

AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 10th March 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>103844</u>	Land At Stretford Mall And Lacy Street, Chester Road Stretford, M32 9BD	Stretford	1	✓	✓
<u>104811</u>	City Point And 2 Hornby Road, 701 Chester Road Stretford, M32 0RW	Gorse Hill	73	✓	✓
<u>105247</u>	Moss Cottage, South Downs Road, Bowdon, WA14 3DR	Bowdon	145		✓ Cllr Whetton
<u>105248</u>	Moss Cottage, South Downs Road, Bowdon, WA14 3DR	Bowdon	170		✓ Cllr Whetton
<u>105249</u>	Moss Cottage, South Downs Road, Bowdon, WA14 3DR	Bowdon	186	✓	✓ Cllr Whetton
<u>105905</u>	World Of Pets, Thorley Lane, Timperley, WA15 7PJ	Hale Barns	211	✓ Cllr Butt	✓
<u>106476</u>	Development Site, Waterways Avenue Pomona, Old Trafford	Clifford	264	Withdrawn by Applicant	Withdrawn by Applicant
<u>106535</u>	Sale High School, Norris Road, Sale, M33 3JR	Brooklands	319		

Page 1 **103844/HYB/21: Land At Stretford Mall And Lacy Street
Chester Road, Stretford**

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST: Tony Great-Rex
(neighbour)**

**FOR: Conor Vallely
(Agent)**

CONSULTATIONS

The following additional response has been received:

Natural England: No comments to make.

Heritage Development Officer: For clarity, the comments of the Council's Heritage Development Officer are reported in full below:

I previously responded to the EIA Scoping Opinion consultation for this site (102862/EIASCO/20) on 14th January 2021. In addition to the heritage assets identified, I requested that the assessment area was widened to include a number of non-designated heritage assets and align with the proposed TVIA views.

Significance the affected heritage assets

It is noted that a Heritage Assessment (HA) has been undertaken by Stephen Levrant: Heritage Architecture Ltd and forms part of the Environmental Statement. The HA provides a detailed background and history to Stretford including map regression; characterisation of the townscape; assessment of building types and materials; analysis of key views of historic buildings and a thorough understanding of the heritage interest of the area.

There is a general concern regarding the use of a methodology assessment which is adapted from the ICOMOS Guidance on 'Heritage Impact Assessments'. ICOMOS guidance sets out a methodology to allow HIAs to evaluate effectively the impact of potential development on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of properties located within a World Heritage Site. A grading scale is suggested which ranks heritage assets based on their potential for international heritage value. The grading of significance based on a WHS hierarchal structure is not considered to be an appropriate method to use to assess the heritage interest of individual assets on this particular site. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the HA provides a comprehensive and informed understanding of the significance of the affected heritage assets.

The heritage assets identified lie within or adjacent to a 250m-500m study area and were agreed at pre-application stage. This includes seven listed buildings, eleven non-designated heritage assets and one proposed conservation area.

These are as follows;

Designated Heritage Assets

Stretford Public Hall, (former Civic Theatre) (Grade II)

Essoldo Cinema (Grade II)

Church of St. Matthew (Grade II) & Cross Base in St Matthew's Churchyard (Grade II)

Church of St Ann (Grade II) & St Ann's Presbytery (Grade II)

Bridgewater Canal Aqueduct, Hawthorn Road (Grade II)

Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs)

Former Post Office, King Street

Derby Hall, King Street

Stretford Library

The Robin Hood Public House

Trafford Christian Life Centre (Former Wesleyan Chapel), Barton Road

Victoria Park including entrance gates onto School Rd & Park Rd

Bridgewater Canal

Watch House, Bridgewater Canal

Stretford Metrolink Station

Stretford Cemetery Mortuary Chapel, Cemetery & entrance gates, Lime Road

Trafford Grove, proposed conservation area

Impact of the proposed development

The hybrid application proposes the demolition of specified buildings in conjunction with outline planning permission and all matters reserved except for access for a mixed-use development comprising: of commercial and community uses in conjunction with up to 800 residential units as well as the introduction of green space, public squares with pedestrian and highways improvements.

There are no objections to the proposed partial demolition of Stretford Mall. The redevelopment of the site provides a welcomed opportunity to reinstate the eroded historic urban grain, integrate remaining heritage assets, improve their connectivity and create an interesting, distinctive and well-designed town centre. As set out in the HA, the urban form of Stretford is severely fragmented; “there is a poor sense of enclosure to the street blocks surrounding the Site and as a result there is a general lack of pedestrian activity and vitality to the area, with vehicular traffic forming the dominant feature”.

The application is supported by a Maximum Heights Plan (Fig 5.2) and outline and landscape masterplans. A Town and Visual Impact Assessment also provides indicative views of the proposed height parameters. The majority of the proposed development will range from 6-8 storeys with 3-4 storeys around the periphery of the Mall. On Lacy Street, the maximum height will be up to 6 storeys. In assessment of the TVIA and VIA in the HA, I have the following comments to make in relation to the potential impact of the development;

Stretford Public Hall, (former Civic Theatre) (Grade II)

Stretford Public Hall is a landmark building and is particularly prominent in views along Chester Road. Viewpoint 7 indicates that over a long distance an increase

in height of upto 8 storeys on the Mall site will partially obscure this listed building. Whilst the Public Hall will then come into view when travelling northwards along Chester Road, the additional storeys proposed to King Street will appear in the periphery of this view and could impact on the appreciation of the listed building. This impact can be mitigated to some degree at detailed design stage, however a reduction in height on Chester Road and King Street would remove the potential harm caused to setting.

