

## AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 12<sup>th</sup> December 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
77288	St John the Baptist Church and Presbytery, Thorley Lane, Timperley,	Village	1		
77850	122 Seymour Grove, Old Trafford, M16 0FF	Longford	16		
80470	Former Kratos Site, Barton Dock Road, Trafford Park, M41 7BQ	Davyhulme East	23		
80764	64 George Street, Altrincham, WA14 1RF	Altrincham	37		
80972	Former Gas Works Common Lane/Manchester Road, Partington	Bucklow St. Martins	44		
81209	Land adjacent to 10 Massey Road, Sale. M33 2GN	Sale Moor	54		
81386	47 The Avenue, Sale. M33 4PJ	St Mary's	63		
81497	Vacant land at Mosley Road/Mellors Road, Stretford	Gorse Hill	70		
81575	Central Island of Junction 10, M60/Trafford Boulevard, Barton Road, Trafford Park M41 7JE	Davyhulme East	78		
81630	Land off Heathermount, West Timperley	Broadheath	87		

81722	Flat 4, The Battens, 72 Stamford Road, Bowdon, WA14 2JG	Bowdon	98		
81888	Allingham House Care Centre, Deansgate Lane, Timperley, WA15 6SQ	Broadheath	104		

Page 1 77288/FULL/2013: St John the Baptist Church and Presbytery,  
Thorley Lane, Timperley

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Andrew Burgess  
(Agent)**

### **APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

The applicant has submitted amended plans which show an increase in the width of the vehicle access to the site to 4.5m in response to the comments of the LHA and also to correct a number of minor discrepancies (relating to windows and doors) between the proposed elevations and floor plans.

A response to a number of queries raised by officers on the Affordable Housing Statement and Viability Appraisal has also been received.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

LHA – Confirm that the increase in the access width is acceptable.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

The further information provided by the applicant in respect of the Affordable Housing Statement and Viability Appraisal has been considered by officers and there remain a number of concerns over some of the costs included and clarification on other details needed. Further consideration and discussion with the applicant is needed to reach a conclusion on viability. As things stand the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development is only viable with a contribution of £231,872, which is below the required Trafford Developer Contribution of 20 affordable units (to be provided by way of a financial contribution towards off-site provision) and a contribution of £93,418.33.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Add the following additional reason for refusal: -**

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development is only viable with the financial contribution put forward, which is below the Trafford Developer Contribution required for the type and scale of development proposed.

The proposed development fails to meet the requirements of the area for the provision of Affordable Housing; Highways and Active Travel Infrastructure; Public Transport Schemes; Specific Green Infrastructure; and Spatial Green Infrastructure, Sports and Recreation. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy L8 of the Core Strategy and guidance set out in SPD1: Planning Obligations and the National Planning Policy Framework and would result in an unsustainable form of development in that it would not contribute to the provision of community infrastructure necessary to help achieve the sustainable community development and environmental improvement objectives of the Core Strategy.

**Page 23 80470/O/2013: Former Kratos Site, Barton Dock Road, Trafford Park**

**APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

The applicant has confirmed the proposals include three access points on Mercury Way, as shown on the submitted layout plan (the application has been considered on this basis and this clarification was requested solely because there was a reference to two access points in the applicant's statement).

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Pollution & Housing** – Confirm that the Air Quality Assessment is satisfactory. It concludes that the operational impacts associated with road traffic emissions will be negligible, but that dust emissions during the construction phase of the development should be mitigated through a scheme of dust control measures. It is recommended that the developer be required to implement the scheme as proposed in the report.

**Environment Agency** – No objection in principle to the updated Flood Risk Assessment. As the site is within a Critical Drainage Area identified within the Council's SFRA, the discharge of surface water from the site should aim to reduce run-off by 50% compared to the run-off from the existing developed site.

**DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Discussions remain ongoing between the Council and TfGM with regard to the level of contributions for a hotel. It is requested that authority be given to the Head of Planning to agree the final contribution.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (A) Add the following – The final contribution is to be agreed by and delegated to the Head of Planning.

Add the following conditions:-

Development to be carried out in accordance with the Air Quality Assessment

Scheme to limit the surface water run-off generated by the proposed development to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development. The scheme shall reduce the surface water run-off rate by 50% compared to that which currently exists at the site.

**Page 44 80972/VAR/2013: Former Gas Works, Common Lane/Manchester Road, Partington**

Amend recommendation (A) as follows:-

- (A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon the completion of an appropriate Legal Agreement to secure a maximum financial contribution of £685,565.56 split between: £133,764.00 towards highway infrastructure improvements, £274,790.00 towards public transport schemes and £276,991.56 towards Red Rose Forest (off-site tree planting) (to be reduced by £310 per tree planted on site in accordance with an approved landscaping scheme .....

