

AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 10th February 2022

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
<u>104761</u>	Sale High School, Norris Road, Sale, M33 3JR	Brooklands	1		
<u>104799</u>	Hale Country Club 47 Clay Lane, Timperley, WA15 7AF	Hale Barns	10		✓
<u>104821</u>	Stretford Grammar School Granby Road, Stretford, M32 8JB	Longford	35	✓	
<u>105315</u>	15 Sandleigh Drive, Hale WA15 8AS	Hale Central	45	✓	✓
<u>105445</u>	12 Rossett Avenue, Timperley, WA15 6EX	Timperley	63	✓ Cllr Brophy	✓
<u>105520</u>	4 Chiltern Drive, Hale, WA15 9PL	Hale Central	73	✓	✓ Cllr Mrs Young
<u>106136</u>	82 Hempcroft Road, Timperley, WA15 7JF	Village	84	✓	✓

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Katie Daniels
(b/h of Applicant)**

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged however condition 2 is amended to reflect the submission of revised plans removing any reference to works proposed under withdrawn application 104800/FUL/21 and to update to the standard condition reason and remove reference to Trafford Core Strategy Policy R1.

The amended condition is shown in full below.

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the amended plans, numbers:
 - 11302-EPR-A1-00-TP-A-TP-1001 Rev PP01 (Site Location Plan)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-00-TP-A-TP-1003 Rev P02 (Proposed Site Plan)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-00-TP-A-TP-1402 Rev PP02 (Proposed Site Sections)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-00-TP-A-TP-1403 Rev PP01 (Proposed Servery Plans and Elevations)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-00-TP-A-TP-1404 Rev PP01 (Proposed WC Plans and Elevations)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-01-TP-A-TP-1201 Rev PP02 (Proposed First Floor Plan)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-02-TP-A-TP-1202 Rev PP02 (Proposed Second Floor Plan)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-GF-TP-A-TP-1200 Rev PP03 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan)
 - 11302-EPR-A1-RF-TP-A-TP-1203 Rev PP02 (Proposed Roof Plan)
 - 11302-EPR-HC-EW-DR-A-04-0301 Rev PP05 (Proposed East and West Elevation)
 - 11302-EPR-HC-NS-DR-A-04-0300 Rev PP05 (Proposed South and North Elevations)

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

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: John Westbrook
(Against)**

FOR:

APPLICANT SUBMISSION

A revised application form has been submitted on 10th February 2022 amending section 24.

This section confirms that Certificate B was signed and notice served on the site owner. The date has been changed from 10/11/22 to 10/01/22 as the date of the 10/11/22 was an error.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation to **GRANT** subject to the recommended conditions is unchanged

Page 45 **105315/HHA/21: 15 Sandleigh Drive, Hale**

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST: Jo Ashraf
(Neighbour)**
Statement read out only

**FOR: San Tou
(b/h of Agent)**

PROPOSAL

Following the amendments received 27th January (reported in the committee report) in order to reduce the rear projection of the extension (ground and first floor level) to 3.5m, further amended plans have since been received 3rd February that alter the proposed fenestration on the rear elevation:

- One first floor window on the rear extension has been removed
- One first floor window on the rear extension has been decreased in size
- One first floor window on the rear elevation of the main dwelling has been increased in size
- The proposed roof-lights on the single storey rear extension have been altered in their position to be more central.

OBSERVATIONS

The submitted amendments to alter the fenestration on the rear elevations is considered to be acceptable in regards to design and amenity.

The alterations do not fundamentally alter the scheme and will not unbalance the appearance of the rear elevation, or harmfully increase overlooking to adjacent sites. Therefore it is considered that the amendments are acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged, however the wording of Condition 2 is amended to reflect the updated revised plans from February 3rd as follows: -

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted drawings, PS133 REV I, PS232 REV I, PS432 REV I, PS522 REV I received by the local planning authority on 3rd February 2022.

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

Page 63

105445/HHA/21: 12 Rossett Avenue, Timperley

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Robin Raymond
Councillor Brophy**

**FOR: San Tou
(b/h of Agent)**

PROPOSAL

Further amendments were received on the 9th of February 2022 in order to reduce the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties. These include a greater set back from the front elevation and reduced projection at ground and first floor to the rear. For clarity these amendments have been summarised in the table below.

Rear projection beyond original house

	Depth at Groundfloor (GF)	Depth at 1 st Floor	1 st floor distance to adjoining boundary	1 st floor distance from non-adjoining boundary
Plans detailed in committee report	5m	4m	3.1m	0m
New amended plans	4.1m	3.2m	3.1m	0.2m

Side projection

	Width at GF	Width at 1 st Floor	Set back from front at GF	Set Back from front at 1 st floor
Plans detailed in committee report	2.3m	2.1m	0.1m	0.1m
New amended plans	2.3m	2.1m	0.75m	0.75m

Alterations to fenestrations include:

- Addition of ground floor window to the front elevation of the side extension
- Addition of 1st floor window in side elevation of side extension
- Reduction in no. of windows in the 1st floor rear elevation of the rear extension and amendment to design of proposed window.

OBSERVATIONS

The amended plans reduce the rear projection of the rear extension and increase the set back of the side extension to the front, along with amending the fenestration.

It is considered the overall scale amended scheme would be acceptable in terms of design and appearance. The increased set back to the front reduces the impact on the streetscene and the reduction in the projection of the rear extensions reducing the overall massing and built form on the site.

As detailed within the committee report the proposal is considered to be acceptable in regards to design and impact on amenity. Therefore a further reduction in massing is considered to enhance the scheme and not alter the recommendation of approval.