Viewpoint 22 indicates the potential impact of 6 storeys to the corner of Edge Lane and Chester Road. This will result in a significant building fronting Chester Road and has the potential to impact on views northwards of SPH. Viewpoint 9 indicates the development will be visible in views looking southwards, however it will sit below the height of SPH. The design of the development in terms of articulation, scale, massing, materiality will be critical in ensuring impact will be minimised on SPH in this view.

Essoldo Cinema (Grade II)

Viewpoints 9, 20, 22 indicate the development on Lacy Street in the context of the Essoldo particular the Chester Road 'cash register' elevation. With the exception of viewpoint 22, the proposed height will not compete with that of the Essoldo and the development can be mitigated through the detailed design.

There is some concern regarding the potential impact indicated in viewpoint 22 which shows a building completely at odds in scale and height to the Essoldo and shops on Edge Lane. Reducing the height of this block and massing would mitigate the harm caused.

Viewpoint 18 shows the development on Lacy Street will not compete with the Edge Lane elevation. However, the 6 storeys blocks should be separated to enable the view of the Edge Lane elevation to be maintained looking northwards along Lacy Street. Further details regarding the difference in land levels between Lacy Street and Edge will be required at the detailed design stage.

Church of St. Matthew (Grade II) & Cross Base in St Matthew's Churchyard (Grade II)

Viewpoint 18 indicates the development of Lacy Street will obscure a long distance view of the tower of St Matthews from Edge Lane resulting in some minor harm to the appreciation of the listed building as a landmark and visual reference.

The increase in 8 storeys on the Mall site could also impact on Viewpoint 7 looking northwards along Chester Road. Nevertheless the existing building is already 6 storeys fronting onto Chester Road. The detailed design stage should seek to improve the architectural interest of this block to enhance the setting of St Matthews Church.

Kinetic views looking southwards across the currently open space will be lost through the development of 3 storey houses and 6 storey blocks adjacent to the Mall in this location. This again will impact on the setting of the listed building and

views of the Church will be lost from Chester Road. This harm could be reduced by creating a view through the development towards the Church or introducing a greater area of open space fronting Chester Road to allow views to be maintained. The reinstatement of historic urban grain in this location is welcome. This will provide a sense of enclosure and context to the Church which is a benefit. Connections/access to the green space and public square are required to and from the church yard to sufficiently integrate the Church into the development and make the building an appropriate focal point.

Former Post Office & Derby Hall, King Street

Former PO is a landmark building occupying the corner of King St & Chester Road. The building is also significant for marking the historic street pattern partially eroded in the 20th century with the development of the Mall. The reinstatement of King Street will enhance the setting of both the former PO & Derby Hall. There are no objections in principle to the additional storeys proposed to the south side of King Street; the Mall is currently a storey lower than buildings on the north side of King St. Viewpoint 21 indicates the increase in height will be visible above both NDHAs. However, the impact is limited and an interesting silhouette and materiality to the proposed development will mitigate this. The treatment of rear elevations of NDHAs onto Kingsway needs careful consideration.

Viewpoints 1 & 23 taken in front of the former PO, indicate the development could have a considerable impact on the NDHAs and potentially overshadow King Street. Providing the height is limited to the corner and the building has sufficient architectural interest this will mitigate the impact. Nevertheless, a reduction in height to complement the former PO would help to preserve the landmark status of the NDHA.

As advised in the HA, a demolition method statement will be required to protect and stabilise Derby Hall. Due to the close proximity this should also include the former PO. Viewpoint 21 does not show the proposed 6 storey block adjacent to Derby Hall as proposed on the maximum height parameters plan. It is not clear if the parameters plan is correct for this area as the outline master plan indicates the retention of existing buildings. The development in this location should step down to 3 storeys to enhance both Kingsway and King Street.

Stretford Library, Bennett Street

Viewpoint 4 shows the proposed 4 storey block on the corner of Kingsway & Barton Road will be visible within the setting of the Library. Providing the development is of a good quality design, the intervening distance between the two sites is such that the proposal will have a limited impact on the NDHA. There is concern however regarding the proposed 6 storey blocks along Kingsway and the impact this will have on the setting of the library which is low in scale and height to compliment adjacent terraces. Viewpoint 24 demonstrates this taking in the south side of Kingsway and the library. Viewpoints 4 & 21 do not sufficiently show the proposed 6 storey blocks. The development should be limited to 3 storeys along Kingsway. Smaller scale buildings onto Kingsway would help integrate the fragmented townscape including several NDHAs

Pedestrian connectivity needs to be improved to Victoria Park (NDHA), the surrounding residential area such as Cyprus Street, Pinnington Lane, Victoria Road, Mitford Street and nearby primary schools. The proposed pedestrian route to Kings Square should be opened out to align with Pinnington Lane which is a well-used pedestrian route. This would result in the loss of the existing public toilets/unit however this would enormously improve connectivity to the town centre from existing residential areas and allow views to Kings Square beyond. The Landscape Masterplan should also include connectivity/pedestrian routes across Kingsway.

The Robin Hood Public House

The proposed 4 storey block on the corner of Kingsway & Barton Road is a concern due to the close proximity to the Robin Hood. The NDHA is a distinctive landmark and the proposed block should not detract from its prominence. Viewpoint 4 indicates the potential impact the development which will be further exacerbated by the 6 storey block behind. The maximum height should be reduced to 3 here along with proposed blocks along Kingsway to reflect surrounding residential properties. The urban grain in this area largely dates from mid to 19th century with residential properties along Urmston Lane and Barton Lane.

Bridgewater Canal

The proposed development at Lacy Street has the potential to open up access to the canal and enhance its setting. The proposed green space is welcomed however the connectivity to the canal is limited and views as well as access should be provided through the development linking to the green space on Chester Road.

