

AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 8th July 2021

ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against	For
97261	Voltage Park, Manchester Road, Carrington, M31 4BR	Bucklow St Martins	1		✓
99487	9 Bow Green Road, Bowdon, WA14 3LX	Bowdon	44	✓	✓ Cllr Whetton
103983	22 Queens Road, Hale, WA15 9HE	Hale Central	64		✓ Cllr Mrs. Young
103984	3 Fernlea, Hale, WA15 9LH	Hale Barns	87		
104196	44 Walton Road, Sale, M33 4AR	Brooklands	96	✓	✓
104199	Garricks Head Hotel, Moorside Road, Flixton, M41 5SH	Flixton	106		✓
104793	Firs Primary School, Firs Road, Sale, M33 5EL	St Marys	123		

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Matthew Thomas
(Agent)**

PROPOSAL

The applicant has submitted an Equalities Statement which indicates that the development has been designed to ensure that the employment units and the layout of the site are accessible to people with more limited mobility or who may have some form of disability to accord with part M of Building Regulations and the Equality Act.

The following features will be included to ensure that the development is inclusive and allows as wide a range of people as possible to work from or visit the site in a comfortable manner:

- Accessible parking spaces are to be provided for all of the employment units, and these are to be located close to the front doors of the units with greater room around the spaces to allow for ease of movement into and out of cars.
- Dropped kerbs will be provided to allow access from disabled parking spaces to the entrances to the units.
- External walking routes will be clearly and visibly defined and tactile paving will be incorporated where footways cross internal estate roads.
- Footways around the site will be designed to ensure that gradients are suitable for wheelchair users and those with less mobility, with ramps provided to deal with level changes where needed.
- Door openings to and within buildings will have thresholds and sufficient width to allow easy movement through doorways and all door handles will be easy to operate and located at an appropriate height for both able and less able-bodied employees or visitors to the site.
- Male, female and disabled toilet facilities will be provided at ground floor and on all upper floors within all of the employment units.
- Vertical circulation from ground floor to all upper floors will be provided by stairs and an 8 person lift in every employment unit, which will be suitable to accommodate wheelchair users and others with greater mobility needs.

REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation has been received from the agent representing HIMOR in relation to the proposed contribution towards the Carrington Relief Road (CRR). Specific concerns question the methodology used to inform the contribution which was based on the report 'Planning Obligations: Developer Contributions towards the Carrington Relief Road' which members approved at the Planning and Development Management Committee on 15 October 2020, and which was updated in a report to the Development Management Committee on 21st January 2021.

The representation suggests:

- The methodology should have taken account of the anticipated quantum of development proposed within the New Carrington masterplan (AECOM, September 2020) in assessing likely trip generation for both residential and commercial developments.
- That discrepancies exist in floorspace figures used in the methodology.
- Trip generation figures used in the Carrington Village planning application 88439/HYB/16 are different to those used in the 'Council's calculations'.
- The funding gap for the CRR is significantly greater than the £12 million outlined in the CRR Report because the grant funding relied upon in the CRR Report is no longer secured. Specifically, the HIF funding timescales will not be met and therefore £8.4 million will be lost.
- The CRR Report identifies a capital cost of the CRR of £30m, whereas the report to the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration of 18 December 2020 identified the cost as being £34m. This would indicate that there is a further £4million shortfall on top of the lost HIF funding.
- The full costs of Phase II of the Lyondellbasell rationalisation, a major land consolidation / infrastructure development required to deliver the CRR through Lyondellbasell's land, have not been considered in the CRR Report. This is required to release the A1 road.
- The cost of acquiring land to deliver the CRR has not been factored in. It can be noted that Voltage Park is not making any contribution towards providing land for the CRR. It should therefore contribute towards the cost of land as necessary to deliver the CRR.

The representation also suggests that Voltage Park is not making any contribution to other sustainable transport infrastructure, including the Trafford Greenway which runs directly to the south of the site.

The LHA consider that there will also be a number of other traffic interventions required to allow Carrington to progress. These interventions were listed in the GMSF Locality Assessment. The wider Carrington development will require further funding for highway works, and that this is a missed opportunity to share the cost in a proportionate manner.

The Council cannot take decisions on development now (in full knowledge of the uncertainties around funding of the CRR) and then expect other landowners such as HIMOR to disproportionately address any shortfall. The approach must be consistent.