**Page 54 81209/FULL/2013: Land adjacent to 10 Massey Road, Sale**

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Following the receipt of amended plans (indicating a revised design and footprint) an additional round of consultation was undertaken. Two further representations have been received as a result of this. Those concerns which have not been previously raised and reported can be summarized as follows:

- The width of access to the rear of the house, and the height of the dwellinghouses is unclear.
- The integral garages and recessed archways bear no resemblance to any of the existing Victorian dwellings in the immediate vicinity.

**OBSERVATIONS**

**DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Following a thorough assessment and re-evaluation of the submitted viability appraisal the Local Planning Authority has accepted that the scheme could only support a financial contribution of £6,000 whilst allowing for a profit of c12.5%. This would be split between contributions towards Highways and Active Travel infrastructure (£96.06); Public Transport Schemes (£237.99); Specific Green Infrastructure (£576.39); Spatial Green Infrastructure, Sports and Recreation (£1,544.50); and Education Facilities (£3,545.05). It is however recommended that an overage clause be attached to any approval which allows the issue of

viability to be revisited upon completion of the proposed development is found to perform better than the applicant initially anticipated.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed development would contribute three additional family dwellinghouses to the stock of accommodation available in the Borough, in a sustainable location, and in accordance with Policies L1 and L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy. The development will not unduly impact upon the residential or parking amenities of the surrounding area, and is considered to be of an appropriate design. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to the completion of a legal agreement covering financial contributions and conditions.

## **RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT**

- (I) That the application will propose a satisfactory development for the site upon completion of a legal agreement which would require a £6,000 contribution but subject to an overage clause to ensure that a contribution up to the value of £29,042.94 could be secured should the applicant's assumption about the viability of the development prove to be incorrect upon the development's completion.
- (II) In the circumstances where the Section 106 agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the date of this resolution, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning.

**Page 63 81686/HHA/2013: 47 The Avenue, Sale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Nigel Chorlton (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Mr Akram (Applicant)</b>

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

LHA – No objection to the proposals subject to the use of permeable surfacing.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Additional condition

- 6. Use of porous materials for hardstanding.

**Page 70 81497/O/2013: Vacant Land at Mosley Road/Mellors Road, Stretford**

Vary condition 7 to the following:-

This outline permission does not grant or imply consent for any access from Mellors Road.

**Page 78 81575/AA/2013: Central Island of Junction 10, M60/Trafford Boulevard, Barton Road, Trafford Park**

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Jon Levenson  
(Agent)**

**CONSULTATIONS**

The applicant has responded to the Highways Agency's comments and states that the Highways Agency's report published in June 2008 concludes that the belief that advertising is distracting is anecdotal rather than based on empirical evidence and that more research is needed. The Highways Agency have further responded to this and advises that the study came to no significant conclusions as to whether roadside advertisement resulted in driver distraction or not and that further exploration was required. Consequently it did not aid either side of the argument which is why the Agency errs on the side of caution in regards to driver distraction, especially in locations such as this where particular attention should be given to the driving task due to the various factors that need to be taken into account such as its location in relation to the junction, the slip roads and the imminent smart motorways on this part of the network.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A letter of objection has been submitted on behalf of the owners of the Trafford Centre, which raises concerns regarding the impact the proposed advertisement would have on public safety. They state that they are not opposed to roadside advertisements generally, however they support the representations made by the Highways Agency in this particular case. They fear that during hours of darkness, the large advertisement is more likely to attract the attention of road users than the smaller but more important road signage and there is a history of motor vehicle incidents in the vicinity of Junction 10. Such accidents result in serious road traffic congestion both on the motorway and surrounding roads that link to Junction 10. They further state that a substantial proportion of people travelling to the Trafford Centre travel from outside of the Trafford area and, despite what the applicant suggests, the route they take is not always well known to them. They advise that no digital imagery at the Trafford Centre is visible above motorway level and are concerned that drivers from outside the Trafford area may be dangerously confused or misled by the advertisement structure when approaching an extremely busy motorway junction.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

As stated in the main report, the Highways Agency has recommended that the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposed advertisement would be detrimental to the safety and free flow of traffic. Whilst it is considered that the impact of the free flow of traffic cannot, in itself, represent a reason for refusal of Advertisement Consent, following further clarification from the Highways Agency, it is considered that this is relevant insofar as this could contribute to a detrimental impact on public safety. It is therefore recommended that reference to the impact on the free flow of traffic should be included within the reason for refusal.

## **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

1. The proposed advertisement, by reason of its siting, size, height, design and luminance, would cause an unacceptable distraction to drivers on the motorway in close proximity to a busy junction and adjacent to highway directional signage and would therefore increase the potential for accidents and have a harmful impact on public safety and the free flow of traffic on the strategic motorway network. The advertisement would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Council's Planning Guidelines, Advertisements.