Having reviewed the impact of the proposed development on the following heritage assets, I agree with the HA that the overall impact will range from be neutral – minor beneficial;

Church of St Ann (Grade II) & St Ann's Presbytery (Grade II)
Bridgewater Canal Aqueduct, Hawthorn Road (Grade II)
Trafford Christian Life Centre (Former Wesleyan Chapel), Barton Road
Victoria Park including entrance gates onto School Rd & Park Rd
Watch House, Bridgewater Canal
Stretford Metrolink Station
Stretford Cemetery Mortuary Chapel, Cemetery & entrance gates, Lime Road
Trafford Grove, proposed conservation area

General design comments

It is noted that the detailed design stage will form part of the subsequent reserved matters applications. This will be critical in ensuring that any harm identified will be sufficiently mitigated. In addition to height, the proposed design should take account of scale, massing, alignment and materials to result in a development which is successful in its context. Highway and pedestrian access improvements need to incorporate a sympathetic palette of materials and be appropriately

designed to avoid over engineered vehicular entrances and kerbs, safety balustrades, poorly sited signage etc. Green space, trees soft landscaping would also help to soften urban environment and complement HAs. In particular the following will need to be incorporated;

- Grain of the surroundings, such as street pattern and plot size;
- The size and density of the proposal related to that of the existing and neighbouring uses;
- The diversity or uniformity in style, construction, materials, colour, detailing, decoration and period of existing buildings and spaces;
- Views into, through and from the site and its surroundings;
- Landscape design;
- Quality of the materials.

Policy & guidance

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 advises; "In considering whether to grant listed building consent or planning permission for any works the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".

In determining this application you should bear in mind the requirements of the NPPF including paragraphs 195, 197, 199-200 & 202-203. In particular para 195 states LPAs should take the particular significance of any heritage asset into account "to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal".

Policies R1 & L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy 2012 apply. Whilst R1 is considered to be out of date the policy is still a material consideration. The following is particularly relevant; Trafford's historic environment makes a major contribution to the attractiveness and local distinctiveness of the Borough. Heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, or landscapes of historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest whether designated or not. The significance, character, and appearance of these heritage assets are qualities that will be protected, maintained and enhanced

Position

All harm identified to the setting [indirectly] of heritage assets ranges from negligible to moderate. With regard to the designated heritages assets affected [Stretford Public Hall, Essoldo & St Matthews Church], this is considered to be 'less than substantial harm' [para 202 NPPF].

This harm will nevertheless require a clear and convincing justification and in accordance with paragraph 202 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'. The balancing exercise should be undertaken bearing in mind the statutory duty of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

With regard to the harm identified to the setting [indirectly] of non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset [203 NPPF].

It is recommended that the applicant should seek amendments to the proposals as set out in my response above to address the concerns. This is to ensure that the proposed scheme constitutes sustainable development as defined by the NPPF.

The following comments were received in relation to the revised height parameters plan:

The main change to the plan is the reduction in height from 6 storeys to 4 storeys adjacent to Kingsway. In order to integrate the fragmented townscape, 3 storeys is considered more appropriate in this location. Nevertheless, the reduction to 4 storeys is an improvement. It is acknowledged this will help to lessen the impact of the development on the setting of Stretford Library and adjacent terraces as well as the setting of the former Robin Hood Public House.

Whilst the revision is welcomed, a number of the other concerns raised have not been addressed. My overall position on the application therefore does not change and is as follows;

REPRESENTATIONS

One additional representation has been received. This makes the following comments:

- Impact on surgeries, dentists, schools, public transport etc.
- Impact on parking provision on Wellington Street

It is considered that the above matters have been appropriately addressed in the committee report.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Residential development – need and mix:

1. Paragraph 9 of the main committee report should be replaced with the following two paragraphs as a matter of clarification:
2. Policy L1 of the Trafford Core Strategy seeks to release sufficient land to accommodate 12,210 new dwellings (net of clearance) over the plan period up to 2026. The Council has a much improved housing land supply figure of 4.24 years. This has come about as a result of comprehensive

and assertive action by the Council over the last two years – for example by granting suitable planning permissions, bringing forward infrastructure, and intervening in the market to bring forward its own exemplar schemes through its investment programme. Delivery is also much improved with the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) in 2021 being 79% (from 61% in 2020), and which moved the Council out of the HDT presumption in favour of development. A forward look at sites coming forward in the next 12 months also indicates a much improved, and improving position. The housing supply and delivery trajectory is therefore strongly and clearly moving in an upwards direction and quickly towards a position whereby the Council will be able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The identified sites making up the supply are also primarily brownfield, and all within the urban area and/or well established development plan allocations, and include Stretford Town Centre.

3. In terms of the HDT, which is a percentage measurement of the number of actual homes delivered against the number of homes required, Trafford's most recent measurement (from January 2022) is 79 per cent. Again, the current HDT figure is the most favourable since the HDT was introduced and is an improvement on the previous year (it stood at 61 per cent in January 2021). Given that housing delivery is now above 75 per cent mark, the 'presumption in favour' is no longer initiated as a consequence of the HDT result (although it remains in place anyway until such time as a five year housing land supply can be demonstrated).
4. Paragraph 16 of the committee report refers to housing policies being rendered out-of-date because of a lack of a five year housing land supply. For clarity, this isn't necessarily the case, rather only the housing target numbers are out of date.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

5. Paragraph 83 of the committee report refers to a condition requiring the proposed access points G and H not to be used as a primary entrance to the site for commercial servicing vehicles. Whilst it is not the applicant's intention to use these accesses for the above purposes, the final access strategy will be developed as the detailed layout of the development progresses. As such, the condition referred to requires the submission of an Access Strategy to confirm these details.

OPEN SPACE/SPORT FACILITIES

6. As reported in the committee report, Sport England was consulted on the application and advises that it objects to the application on the basis that no financial contribution towards improvements to off-site indoor and outdoor sports facilities is proposed. The response includes a calculation for a financial contribution towards indoor and outdoor sport, inclusive of costs for a range of facilities including swimming pools, changing rooms and playing pitches.