OBSERVATIONS

The CRR is a longstanding infrastructure project required as part of the delivery of the Carrington strategic site under Policy SL5 of the Core Strategy. The cost of the CRR has escalated and there is a funding gap. Part of this funding gap is expected to be met from CIL but a significant shortfall remains to be met through developer contributions. The Council devised a formula based on vehicle trips that would be generated by various commercial and residential developments within the allocated area.

The formula was included in the CRR report referred to in HIMOR's representation above. It sets out how financial contributions towards the Carrington Relief Road will be calculated for development within the Carrington Strategic Location in accordance with Policies SL5 and L8 of the Core Strategy. It would not be appropriate for the methodology to take account of the additional anticipated quantum of development proposed within the wider New Carrington masterplan as suggested by HIMOR. The New Carrington proposals form part of the draft Places for Everyone (PFE) plan which is not yet at Regulation 19 stage and can therefore only be given limited weight as a material consideration.

Highway infrastructure contributions within SPD1 2012 were based on trip generation. Given it was based on policy in the Core Strategy, which remains part of the adopted development plan for the Borough, it was considered to be a reasonable starting point to revisit how those contributions should be calculated. The basic calculation uses the number of daily trips generated for the type of development divided by the total number of projected trips for all projected development within the area and then multiplied by the cost of the mitigation – i.e. the anticipated cost of the CRR. This number is then divided by the amount of commercial floorspace per 100m². This produces a figure to be applied per 100m² of commercial floor space. Baseline trip generation figures were extracted from consented development within Carrington, averaged out and sensitivity checked by highway engineers at Amey.

The additional funding from developer contributions makes the delivery of the Carrington Relief Road much more certain, as the funding gap can be closed by a mixture of these contributions and future CIL payments. Any increased costs associated with the delivery of the CRR will need to be found elsewhere and the Council is currently working on this.

It is considered that the methodology applied in the CRR Report is the most appropriate way of calculating a developer contribution towards the CRR for Voltage Park and moreover is consistent with other recent decisions made by the Council on sites at Heath Farm Lane and Hall Lane.

With reference to the other points raised by HIMOR, HIMOR have previously indicated that they would provide the land for the CRR and thus a financial contribution has not been sought from them to the CRR, whilst the other longer term infrastructure aspirations referred to are associated with and expected to come forward as part of the wider New Carrington development.

The Council's approach to delivering the CRR is considered to be reasonable, consistent and does not require HIMOR to contribute in a disproportionate manner.

The recommendation remains unchanged.

CONDITIONS

Following further discussions with the applicant, one additional condition and a number of minor amendments to the detailed wording of the conditions are proposed as indicated below:

Amended conditions:

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:

Site Location Plan - 30731-PL-100 A

Proposed Site Layout Plan - 30731-PL-101

Unit 1 Elevations - 30731-PL-104 A

Unit 1 GA Plan - 30731-PL-102

Unit 1 Office Plans - 30731-PL-103

Unit 2 Elevations - 30731-PL-107 A

Unit 2 GA Plan - 30731-PL-105

Unit 2 Office Plans - 30731-PL-106

Unit 3 Elevations - 30731-PL-110 A

Unit 3 GA Plan - 30731-PL-108 A

Unit 3 Office Plans - 30731-PL-109

Unit 4 Elevations - 30731-PL-113 A

Unit 4 GA Plan - 30731-PL-111

Unit 4 Office Plans - 30731-PL-112

Unit 5 Elevations - 30731-PL-116 A

Unit 5 GA Plan - 30731-PL-114

Unit 5 Office Plans - 30731-PL-115

Land Parcel Plan - 30731-PL-200 A

Materials - 30731-PL-118

Proposed Site Layout Plan with tracking - 30731-PL-123

Soft Landscaping sheet 1 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74001 P08

Soft Landscaping sheet 2 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74002 P08

Soft Landscaping sheet 3 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74003 P07

Soft Landscaping sheet 4 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74004 P07

Soft Landscaping sheet 5 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74005 P07

Soft Landscaping sheet 6 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74006 P06

Soft Landscaping sheet 7 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74007 P06
Soft Landscaping sheet 8 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74008 P04
Soft Landscaping sheet 9 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74009 P07
Soft Landscaping sheet 10 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-LD-L-74010 P06

General Arrangement Plan 1/3 - WIE-A-90-12.1 A02
General Arrangement Plan 2/3 - WIE-A-90-12.2 A01
General Arrangement Plan 3/3 - WIE-A-90-12.3 A01

Indicative Drainage Layout 1/4 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-DR-D-92101 P05
Indicative Drainage Layout 2/4 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-DR-D-92102 P05
Indicative Drainage Layout 3/4 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-DR-D-92103 P05
Indicative Drainage Layout 4/4 - 15005-WIE-ZZ-XX-DR-D-92104 P05

