

## AGENDA ITEM 5

### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> February 2023

#### 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
<a href="#"><u>101400</u></a>	York House, 1 Bridgenorth Avenue, Urmston M41 9PA	Urmston	1	✓	✓
<a href="#"><u>107982</u></a>	30 Little Brook Road Sale, M33 4WG	St Marys	27	✓ Cllr Holden	
<a href="#"><u>108067</u></a>	18 Finchale Drive Hale, WA15 8NH	Hale Barns	37	✓	
<a href="#"><u>108791</u></a>	13 Foxglove Drive Altrincham, WA14 5JX	Broadheath	48		✓
<a href="#"><u>109475</u></a>	15 Erlington Avenue Old Trafford, M16 0FN	Longford	67		
<a href="#"><u>109504</u></a>	24 Bonville Chase Altrincham, WA14 4QA	Bowdon	75	✓ Cllr Whetton	✓
<a href="#"><u>109513</u></a>	Gulmarg, Garden Lane Altrincham, WA14 1EU	Altrincham	92	✓ Cllr Jerrome	✓
<a href="#"><u>109739</u></a>	Broadoak Comprehensive School, Warburton Lane Partington, M31 4BU	Bucklow St Martins	122		✓
<a href="#"><u>109828</u></a>	19 Ashford, Sale, M33 5RE	St Marys	144	✓	

**Page 1**                      **101400/FUL/20: York House, 1 Bridgenorth Avenue,  
Urmston**

**SPEAKER(S)**            **AGAINST:**                      **Lee Pye  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:**                              **Gareth Salthouse  
(Agent)**

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Objection**

A letter of objection has been received from the occupier of a neighbouring site which raises the following issues:

#### **Right of Access**

The southern part of the application plot would include the currently fenced off Bridgewater Road, which the objector has a right of access over for their adjacent plot. This access right was included in the title deeds for the application site when the Council sold the plot in 1992. It is unreasonable for the LPA to now ignore this right of access when considering the current application.

Much of the proposed car and cycle parking would be located over this right of way.

The objector is currently in the process of considering whether to take legal action to enforce their access right.

#### **Highways Impacts**

The proposal will add to the currently severe traffic congestion in the local area resulting from school drop-off and pick-up from the two adjacent schools.

The submitted Transport Report does not acceptably address these concerns.

The proposed under-provision of parking will not encourage sustainable transport use in part because of the lack of accessible sustainable transport options in the local area. This will result in additional on-street parking which would exacerbate the current issues with traffic congestion.

#### **Bin Store**

The bin store should be repositioned away from the objector's loading bay doors to avoid the possibility of the objector's property being impacted by vermin resulting from the poor management of the bin store and the fact that the objector's loading bay doors are left open for large parts of the day.

The proposed servicing arrangements are flawed because they rely upon bins being taken onto Bradfield Road to the north where this road narrows to a single lane, which will result in the closure of this road whilst the site is being serviced with the refuse wagon in situ. This could be for a lengthy period whilst each individual Euro bin is taken to the wagon and returned to the bin store. The alternative option would be to have the Euro bins lined up on the footpath, however this would block off this route for pedestrians, including school children, buggies and toddlers.

## **APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

The applicant has responded to the objector's arguments as follows:

### Right of Access

The issues raised by the objector are a private civil matter and are not a material planning consideration.

The applicant's solicitor had requested that the applicant provided evidence of the access right three years ago and no response has been received.

### Highways and Servicing

The issues raised by the objector have been thoroughly addressed throughout the planning process and are detailed in the Committee Report. Whatever happens with the site, there will always be a continued need for waste collection and the proposed development enables this to take place in a managed way.

### Viability

The applicant has also provided the following comments in support of their viability arguments relating to the lift.