7. These comments have been reviewed by Officers and it is considered that the figures set out in the Sport England response do not reflect the policy requirements of the Trafford Core Strategy and SPD1, in particular the request for a contribution towards indoor sports facilities. With regard to outdoor sports provision, no contribution to changing facilities would be required due to the completion of an improved changing room scheme at Turn Moss Playing Fields, as identified and prioritised in the Local Football Facilities Plan (LFFP) and stated in the council's 5 year investment plan. As a result of an assessment of the scheme against the specific needs for outdoor sports facilities in the area, a revised contribution has been calculated.
8. As stated in the committee report, the applicant is committed to providing 25 per cent affordable housing as part of the development as well as a substantial policy-compliant contribution towards education improvements (over £3.6m). Although no contribution is made toward off-site sport improvements, overall the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims of Core Strategy Policy R5 in that the development will deliver a substantial amount of open space within the site where there currently is none. This is a significant benefit of the proposed development and has been identified as such in the committee report. The lack of a contribution towards off-site sports facilities is identified as an adverse impact of the development, however this does not affect the conclusion and recommendation set out in the committee report; that the benefits of the scheme are considered to significantly outweigh all adverse impacts and the application is recommended for approval.

CONDITIONS

Condition 32 is updated to require the provision of a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) and a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP):

A Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) and a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) shall be provided within the development. Any reserved matters application(s) relating to a phase that includes a LEAP or a NEAP shall include full details of the play area facilities within that phase, including location, size, specification for the play equipment to be installed, full landscaping details and a maintenance regime for the lifetime of the development. The play area facilities shall be provided before that phase is occupied and subsequently maintained for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that children within the development have reasonable access to good quality play space, in accordance with Policy R5 of the Trafford Core Strategy and SPD1: Planning Obligations.

Within the response from Sport England, a condition is recommended to require the submission of an Active Environment Strategy, in the interests of promoting active travel and creating safe and attractive walking and cycling routes and

been provided to demonstrate that the manoeuvres required for the operation of the proposed parking can be achieved in combination with use of the dedicated internal service area. The LHA has agreed to this and a formal Parking Management Strategy will be secured by condition along with requirement for electric vehicle charging provision.

The parking exercise undertaken by Axis for the TRICS comparison sites is irrelevant to this proposal which has restricted parking and a managed system to book parking and at which there are external parking controls. A review of TRO's will be undertaken by the LHA, funded by the developer, to ensure that suitable controls are in place. Funding is to be secured via S106 Agreement. As noted in the TS, the TRICS sites have an average level of parking provision of 85% and are not subject to management therefore the levels of vehicle movement would be higher than at the application site.

Clarification is required over a statement made in the supporting information. The point being made was that other hotels are available in the area that offer parking should this be a priority for a guest i.e. they can choose to stay at a different hotel, not as suggested in the Axis comments that these people could stay at the proposed hotel but use the parking at a different hotel.

Axis note that parking is limited in the existing bays on adjacent roads near the site to a maximum of 8 hours between 9am and 5pm. It is unclear how Axis conclude from this that these controls would prevent parking overnight. 'Use of available parking subject to the confines of parking controls' should not be a controversial statement.

Axis seek to present an argument that a walking distance of 600m to a tram stop is unacceptable for the proposed use despite acknowledging their own statement contradicting this in relation to the LCCC Red Rose Development 103921/FUL/21 and tram stops in excess of 1km from that site, (they are referring to accessibility to the wider tram network and not just the adjacent Old Trafford Stop). It is also noted that in the recently approved hotel development at Barton Road, the committee report states the following:

"The site is also accessible to the new Trafford Centre Metrolink extension now completed, with the nearest Metrolink stop at Event City approximately 1km from the site.....easily accessible from the site and provides direct connections to an extensive part of Greater Manchester and to other modes of transport such as the airport and Manchester Piccadilly." The application site is closer to tram services than this site referred to in the report.

The pedestrian route through the parking area has been amended as part of the revised layout, though this is not the only or the main pedestrian

access route to the proposed hotel. All parking bays meet the standard size criteria, the parking area will be gated and subject to surveillance.

Matchday Restrictions

Matchday restrictions and proposed management measures are set out in the Transport Statement and referenced in the Committee Report.

The Committee Report states that the LHA considers the development is compliant with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies L4, L7 and NPPF.

REPRESENTATIONS

Two objections have been received since the report was completed, from No. 9, Hornby Road and Apt 50, Warwickgate House, re-iterating concerns that the development will impact negatively on visual amenity, privacy, traffic, pollution and wildlife and raising concerns that it will result in more crime.

OBSERVATIONS

The issues raised in the objections are already addressed in the main report and do not affect the recommendation.

While the content of the rebuttal by the applicant's highways consultant is noted, this does not alter the assessment of the highways impacts as set out in the report or the recommendation.

Para 108 is amended to make clear that the retention of the original architect is via a section 106 legal agreement and not a condition (added text in bold):

'It is considered important to the successful outcome of the development that conditions are used to retain control of the detailing, quality materials and the original architects **through a section 106 legal agreement.**'

The last sentence of Para 259 of the Committee report is amended to so that the section 106 requirements are referenced in relation to the mitigation of the impacts of the development, as well as conditions. The sentence is amended to read as follows (added text in bold):

'No conflict with the development plan or the NPPF have been found in respect of any of these issues, which have been found to be acceptable, with, where appropriate, specific mitigation to be secured by planning condition **and a section 106 legal agreement.**'

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged.