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

5. No above ground construction (with the exception of demolition, vegetation clearance, initial groundworks and site regrading) shall commence until details of the proposed site levels has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location, the nature of the proposed development and having regard to Policies L7, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. No above ground construction (with the exception of demolition, vegetation clearance, initial groundworks and site regrading) shall commence until hard landscaping details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location, the nature of the proposed development and having regard to Policies L7, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

25. Notwithstanding the requirements of condition no. xx no drainage systems shall be introduced which allow for the infiltration of surface water to the ground unless and until a scheme for their installation has been submitted to an approved in writing by the LPA. The scheme shall include an assessment of the risks to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development, does not harm groundwater resources having regard to Core Strategy Policy L5, the

National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection.

30. The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory provision is retained within the site for the accommodation of vehicles attracted to or generated by the proposed development, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 3 – Parking Standards and Design and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Additional condition:

32. No development shall take place until a phasing plan for the works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 44

99487/FUL/19: 9 Bow Green Road, Bowdon

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Alexander McCarthy
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

**Dr Z Rab Alvi
(Agent)
Councillor Whetton**

Representations

Following the publication of the committee agenda a further submission has been made by the applicant in relation to one of the previously received representations. It is noted that the representation received from 11 Stanhope Rd on 1/06/2021 and dated 30/05/2021 cites a separate application (103057/OUT/20) in the body of the text. Application 103057/OUT/20 is a current application that relates to a proposal for a pair of semi-detached properties on the corner plot (to the west of the current application site).

Observations

Following a further review of that representation, it is confirmed that the objection is primarily commenting on planning application 103057/OUT/20 even though the subject header refers to 99487/FUL/19. However, the representation does state that they object to all the applications on the wider site and that the entire

development threatens to destroy the character of the area and will lead to an already busy junction becoming even more dangerous.

RECOMMENDATION

There are no amendments or additional conditions proposed and the recommendation remains unchanged.

Page 64

103983/HHA/21: 22 Queens Road, Hale

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

FOR:

**Susan Crowley
(Agent)**

Councillor Mrs. Young

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Since the committee report was published, a second Opinion prepared by a barrister has been received on behalf of the applicants. The Opinion challenges the Officer's report to the Planning Committee. The key matters that they raise are: -

- The applicants accept that the proposed development requires planning permission as it falls outside of the tolerances of permitted development.
- If planning permission is refused, the applicants could carry out a scheme of works to the roof, materially identical to the present scheme, but just 5cm lower and there would be no requirement to seek planning permission. 5cm is perfectly acceptable in terms of development tolerances and would be indiscernible to the objective person on the street.
- The development would not be materially different to that which would be achieved under permitted development rights (the fallback) and that is a material consideration in the determination of the scheme.
- If required the applicants will remove the unauthorised development and construct the same form of development again 5cm lower. They are able to raise the funds to do so and would need to carry out the works to recoup money invested in the property, putting them to considerable disruption and expense for no tangible benefit in planning terms.
- Fundamentally the change to the roof that has taken place and goes beyond what is regarded permitted development is the angle of the forward-facing roof plane, which has been increased by 11%. The change would be imperceptible to most.
- The Officer's position that the fallback is a material consideration that should attract "no weight" in the planning balance is irrational. The position is unreasonable; the planning system has no punitive role, even in the respect of landowners who have deliberately flouted planning rules.

- Officers consider the increase in height is not 5cm, a figure based on the most accurate survey drawings, but could be up to 40cm. An Inspector will be concerned with the best available evidence, which are the recent plans submitted. It is unclear why the neighbouring property (No.20) should be a benchmark for the relevant height.

The applicant has also submitted photographic images, including a Google Maps image, taken from Stanway Drive to illustrate the difference in height between the original roof and the current roof of the property with the roof extension.

