planning offer no new evidence to alter this conclusion.

Site Assembly: Maloneview has provided extensive information on the position with site assembly which the Council's consultant has tested and accepted as making sufficient progress and there being no insurmountable barriers to delivery. The site is available when compared with the Practice Guidance advice and a viable scheme is being promoted. Despite Walsingham Planning's assertions, the scheme has only been actively promoted for 3½ years (see Maloneview's letter issued 24th May 2013) which falls well within the Practice Guidance time period for defining availability when promoting Town Centre schemes. Maloneview's pre-application request demonstrates a clear intention to progress with a planning application which is an important consideration in terms of deliverability.

Bridge Link: Maloneview's position is as per their letter issued on 8th July 2013 and they conclude this does not represent a barrier to delivery. Walsingham Planning offer no new evidence in this regard.

Bowdon Downs Residents Association – make further objection to the proposal raising the following concerns:-

- The impact figures on Altrincham cannot be accurate as they are based on the emerging development of Altair which may not happen
- To determine on this basis is pre-judging the Altair proposals
- The reports for both applications should reflect the negative impacts on Altrincham town centre without the assumption that Altair will be built

OBSERVATIONS

The additional information reported does not require any amendment or addition to the Observations.

Agenda Item No. 6 80577/FULL/2013: B & Q Plc, Atlantic Street, Broadheath.

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Frank Young (Waitrose)
	FOR:	Richard Bakes (Applicant)

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

The applicants have submitted brief comments on the officers report together with a more detailed response to the LHA concerns:-

The 4 reasons for refusal are addressed individually and in summary the points made are:-

- There are clear indications of qualitative need for additional floorspace provision in Broadheath
- There is no clear pressing qualitative need for another foodstore in Sale
- The Sale shopping centre does not meet the key test for potential alternative sites as it is not available
- The proposed Morrisons would result in a significant reduction in retail floorspace at the site so Policy W2.14 is not relevant to the application
- The highways issues have been addressed – there will be improved car parking, motor cycle and cycle parking; there will be improved pedestrian links; reduced width to service access to help pedestrians; new right turn lane to Davenport Lane; link to canal towpath which could not otherwise be created; all outstanding issues can be dealt with under s106 or conditions. Furthermore, when assessed against car parking standards the proposed level of parking provision (67%) is better than the existing level of provision (46%). A car parking management strategy is proposed as is funding for further TRO's on the local highway network
- The proposed Morrisons would result in a significant improvement to the appearance and character of the area and will also help to open up the canal towpath allowing greater public access to and public appreciation of the heritage asset

B&Q has confirmed that the existing store on the site will close irrespective of the outcome of the current planning application and that this is likely to occur during 2014.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours – A further 25 letters expressing support for a Morrisons foodstore in this location making similar comments to those already reported.

1 further letter of objection raising similar concerns to those already reported.

Bowdon Downs Residents Association – make further objection to the proposal raising the following concerns:-

- The impact figures on Altrincham cannot be accurate as they are based on the emerging development of Altair which may not happen
- To determine on this basis is pre-judging the Altair proposals
- The reports for both applications should reflect the negative impacts on Altrincham town centre without the assumption that Altair will be built

Market Place Europe Ltd – have been appointed by the Council to assess the current viability of the market and to recommend improvements to the market that will act as a catalyst to drive footfall to the market and the town centre.

In summary - The proposal for a supermarket (Morrisons) to be located on the fringe of the town within a retail park would not help the market nor indeed the town centre.

Morrisons who brand their outlets as 'Market Street' would in our opinion have an immediate and detrimental effect on the market and town. This scenario will not be appealing to any private market operator who may be looking to partner Trafford Council in rejuvenating the market and thus potentially depriving the market of much needed investment.

OBSERVATIONS

Highways

LHA has reviewed the information submitted and can confirm that most points can now be dealt with by way of condition or s106 if there was a decision to grant permission:

In regards to car parking:

The layout of the car park now seems acceptable, however, the LHA is still concerned that the proposed car parking is not adequate to support the proposed uses on the site. The LHA does not agree with the applicant's position about existing parking provision within the site. All the existing units have historically been used for retail warehousing and the existing car parking within the site is sufficient for retail warehousing use and not non-food retail use.

It is understood that the applicants have proposed a car parking management strategy to limit the length of duration within the site's car park and have also suggested the implementation of Traffic Regulation Orders on neighbouring roads to be funded by the applicant and whilst these proposals are productive, the LHA still considers that the proposed shortfall in parking will impact on neighbouring retail sites that are more directly accessible from the junction of the A56 / George Richards Way.

Retail

The applicants state that Policy W2 contains no reference to there being a need for a new foodstore in Sale Town Centre. Whilst this is technically correct, Policy W2.5 specifically envisages 4,000 sq.m of new retail floorspace in seeking to meet its objective to consolidate and improve the town centre.

It is considered important to record that Policy W2.14 is in two parts. The first part relates to expansion of the existing retail warehouse parts, which can be interpreted as being geographical expansion, and which requires justification against the tests set out in national guidance. However, the second part of the policy refers to development within the retail warehouse parks, and this part of the policy is clear in stating that such development '*...should be limited to the sale of bulky comparison goods only*'. It is considered that Peacock and Smith's comment conflates the two components of the policy and would note the substantial increase in retail turnover that would be achieved as a result of the application proposal, even if there is a reduction in the quantum of retail floorspace.

The comments from Market Place Europe support the recommendation to refuse the application and in the balance of considering both applications would weigh against the Morrisons proposal compared to the PAG proposal.

**HELEN JONES
CORPORATE DIRECTOR
ECONOMIC GROWTH & PROSPERITY**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:
Dave Pearson, Acting Chief Planning Officer
Planning Department, P O Box No 96, Waterside House, Sale Waterside,
Sale, M33 7ZF
Telephone 0161 912 3198**