Page 145 105247/HHA/21: Moss Cottage, South Downs Road
Bowdon

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Chris Griffiths
(b/h of Applicant)
Councillor Whetton**

Page 170 105248/LBC/21: Moss Cottage, South Downs Road
Bowdon

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Chris Griffiths
(b/h of Applicant)
Councillor Whetton**

Page 186 105249/FUL/21: Moss Cottage, South Downs Road
Bowdon

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Christopher Payne
(Neighbour)**

Statement read out only

**FOR: Chris Griffiths
(b/h of Applicant)
Councillor Whetton**

APPLICANT SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Report which surveys the trees at the site and proposes a method statement, among other things.

The applicant has submitted two photographs of the adjacent property "Woodend". Cllr Whetton has also submitted three further images of the application site. It is understood that these images have been forwarded to members of the committee. They are not considered further.

CONSULTATIONS

Arboriculturist – The removal of the sycamore, T24 will make the most difference to the view onto the site from the roadway. However, T24 is already showing signs of included bark so would be likely to be removed within a few years anyway. I would not have assessed this tree within category B. The other trees proposed for removal to enable the development for both applications are unlikely to have a negative effect on the conservation area.

- (Page 214 of the agenda pack) - Confirmation that the revised parameters plan showing 2-3 storey development in the central core of the site has now been received by the LPA. **Response:** Updated parameters plan has been received.
- (Page 218 of the agenda pack) – Strategic Planning recommend that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment be submitted. Applicant states that as the application is at outline the exact built form is not known at this stage. Also applicant has not seen comments from Strategic Planning. **Response:** The LPA agree that a LVIA was not required with the application as only access being applied for at this stage and all other matters including appearance and scale to be detailed at reserved matters stage. Strategic Plannings comments have only been made public as officers were still in ongoing discussions regarding matters only just resolved.
- (Paragraph 16 officers report) – States that officers do not agree with the area of previously developed land (PDL), applicant states that plan submitted reflects discussions at pre-application stage. **Response:** An area along the northern end of the site with Wood Lane was shown as PDL at pre-application stage which was not accepted by officers. Following consideration of this application there is doubts over some areas to the north side of the World of Water building and the outbuilding which appears to be tree/vegetation cover and also beyond the western boundary of the compound. As with all pre-application responses the LPA caveat that it is only an informal opinion only and all matters reviewed and considered at planning application stage.
- (Paragraph 21 officers report) – States that the applicants planning case relies on a number of very special circumstances (VSC). The applicant suggest this is incorrect as it relies upon the package of benefits/material considerations considered together and that they have not sought to suggest each individual benefit/material consideration is a special circumstance in its own right. Also whilst the officers report mentions that there is economic benefits it does not go into detail such that the development could support 359 jobs (124 workers and 93 employees in indirect employment) these figures based on The Home Builders Federation online housing calculator. **Response:** The applicants planning statement at paragraph 7.101 lists what they refer to as very special circumstances. The other material benefits and material considerations listed in the applicants statement have been considered by the LPA many of which duplicate what has been listed under their VSC. The economic benefits of the development are acknowledged within the officers report, however all development sites will result in benefits to the local economy and this site is no different in bringing forward such benefits.
- (Paragraph 29 officers report) – The officers report states that there would be a net loss of bio-diversity on site. The applicants suggest this is incorrect and that if a lower quantum of development comes forward then

net gain biodiversity can be achieved on site. **Response:** Based on the quantum of development proposed there is a net loss of bio-diversity, if the number of residential properties and development is reduced in any way then there could be a net gain. Net gain can be achieved by providing off-site provision and discussions with colleagues in strategic planning would suggest that there are three potential receptor sites which have been identified for bio-diversity improvements which include King George Pool; Altrincham Golf Course and Davenport Green. This could be secured through an appropriate condition/S106 in the event the application is approved to secure off-site improvements

- (Paragraph 30 officers report) – Officers report states that the site is not a highly sustainable/accessible location. The submitted Transport statement provides details of services within walking distance, good accessibility to surrounding cycle network and nearby bus stops which benefit from frequent services. There is no national or local policy which necessitates that development can only come forward in highly accessible/sustainable location, it has been demonstrated that the site is in an accessible/sustainable location. **Response:** Noted that the site is now referred to as accessible/sustainable location in the applicant's response. However the LPA do not consider this site to be in a sustainable location and is contrary to the Spatial Strategy of the Core Strategy which seeks to direct new development to sustainable locations in the urban area.
- (Paragraph 32 officers report) – The applicant has stated that the provision of a play area and two public electric charging spaces are to be listed as benefits rather than mitigation. The applicant also states that they would accept a condition demonstrating a commitment to achieve a 19% CO2 reduction reflecting the PfE Policy JP-S 2 Carbon and Energy (Traffords current policy seeks a 5% reduction). The applicant would also welcome a condition requiring a high quality design reflecting the precedent information in the Design and Access Statement as the applicant is aware of schemes coming forward elsewhere in the Borough that do not achieve these high standards. A reconsideration of these matters may require a reassessment of the planning balance/conclusion. **Response:** with regards the provision of a play area, SPD1:Planning Obligations details that schemes of 100 units will need to provide new local open space as part of the site design. The quantum of development would suggest that a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) would be required as a means of mitigation. The two electric parking spaces are acknowledged as a benefit but also to a degree mitigate against air pollution. The reduction in CO2 is welcome which exceeds existing targets. In relation to the suggested condition regarding design, the LPA seek to achieve high quality design across all of the Borough and it is therefore expected from all development proposals coming forward. These benefits have been weighed in the balance and do not however change the Councils overall conclusion as detailed within the officers report. The LPA have no objection to including

such a condition and should planning permission be granted a condition requiring details of a design code would be recommended.