OBSERVATIONS

1. Following the submission of additional information relating to the resulting height of the roof of the property, a Council Officer has carried out an inspection of the roof of the adjacent property No.20 Queen's Road to establish whether or not the roof pitch was accurately represented on the drawings submitted with the planning application relating to No.20 in 2010.
2. The inspection found the slope of the roof to be steeper than what was indicated on the approved plans for no. 20. It is therefore considered that the original elevational drawings submitted for this planning application are likely to be an accurate representation of the property before it was extended. It is therefore considered that the increase in the height of the resulting roof, as shown on the submitted plans would be 5cm. Notwithstanding this, as detailed in paragraphs 45 - 47 of the Committee report, any increase in the height of the main roof means that the development does not fall within Permitted Development Rights.
3. In respect of the fallback position this is addressed at length within the main report, the weight to be given to a fallback is at the discretion of the decision maker. A fallback position is something which could lawfully happen on the land if the application proposed is not approved. In this instance the applicants argue that they would lawfully be able to erect a similar scheme (if the current development was removed) to that proposed, but 5cm lower to comply with the General permitted Development Order (GPDO).
4. It is then necessary to assess whether there is more than just a theoretical prospect that the fallback could be implemented. In respect of paragraph of 49 the committee report, the applicant has not demonstrated how they would be able to construct an alternative scheme that shows full compliance with the General Permitted Development Order, but has now indicated they have the means to do so. On the basis of the applicants' submissions, members must consider whether there is more than a theoretical prospect of the fallback position taking place. If they consider that there is, then the fallback is engaged and becomes a material consideration in the determination of the application. The weight to be attached to the fallback is a matter for members and one of the factors

which will be relevant to that consideration is the level of probability that the fallback would be implemented

5. As detailed within the committee report this is not an assessment of the scheme as built on site and any potential enforcement action that should be taken against that development, but an application for planning permission for a new proposal.
6. The proposal before Members requires planning permission, which is acknowledged by the applicants. The proposal, whilst partially built must still be assessed against Trafford's Development Plan. The proposal fails to comply with the Council's adopted policy and guidance in relation to the works to the roof and it is not considered by officers that the weight which should be applied to the fall back position should outweigh the development plan considerations.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is unchanged.

Page 96

104196/HHA/21: 44 Walton Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Heather Forbes
(Neighbour)**

Statement read out

FOR:

**Gareth Lloyd
(Applicant)**

REPRESENTATIONS

Following the publication of the committee agenda two further objections have been received from previous objectors.

22 Raglan Road - The objection reiterates previous concerns that have already been duly noted and considered in the main committee report. An additional ground for concern noted in the objection is the proposal would have a negative effect on the value of the property. This is not a material planning consideration.

42 Walton Road- The objection notes the SPD3 requirements for parking and existing parking provision on site as considered in the main committee report. Further comments are summarised below:

- There is a significant, well documented history of parking problems on Walton Road. Ward Councillors have undertaken parking scheme and restriction consultation with residents.

Residents have previously received plans detailing proposed parking restrictions.

- In addition, Walton Road is included within an Active Neighbourhood consultation, where on-street parking would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the scheme.
- Due to homeworking and Covid-19 restrictions, tram use is currently reduced and the current levels of parking do not accurately reflect the daily problems experienced by residents due to commuter parking. Therefore, a site visit would not flag this issue.
- Permitting development with inadequate parking provision would add to this already substantial problem.
- Certificate ownership in one name when two people named on land registry
- Consider that the development is 10.08m from rear boundary not 10.50m as required in SPD4.
- Occupiers of no. 42 request the application to be deferred to allow them to acquire an independent daylight, sunlight and overshadowing study of the impacts of the proposed development on their house and garden.
- Object to the content of the committee report which they consider contains factual inaccuracies and fails to address all of our objections.

NEIGHBOUR SUBMISSION

Since the committee report was published the neighbour, No. 42 Walton Road has submitted an email which raises concerns with a number of elements of the committee report including the referencing of habitable windows and impact to light on the dwelling and garden. These are addressed as necessary in this additional information report. The email has now been uploaded as an objection and is public on the website.

OBSERVATIONS

1. The application site has space for two vehicles on hardstanding to the front of the property and unrestricted parking exists on Walton Road. It is not considered the shortfall of one off street parking provision would have a significant additional impact in terms of on-street parking available to justify the refusal of the application on the grounds of impact on either highway safety or residential amenity. As such the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of parking.
2. Concerns have been raised relating to matters which Officers have referenced in the committee report the ground floor and first floor windows at no.42 being non-habitable (paragraphs 10 and 11). For the avoidance of doubt this is an error and the rooms are habitable, the ground floor windows serve a living room and playroom and master bedroom and second bedroom at first floor.