The introduction of 1no window in the 1st floor side elevation provides increased fenestration to this elevation, which is supported, however does provide for overlooking opportunities to the south. Therefore a condition will be required to ensure this window is fixed shut and obscured glazed up to 1.7m above floor level to avoid a loss of privacy.

RECCOMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged however a condition is added for the obscured glazed window and condition 2 is amended to reflect the updated revised plans from February 10th: -

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

PS522 REV J; PS132 REV J; PS134 REV J; PS135 REV J; PS222 REV J; PS232 REV J and the associated site location plan.

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

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) upon first installation the windows in the 1st floor on the Side elevation facing South shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

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

Page 73

105520/HHA/21: 4 Chiltern Drive, Hale

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Mark Hall
(Neighbour)**

Statement read out only

FOR:

**Keith Miller
(Agent)
Councillor Mrs. Young**

APPLICANT SUBMISSION

Since the Committee report was completed 2x letters of representation have been received from two neighbors from different addresses.

REPRESENTATIONS

The representations re-iterate previous concerns and raise the following concerns:

- Late submission of plans after the consultation period which changed the internal layouts
- Unable to object to revised plans
- Statements in the report that are not factually correct
- There are six objections stated, when there is 8 objections
- Representation inaccuracies – a neighbours representation has been ignored.
- Other matters section – annex
- Objections to clauses of SPD4 guidance inadequately addressed
- Principle of development clashes with Trafford council policies

- Reference to Overshadowing and Overbearing
- Detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.
- Size of development.
- Negative effect on character or appearance.
- Reference to SPD4
- The comment of support has been taken out of context and in no way do we support this development when speaking about the lack of windows facing our property.
- Communication with the Councillor Young
- Sunlight report, possibility of bias
- No member of the planning department has visited the neighbouring properties to see directly the impact on them. (unless they have been onto our property without permission?) This has been requested in numerous emails. No-one has contacted neighbours to discuss the impacts on them. This could have very easily have been carried out in a “covid safe“ way.
- Reference of L7 and design
- Ecology - design in the plans for a loft conversion that you mention in the report
- Review of the way the planning process is carried out
- Resident trauma
- One statement claims “the total additional internal floor space proposed is approximately 59sqm” – there are TWO floors are roughly 45sqm each with additional sqm in a loft space, arguably tipping close to the CIL requirement at 100sqm (the loft space referred to is not shown on the latest plans, so its area cannot be verified).

OBSERVATIONS

The neighbour comments received in relation to planning application 105520/HHA/21 as originally submitted have been set out in the Committee report. Any further comments received from neighbours in relation to the application are reported in this Additional Information Report in the usual manner, therefore Members will be aware of any further comments received prior to reaching a decision. In addition the applicant/agent/neighbours have been made aware of the opportunity to address Members of the Committee through the Committee speaker procedure.

The comments raised above have been duly considered.

Submitted Plans

The agent submitted revised plans removing the flat roof loft extension, reducing the projection of the two storey side and updating the description of development. Neighbours were re consulted on 23.12.2021. Amended floor proposed plans and an application form were submitted on 13.01.2021. The proposed floor plans removed the proposed internal walls and the application form removed the reference to annex. It was considered the submitted plans did not warrant a consultation given this was a reduction in the internal development proposed and

the layout of the floor plans remained unchanged, there were no additional windows proposed and this did not change the description of development. Similarly, the amended application form removed 'to provide annex initially'.

Representations

At the top of the report, there is reference to six objections as this warrants a planning application to be put forward for planning committee. In the body of the report, under representations there is reference to eight representations.

Under the representation section, objections are listed but not written out in full. Before a Planning Committee meeting, Councillors and members of the public review public access to view any objections in full. All objections have been noted in the committee report. The neighbour representation which was highlighted as not included noted separate dwelling, out of character, openness, inappropriate and non-compliant with SPD4.

A site visit was conducted as part of the application, but not of neighbouring sites as this was not considered necessary in this instance.

Annex

The application proposal is for an extension to the existing dwelling and if permission was granted, the application would be for an extension only. The internal walls and reference to annex was amended by the agent to avoid any confusion.

Ecology

The report incorrectly notes a loft conversion, this was removed from the application proposal. To clarify the report should note roof alterations only. The proposed roof plans show an additional roof light and given the extensions to the property, the Greater Manchester Ecology consultation response was considered relevant to be included within the committee report.

The proposed development were assessed in accordance with a legal framework which aims to ensure the process is fair and transparent. This is noted in the residential amenity section of the committee report. Whilst the applicant chose to submit a sunlight report this was not taken into consideration for the assessment of the proposal.

The floor space was taken at ground floor at approximately 59sqm.

It is considered that any decision on the application will be taken in an open and transparent manner.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation to **GRANT** subject to the recommended conditions is unchanged.

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Sharon Ackerley
(Neighbour)**

Statement read out only

**FOR: David Ormesher
(Agent)**

REPRESENTATIONS

Following the publication of the committee agenda one further objection has been received from a previous objector:

87 Hempcroft Road - The objection reiterates previous concerns that have already been noted and considered in the main committee report. Particularly points:

- *Damage and disruption from potential future development of the proposal*
- *Potential impact to nearby wildlife as a result of construction*
- *Overshadowing / Loss of light upon neighbours*

OBSERVATIONS

It is considered that the proposal would not result in harmful levels of overshadowing loss or light given the context of the site and scale of the extensions as outlined in the committee report.

It is accepted that there would be a degree of noise and disturbance from the construction of the extensions. However given the scale of the proposed development and location of the site this is not considered to be at a level above and beyond what is expected with residential extensions and as such is considered acceptable in this regard.

The development would not result in the removal of trees or impact on the adjacent wildlife corridor given the separation distance and scale of the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged.

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