- (Paragraph 52 of the officers report) – This paragraph states that there is no retail food service near to the site with the closest being Timperley Village. It should be noted that Briarfield Road Local Centre has a range of services which includes a Tesco Express and is only circa. 750m from the site. **Response:** The Briarfield Road Neighbourhood Shopping Centre is located approximately 1km from the site, a similar distance to Timperley Village from the application site.
- (Paragraph 110 of the officers report) – No reference to the applicants response regarding TfGMs comments: **Response:** The applicants transport consultant in their response to LHA and TfGM comments stated that they consider they have addressed and agreed all the issues raised by TfGM with the LHA, including trip distribution; trip rates; junction assessments; mitigation; access arrangements; traffic regulation orders and construction management plan. LHA have provided an update on all highway matters which is reported later in this additional information report.
- (Paragraph 127 of the officers report) – Can the commitment to providing a LEAP be clarified, via a condition at reserved matters stage. **Response:** The LPA would have no objections to the delivery of the LEAP secured through an appropriate condition should the application be granted permission.

The applicant has also provided a supporting statement, sent to all the members of committee. The statement outlines the benefits of the scheme as follows:-

- 45% onsite affordable housing contribution;
- A new play area, wildlife corridor along Timperley Brook and new accessible open space;
- The use of SUDS
- New pedestrian and cycle routes through the site
- £500,000 CIL payment and S106 contributions towards local infrastructure improvements
- Economic benefits
- Delivering at least two electric charging points for public use

The applicant suggests that officers have failed to assess the very special circumstances VSC that have been put forward in their entirety. **Response:** Officers have considered all the benefits and VSC put forward by the applicant. The benefits of the scheme have been considered and are detailed in the planning balance section of the report, however a number of these 'benefits' are in fact policy requirements in order to mitigate the quantum of development. As such officers conclude that the VSC advanced by the applicant do not (individually or cumulatively) overcome the identified harm to the Green Belt. With regards the figure of £500,000 towards CIL, this figure is an estimate by the applicant and the final figure is not yet known. This will be dependent on the

number houses and apartments that may come forward, houses are subject to a higher charge per sqm than apartments.

REPRESENTATIONS

A further 3 representations have been received objecting to the proposed development, many of the issues raised have been detailed on the main report to committee and the further comments are as follows:-

- Labour manifesto green revolution web-site highlights importance of Green Belts, they are now threatened by developments.
- Timperley will lose half of its Green Belt. We are in an environmental and wildlife emergency
- The site contains a considerable amount of trees, consideration should be given to retaining these trees – The site is a wildlife corridor for foxes, hedgehogs and other wildlife including great crested newts. Japanese knotweed is on the site but not referenced in the survey (note: In response Japanese Knotweed is referenced in the Updated Ecology Report (July 2021) paragraph 2.13.
- Site was originally proposed for 24 dwellings now 116 with the requirement for 100-200 car parking spaces causing more pollution and congestion on surrounding streets as well as highway safety issues, roundabout operating beyond capacity.
- The air report done during lockdown therefore data is not relevant
- This development will add extra burden on doctors, dentists and school places
- Site is a floodplain and Timperley Brook cannot cope with more run off so where will the water go.
- The site has not been previously developed, existing structures are greenhouses and classed as temporary structures.
- Question validity of the ground contamination report which states further ground risk assessments and quotes development of 74 houses.
- The development raises concerns regarding crime impact conflicts
- The proposal is in contravention of urban sprawl.

OBSERVATIONS

Some minor amendments to the wording of the PfE section of the officers report have been undertaken to better reflect the current status and aims of the PfE plan process. For completeness all of the PfE section has been detailed including the same paragraph numbers as appears on the main officers report, as follows:

Places for Everyone (PfE)

45. The Publication version of Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan Document has been produced by nine Greater Manchester boroughs and sets out the amount of new housing and employment development required over the plan period whilst supporting the delivery of key

infrastructure and protecting environmental assets. The plan also proposes a new Green Belt boundary and identifies sites for development which are outside of the existing urban area. This includes two proposed allocations in Trafford, New Carrington and Timperley Wedge. Both are proposed for mixed use development with a significant amount of new housing, employment land and supporting infrastructure. Some of the land within the allocations is proposed for release from the Green Belt. The Plan has recently been subject to a Regulation 19 consultation and has now been submitted (14.02.22) to the Secretary of State for Levelling up, Housing and Communities so that it can be assessed through an examination in Public by appointed Planning Inspectors (Regulation 22).

46. The application site is within the 'Timperley Wedge' area which is proposed to deliver approximately 2,500 new homes and 60,000 sqm of office floorspace in plan period (2021 – 2037). The PfE Plan is considered to be at a relatively advanced stage in the plan making process (currently at 'Regulation 22' stage), and can therefore be afforded some weight in determination of this application. This has to be balanced against the fact that there are still unresolved objections to PfE, including in relation to the principle of releasing land from the Green Belt, both in the Timperley Wedge allocation and elsewhere within Greater Manchester.
47. However until adoption of the PfE, at present the land remains designated as Green Belt. If PfE were to be found to have sufficient weight to justify the release of this land from its current designation ahead of formal adoption, very special circumstances as defined in Paragraphs 147 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) would need to be demonstrated.
48. The site as previously stated has been identified within the Publication version of the PfE Joint Development Plan Document within Policy JP Allocation 3.2 (JPA3.2 relating to the 'Timperley Wedge' site. The Council have prepared a high level Masterplan (September 2021) for the site, which supports Policy JPA3.2 and identifies indicative development parcels, infrastructure requirements and a phasing schedule for the site. The Masterplan has been prepared in collaboration with local landowners and other key stakeholders. The proposed allocation is also supported by a number of other evidence base documents, including a Transport Locality Assessment and strategic Viability Assessment.
49. Policy JPA 3.2 of PfE requires development to be in accordance with a masterplan or SPD agreed by the LPA to ensure the site is planned and delivered in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. The concept masterplan produced has informed the main elements that will be part of the allocation, and a more detailed masterplan will be produced should the PfE Plan be adopted. The proposed Timperley Wedge allocation will deliver:-
 - 2,500 residential dwellings (minimum of 45% affordable)