3. Whilst the windows serve habitable rooms, they are obscure glazed at both ground and first floor and thus are secondary. These rooms benefit from sources of light from windows to the front and rear of the dwelling. As such it is considered the proposed two storey side extension would not result in a harmful loss of light to those windows.
4. In respect of land ownership an updated certificate of ownership has been submitted to address the matter raised.
5. The submitted site plan shows that the two storey rear extension would be 10.5m from the rear boundary and this has also been measured on the Council's OS mapping system. Therefore officers consider the proposal to be compliant with policy in respect of the depth, however as noted in paragraphs 18 and 19 of the main report the rear of the application site faces towards the side of the gardens of properties to the rear and as such is not considered to cause harmful overlooking or be overbearing.
6. The proposed two storey side and rear extension would result in a degree of overshadowing to no. 42, however given the siting and depth of the proposed extension and orientation of the site this impact is not considered to be unduly harmful. Also as noted in the committee report the proposal complies with SPD4, which seeks to provide support of extension parameters which protect residential amenity and there are no specific reasons why in this a case a development complaint with SPD4 would be unacceptable Officers note the request from the neighbour to obtain an assessment for day/sunlight and overshadowing, however for an application of this nature that is not considered necessary and officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with the development plan.
7. Whilst the neighbour at no. 42 is concerned that their objection has not been recorded in full, officers consider that the report and this subsequent update does address the main points of their objection, which is available to review on the Council's website.
8. As concluded within the committee report the proposal is compliant with adopted policy and guidance and is not considered to result in an unduly harmful impact on the residential amenity of adjacent occupiers given the scale and siting of the proposal and separation to the neighbouring properties.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is unchanged.

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Jamie Wilkinson
(Applicant)**

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

A further representation has been received from the occupier of a neighbouring property who had previously objected to the proposal. This representation confirms that the proposed dormer elements are currently in the process of being installed, prior to a decision being made by the Planning and Development Management Committee.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM APPLICANT

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed rear facing dormer windows would comply with the ventilation scheme approved through discharge of conditions reference 103265/CND/21:

UPVC wood grain effect windows are to be installed complete with Simon Acoustic EHA trickle vents complying with the required: 5000mm² of ventilation and 36 – 38 decibels of acoustics.

FINAL RESPONSE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH (NUISANCE) CONSULTEE

The Environmental Health (Nuisance) consultee has confirmed no objection with reference to this additional information.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATION

Further Representation

Both the objector and the applicant have been advised that the work being carried out by the applicant is at the applicant's own risk. The applicant has confirmed that work on the dormers has ceased and that this was a result of miscommunication on site.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is unchanged.

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

CONSULTATIONS

Lead Local Flood Authority - The site is not within the flood map for surface water 1 in 100-year outline and there are no records of flooding within 20m or Ordinary Watercourses within 5m. There will be no significant change to the impermeable area and so little change to the surface water runoff generated by the site. The following informative is recommended: No surface water should discharge onto the highway or any third-party land.

Local Highway Authority – No objection in principle subject to conditions requiring an updated Travel Plan, a Construction Method Statement and appropriate cycle storage provision.

HIGHWAYS

The Local Highway Authority recognise that vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to the site remains unchanged and therefore acceptable.

The proposal will increase pupil numbers by thirty and staff numbers by two. It is not proposed to increase parking provision at the site as part of this application. It is recognised that the school has a Travel Plan and it is recommended that it is updated to ensure an acceptable impact in terms of car parking once the temporary classrooms are in situ.

The minimum cycle parking standards as detailed within SPD3 state that 1 space per 5 staff plus 1 space per 3 students is required. The proposed temporary classroom would facilitate an additional 30 pupils at the site and two additional members of staff. It is recommended that a condition is added requiring details of an additional 10 cycle parking spaces at the school.

The application therefore remains acceptable in highways terms subject to the above recommended conditions.

OBSERVATIONS

A Construction Method Statement has been submitted and it has been confirmed by the LHA that this is acceptable. It is therefore recommended that a condition is attached requiring the implementation of the approved method statement. In accordance with the recommendation of the LHA, it is also recommended that conditions are attached requiring the submission and implementation of an updated Travel Plan and details of additional cycle parking provision.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation for approval remains unchanged however it is recommended that the following conditions be added to any grant of planning permission:

4. The Construction Method Statement received by the local planning authority on 6 July 2021 shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the convenience of users of the highway, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The temporary classrooms hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until an updated school Travel Plan, which shall include measurable targets for reducing car travel, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. On or before the date when the classrooms hereby permitted are first brought into use, the updated Travel Plan shall be implemented and thereafter shall continue to be implemented for the duration of the temporary permission.

Reason: To reduce car travel to and from the site in the interests of sustainability and highway safety, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The temporary classrooms hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a scheme for secure cycle storage has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, the scheme shall include expanded cycle parking provision for ten additional bicycles. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

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

RICHARD ROE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:

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