*The construction cost for Option B is £2,520,000 once contractor design fees are taken into account. The Net Present Value, or 'NPV' shown in the model, is an assumption approved by Irwell Valley Board and used on all development projects across GM. It requires £1,000 per apartment (£18,000 total) as a positive NPV to assure the Board that the scheme is viable; there is no profit and this represents a very marginal contingency (rather than aiming for 'zero'). The lift cost of £60k is supply only and excludes costs such as electrics, lift lining, steel work, scaffolding erection and disassembly, and the cost relating to the additional space that a lift shaft would require (the additional space would prevent the scheme coming forward in any event in feasibility/viability terms). This far exceeds what can be accommodated. The viability model shows an NPV of £20,877.00 and the only 'excess' available is £2,877 (i.e. £20,877 minus £18,000). Anything above £2,877 is the 'tipping point'.*

*A service cost for a lift would be around £7.40 per apartment per week in addition to standard service costs for cleaning, grounds maintenance, insurance etc. This also excludes any unexpected costs for damage or third party costs if parts are not available through the Irwell Valley Homes lift maintenance contractor. A recent example on another scheme cost around £10,000 for a lift to be fixed due to faulty parts that were outside of Irwell Valley Homes' service contract.*

*We can confirm that the values used for the viability appraisal by Irwell Valley reflect affordable rents rather than social rents so there is no discrepancy on this point.*

*On Local Housing Allowance, RPs can theoretically charge 80% of Open-Market Value (OMV) rents to tenants and some do. Irwell Valley Homes as part of their 'social purpose' and the assumptions approved by Board will only charge rents capped at LHA and this is calculated by central government based on different geographical areas. It is designed to ensure that all rents are affordable to those in need i.e. it equates to the benefit paid by the Government. If 80% OMV is charged then the excess beyond the LHA provided by the Government must be met directly by the tenant, whereas the rent at Bridgenorth will not exceed the benefits that are available for housing from the Government for the rental and ensures that the tenants have an affordable home to live in.*

## **CONSULTATIONS**

**LHA** - The LHA had confirmed no objection to the proposal's highways and parking impacts, including the proposed level of parking provision. The LHA has reiterated their stance in response to the objection:

*I have reviewed the application and read the latest representation regarding the right of way, highways & parking and the refuse storage and collection. The LHA position remains unchanged with no objection to the proposals. I have nothing further to add.*

**Waste** - The Waste consultee has confirmed no objection in relation to the proposal's waste collection arrangements and resulting impacts and has provided the following additional comments in response to the objection:

*As discussed, we don't have concerns about the collections from this property. There is an existing dropped kerb and we can stop the refuse collection vehicle before where the road narrows so we would endeavour to keep the access clear for vehicles to pass.*

*We do avoid collections during school drop of and pick up and the crew would be expected to plan their route accordingly.*

## **OBSERVATIONS**

Further comments are provided in relation to the issues raised in the representation referred to above:

### **Right of Access**

The section of Bridgewater Road within the application site is un-adopted and is currently blocked off by heras fencing. Private access rights are not a material planning consideration but are instead a private matter between the two parties.

### **Highways Impacts**

The LHA has raised no objections in relation to highways and parking impacts and the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

### **Waste**

The Waste consultee has raised no objections in relation to the waste collection arrangements and impacts and the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

### **Viability**

The additional information submitted by the applicant further supports the position that the installation of a lift in the property would be unviable and would lead to increased service costs for the future occupants of the development.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation is unchanged.

**Page 27**                      **107982/HHA/22: 30 Little Brook Road, Sale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Anne Risdon (Neighbour) Statement to read out Councillor Holden</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	

**Page 37**                      **108067/HHA/22: 18 Finchale Drive, Hale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Dr Ula Boussabaine (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	

## **NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATION**

Following the publication of the committee agenda a further three representations have been received from 2, 14 and 20 Finchale Drive, which are summarised below:

### *Design/Amenity*

- Previous Apex roof was a good and fair solution which complemented street-scene.
- New design has appearance of lean-to which isn't complementary to street-scene.
- Proposal results in a property which is overbearing, too large in scale and greatly undermines the character of the street.
- Flat roof should be considered to match the rear extension and to reduce loss of light and visual intrusion to no 20.
- Smallest site on Finchale shouldn't have the biggest house.
- Timber cladding to the front elevation hasn't been added in accordance with the PHAA.

### *Neighbour Consultation*

- Lack of formal notification of new plans and subsequent re-consultations (2 and 14 Finchale).
- Insufficient time to respond/not received letters which were posted (20 Finchale).