- 60,000sq.m employment land;
- A comprehensive public transport strategy including bus rapid transit, walking and cycling routes;
- Contribute to Airport Metrolink Line, western leg extension;
- Improvements to the local and strategic highway infrastructure including a new spine road and junction onto Thorley Lane;
- A new local centre, providing community infrastructure; and
- Significant green infrastructure enhancements and rural park; retain and enhance existing sports and recreation facilities

ACCESS, HIGHWAYS AND CAR PARKING

In relation to the concern raised in respect of the Wood Lane access and a potential 'rat run' the LHA are now satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures can be incorporated into the final design stage when approval for layout is sought at reserved matters stage and the details of which could also be secured through a design code which would be a condition of any permission. Such measures will prevent cars cutting through the development as a means to avoiding queuing on approach to the Thorley Lane roundabout junction. The LHA have also stated that the final detail of swept path for large vehicles accessing/egressing the development through the Wood Lane access can be agreed by condition and addressed at the detailed design stage.

With regards the ghost island junction to serve the Thorley Lane access the LHA have considered the predicted daily trip movements which amount to less than 500 movements per day. Given that the site will be accessed from both Thorley Lane and Wood Lane and not solely dependent on one access to the site, and after further detailed consideration it has been concluded that a contribution toward a ghost island junction cannot be justified in these circumstances.

The draft PfE masterplan for the Timperley Wedge allocation suggests the provision of a new spine road and associated roundabout junction onto Thorley Lane, the location of which is believed to be between the existing site access and the Thorley Lane roundabout. The applicant had as part of the current application proposals, made a commitment to provide a financial contribution towards these PfE infrastructure works, the final costings of which are as yet unknown. The LHA have concluded that in terms of the current development based on its own merits and coming forward separately from other development sites within PfE plan, the development does not result in severe harm to the roundabout junction and would not require works to this as mitigation. It is considered that it would be unreasonable to request a contribution for such, particularly given that the PfE plan is not adopted and is only afforded limited weight in the decision making process. Additionally the Timperley Wedge masterplan currently has no status.

The LHA would however support pedestrian improvements in the immediate vicinity of the application site, as also suggested by TfGM to improve pedestrian accessibility particularly at the Thorley Lane roundabout. This would be in the form of a signalled controlled crossing on Thorley Lane near the roundabout with

Wood Lane/Clay Lane and a zebra crossing on Wood Lane with associated highway works such as pedestrian refuges. It is considered that these measures would secure much needed improvements to pedestrian infrastructure, mitigating the harm arising from the development, in the locality and improving accessibility to surrounding streets from the development site. The applicant has agreed to these provisions and details of which would be agreed by either condition or as part of the S106 and considered at reserved matters stage. The LHA have advised that they would support the inclusion of a condition securing the pedestrian improvement works in the event of planning approval being granted.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Paragraph 163 of the Officers report to committee details the agreed heads of terms detailing developer contributions, this is now amended to reflect the requirement for the applicant to contribute towards pedestrian crossing improvements at the Thorley Lane roundabout as follows:-

- Affordable Housing – 45% provision (75% intermediate tenure/25% affordable or social rented);
- Education Contribution;
- Electric vehicle charging spaces for public use (minimum of 2);
- On site children’s play area;
- A financial contribution and scheme detailing pedestrian access improvements to the Thorley Lane/Wood Lane roundabout junction
- Off-site Biodiversity Net Gain provision

RECOMMENDATION unchanged.

Page 264 106476/FUL/21: Development Site, Waterways Avenue, Pomona, Old Trafford

APPLICANT’S SUBMISSION

The agent for the application has requested that the planning application is withdrawn with immediate effect.

RECOMMENDATION: WITHDRAWN

AGENDA ITEM 7 – URGENT BUSINESS - APPLICATION 105847/FUL/21 - HARE AND HOUNDS HOTEL, WOOD LANE, TIMPERLEY, WA15 7LX

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Housing Land Supply

The following paragraphs are amended and are to be replaced in order to clarify the need to apply the tilted balance as a consequence of the Council’s lack of a 5 year housing supply. The amended paragraphs are shown in full below.

7. The NPPF places great emphasis on the need to plan for and deliver new housing throughout the UK. Local planning authorities are required to support the Government's objectives of significantly boosting the supply of homes. With reference to paragraph 60 of the NPPF, this means ensuring that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed, and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. As referenced in paragraph 4 above and having regard to NPPF paragraph 11, the Local Plan is considered to be out of date for the determination of housing applications where the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing supply.

13. Policy L1 of the Core Strategy controls the number and distribution of new homes across the Borough. Given the lack of five year housing land supply, and the age of this policy (including the need to use the more recent 'standard method' of calculating housing need), it is now out of date. The tilted balance is therefore engaged and in assessing this application, it is necessary to consider whether the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.

Loss of open space

The following paragraph is amended and to be replaced to confirm the Council's position in regard to contributions. The amended paragraph is shown in full below.

32. Notwithstanding the cessation of the use of the site as a bowling green, the proposal does result in the loss of protected open space that provides a public and communal function in the form of a pub garden. In line with Policies L8, R5 and SPD1 there is the need to provide either (i) some open space provision on site, to mitigate the impact of an increased population with any shortfall made up by a financial contribution to off-site provision or (ii) full replacement of the open space off-site and associated costs calculated at £11.97 per square metre. There would not be adequate space within the proposed development for the provision of on-site open space and a commuted sum is therefore required as detailed in the Developer Contributions section of this report (as amended within this AIR).