## **Page 87 81630/FULL/2013: Land off Heathermount, West Timperley**

### **PROPOSALS**

The parking layout to the front of plots 1 to 6 has been amended to take account of LHA concerns. This has resulted in a reduction in the amount of landscaping in this area.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

#### **CAR PARKING & HIGHWAYS**

As a result of changes to address comments from Highways and the requirement for visitor parking, the frontage to Plots 1 and 6 are dominated by parking (13 no. spaces). Further amendments have been sought to address the visual impact this has which is not ideal. The agents have responded that there is nowhere else to put this visitor parking on site. Attention should therefore be paid to the use of high quality surface materials to break up this extensive area of hardstanding.

## **DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

The agents have submitted a statement in response to the S106 figures provided by the Council for this site. Specific comments on the contributions are as follows:

### Affordable Housing

*There has been an over-provision on the earlier phase of development of 3 units.*

### Spatial Green Infrastructure, Sports & Recreation

*There has been a provision of a large area of open space to the north of the railway line and as such a reduction in the amount sought is requested.*

Discussions are ongoing regarding what is an appropriate level of provision and it is therefore requested that delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning to agree this and to issue the decision once this has been agreed.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- (A) Add the following – The final contribution is to be agreed by and delegated to the Head of Planning.

**Page 98 81722/HHA/2013: Flat 4, The Battens, 72 Stamford Road, Bowdon**

**SPEAKER(S)      AGAINST:      Mrs Harker  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:**

**Page 104 81888/FULL/2013: Allingham House Care Centre, Deansgate Lane,  
Timperley**

**SPEAKER(S)      AGAINST:**

**FOR:      Paul Carr  
(Agent)**

## **APPLICANTS SUBMISSION**

The applicant has provided further details regarding the proposal and is summarised as follows:-

The scheme does not involve reduced rents. Deansgate Lane is for vulnerable adults with a range of disabilities.

The cost of delivering such specialist schemes is higher than that of delivering standard affordable housing accommodation. There is an identified need to



deliver in an area like Timperley, as it offers a safe, good quality location to ensure a suitable environment for vulnerable adults. It is appreciated that what is essentially an affordable housing scheme would not traditionally be delivered by the market in such a good location and, as such, the land values are higher than they normally would be for standard affordable housing.

It has traditionally been recognised by Central Government that delivery of such accommodation places a greater burden on the HB budget for a local authority. This is why such exempt rents are not paid out of the local budget; they are recovered from Central Government funds.

Delivery of this specialist accommodation will continue to deliver the aspirations of both Inclusion Housing and the Council - to provide suitable accommodation for vulnerable adults and allow them to live in the manner and dignity which they absolutely deserve.

The applicant has provided a revised site location plan which now incorporates the section of (existing) parking bays along the eastern section of the site.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

**Pollution and Licensing (Contaminated Land)** – Contaminated land Phase 1 survey not required.

**Housing Strategy** – The units do not qualify as affordable housing, but it is considered that they are providing specialist accommodation for people with housing support needs and on that basis the proposal would not require affordable housing S106 contribution

**Network Rail** – Recommend conditions which are indicated under the Recommendations section of this report

**LHA** – This scheme should be assessed on the same basis as the previous application 80433/FULL/2013 which required an additional 3 car-parking spaces for visitors and staff (29 spaces in total with the associated care home) along with 2 motorcycle parking space and two secure cycle parking spaces.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Letter received from a resident on Brook Avenue objecting to the proposal on the grounds of inadequate parking – The proposal will result in an increase in staffing who will park outside residents home – Staff have advised residents that they have been told they cannot park on the site

## **DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Following the additional supporting statement outlined in the Applicants Submission of this additional information report; whilst the proposed accommodation does not fall within the definition 'of affordable housing' for the

purposes of SPD1 Planning Obligations it is accepted as specialist housing provision for people with housing support needs and following consultation with the Council's Housing Strategy section they have confirmed that this housing provision should not trigger any affordable housing contribution. On this basis it is considered that the scheme should not also require any contributions under SPD1. Reference to restriction of use to affordable housing at para.10 of the officer's report to committee should be disregarded.

**RECOMMENDATION: Grant**

Condition 2 - C3 assisted living accommodation use as set out in applicants statements received on the 19/11/2013 and 04/12/2013.

Condition 8 – Provision and Retention of Parking

Condition 13 – Surface water drainage

Condition 14 – Details of ground works and excavations adjacent to Network Rail land.

Condition 15 – Submission of risk assessment and method statement regarding works adjacent to Network Rail Land

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:  
Rob Haslam, Head of Planning  
Planning Department, P O Box No 96, Waterside House, Sale Waterside,  
Sale, M33 7ZF  
Telephone 0161 912 3149**