Summary of principle of residential development

The following paragraph is amended and to be replaced to confirm the Council's position. The amended paragraph is shown in full below.

33. The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. Paragraph 11d (i) is not relevant in this case since there is no clear reason for refusing the development proposed when having regard to the application of NPPF

policies which seek to protect areas or assets of particular importance and the tilted balance is therefore engaged. The proposal would make a moderate contribution towards meeting the Council's housing land targets and an identified need for older persons housing. Had it not been for the total loss of the pub on site and the heritage and community benefits this brings, residential development could have been acceptable in principle. Nonetheless, even if the development had been acceptable in principle it would still be necessary to consider the design of the proposal together with site specific issues relating to heritage and design, highways impacts, residential amenity, flooding and drainage, contamination and ecology. These issues are considered in more detail in the following sections of this report.

DESIGN

Paragraph 70 to be deleted and replaced with the new paragraph 70 below to correct the location of the petrol station in relation to the application site.

70. To the north west of the site, on Stockport Road there is a single storey petrol station and immediately adjacent to the site there is a two storey parade of five retail units.

The following paragraph is to be amended and replaced to provide a more detailed conclusion. The amended paragraph is shown in full below.

101. Good quality design is an integral part of sustainable development. The NPPF and PPG recognise that design quality matters and that the planning process should be used to drive up standards across all forms of development. Importance of context and identity in development proposals is further emphasised in the NDG. Whilst the design response to the site in terms of visual appearance, architectural treatment and materials is considered poor, the overall response to the site context and character, being open, low density and predominately two storey detached properties is considered to be particularly harmful. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, height, massing and footprint is out of keeping with the surrounding area, to the detriment of its visual appearance within the locality.
102. The proposed development is considered to be an inappropriate design response to the context of the site for the reasons given above, and so the development is considered to be contrary to Policy L7, the NPPF and guidance within the NPPG, NDG and NMDC.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

External Amenity Space

Paragraph 119 to be amended and replaced as follows.

119. The DAS outlines that all ground floor apartments will be served by private patios. It is not considered that these spaces can be considered as private spaces. The majority front either Wood Lane or Shaftesbury Avenue, with only low level planting to screen them from the street and each other. Those that face into the communal amenity spaces are also afforded little privacy with shrub planting between them and situated in close proximity of the on-site car park. The level of space provided at 4 sq. m, is not considered to be usable with outward opening doors and the supporting structure of balconies above resulting in little usable space. Paragraph 13.1 of PG1 specifically advises that the provision of private outdoor space “does not include front or side garden areas open to view from roads ...” Therefore the space provided fronting Shaftesbury Avenue and Wood Lane should be discounted as private amenity space provision within the development. As well as being sited to the front and side of the site, the amenity space would be sited adjacent to main roads on a busy junction with many passing and waiting vehicles and would be sited close to the back of the pavement.

The following paragraph to be inserted following paragraph 123

Overall, for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the quantity and quality of proposed amenity space proposed is of a poor standard and fails to provide future residents with an appropriate standard of outdoor space. As a result of the above reason for refusal 4 has been updated.

Noise

Paragraphs 127 and 128 to be deleted and replaced with the new paragraph 127 below, following further consultation comments from Pollution and Licensing.

127. Following further consultation with Pollution and Licensing it is considered that the issues of noise raised above can adequately be addressed by a pre-commencement condition regarding the requirement for additional surveys and appropriate mitigation measures applied. It is considered therefore that this should not form a reason for refusal.

OTHER MATTERS

Inaccurate Plans

The following paragraph is amended and to be replaced to confirm the Council's position. The amended paragraph is shown in full below.

169. Representations received state that the submitted plans are inaccurate in relation to surrounding sites and neighbouring properties omitting to show for example garages and boundary features in neighbouring plots. Notwithstanding this, the plans are deemed to be correct in relation to the

application site itself, site visits have been carried out and together these have allowed for an informed and accurate assessment to be made against all existing relationships.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

The following additional paragraphs to be added following paragraph 176.

Open Space Provision

In line with the standards contained in SPD1 a financial contribution of £12,879.72 towards the enhancement of existing, off-site local open space facilities will be required.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Scheme benefits

The following paragraph is amended and to be replaced to clarify the assessment in relation to a sustainable location. The amended paragraph is shown in full below.

187. Whilst the site is partially brownfield land the old bowling green remains as greenfield and therefore the weight afforded to previously developed land is considered to be limited/moderate. Equally whilst the location is considered a sustainable location, this is a requirement of national and local policy and therefore is a neutral consideration. Additionally it is noted that whilst being sustainable, it still has limited services/facilities nearby. Furthermore given the conclusion of the scale and design of the proposal, and the loss of the non-designated heritage asset, limited weight is afforded to efficient use of land.

Conclusion

The following paragraph is amended and to be replaced to clarify that all benefits of the scheme have been taken into consideration in weighing up the tilted balance. The amended paragraph is shown in full below.

203. The exercise under the tilted balance has also been carried out, and the several significant harms arising from the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweigh all of the benefits of the scheme taken together, when tested against NPPF Paragraph 11(d)(ii), the tilted balance. This is even when giving substantial weight to the contribution the scheme would make to the Borough's housing land supply, in a situation where there is a shortfall below the 5 year requirement.

RECOMMENDATION

Reason for refusal 4 is amended and replaced with the following:

4. The proposed development fails to provide a good standard of external amenity space for future residents by reason of its quantity and quality, given the scale and siting of the amenity space and by virtue of its proximity to Wood Lane, Shaftesbury Avenue and proposed on site car park. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Delete reason for refusal 6. as it is considered that these issues could adequately be addressed by planning conditions.

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