### *Planning Process*

- End result would be what was initially withdrawn in February 2021, due to likelihood of proposal being refused, is now considered for approval, why ok now if previously warranted refusal.
- The Council's planning policy has been circumvented by several varying applications.
- Development on this site has been 'one-sided' towards the applicant.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### *Design/Amenity*

1. The objections received in relation to design and amenity do not raise any new issues that have not been considered within the main committee report. The amendments to the roof shape of the proposals were requested by the case officer and are considered to give a better visual relationship between the proposed side extension and the main property and within the street-scene. The impact on amenity to no.20 with reference

to loss of light and visual intrusion is covered within the officer report, however give the scale of the proposed extension the impact is considered to be acceptable.

2. The agent has confirmed the intention is to add the timber cladding as shown on the PHAA, which is a separate development to the one being considered.

#### *Neighbour Consultation*

3. Neighbour notification of the application was carried out in accordance with Trafford's adopted Statement of Community Involvement and the Town and Country Planning Act Procedure Order 2015 (as amended).

#### *Planning Process*

4. The Council is satisfied the PHAA granted by appeal has been sufficiently complete for this current application to represent a new building operation on the site.
5. It is acknowledged the development has been subject to a lengthy process and numerous applications. This is not a material planning consideration and officers must consider the proposal before them in assessing the application.

### **PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

6. Officers are satisfied that the conclusions and recommendation set out in the committee report remains unchanged in the context of the matters addressed in this report. The application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

<b>Page 48</b>	<b>108791/FUL/22:</b>	<b>13 Foxglove Drive, Altrincham</b>	
	<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	
		<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Craig Hollingsworth (Applicant)</b>
<b>Page 75</b>	<b>109504/VAR/22:</b>	<b>24 Bonville Chase, Altrincham</b>	
	<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Bernard Healey (Neighbour) Councillor Whetton</b>
		<b>FOR:</b>	<b>John Groves (Agent)</b>

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST:**      **Kerry Nield  
(Neighbour)  
Cllr Jerrome**

**FOR:**      **Steve Goodwin  
(Agent)**

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

One further letter of objection has been received, raising the following concerns: -

- The objector is a Transport Planner with over 20 years' experience in this field, including a number of years spent working for a Highway Authority, leading the highway development control team.
- The 2017 planning application for this site (ref 92764/FUL/17), which presented a very similar proposal, was refused on highway safety grounds. The refusal notice stated "***The proposed access and parking arrangements to the site would lead to potential conflict between highway users when carrying out manoeuvres to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy***".
- The potential conflicts remain the same and therefore the conclusion must be the same.
- To apparently try and reduce the impact of the scheme on neighbouring properties the building has been moved as far towards Garden lane as possible, indeed the front wall of the building now forms the boundary with Garden Lane, which means that opening windows would project directly into the highway and there is no visibility from the driveway. This puts all users of Garden Lane at risk, as vehicles emerging from the driveway will have no visibility of oncoming vehicles, cyclists or pedestrians.
- The positioning of the driveway to abut the boundary wall means that a vehicle reversing out of the driveway would do so toward the access gateway of the adjacent properties (numbers 8 and 10 to the north) with no ability to see a vehicle or pedestrian egressing those dwellings. This would therefore compromise the safety of the residents of those existing properties. The fact that this may be the location of the existing driveway of the application site should carry no weight as the opportunity exists for a safer arrangement to be achieved. Deficiencies of a new proposal cannot be justified by reference to existing shortcomings.



- It has not been demonstrated how vehicular access to / from the driveway could be achieved without encroaching into adjacent private land and / or if this movement is even possible if the adjacent parking spaces were occupied. It is not possible for a car to enter the driveway in a forward gear without encroaching into the third party land. If a car were to reverse into the driveway it could not then egress the driveway in a forward gear without encroaching into the third party private land.
- Unless and until this manoeuvre has been satisfactorily demonstrated by providing swept-path analysis, the ability of a vehicle to access the application site remains in doubt. If the driveway cannot be safely and efficiently accessed, the driveway cannot act as a parking space and the proposals therefore do not meet the requisite parking standards.
- The NPPF paragraph 110 bullet point B states that safe and suitable access to the site must be achieved for **all users**. It should be emphasised that all users includes pedestrians, who should be treated as a priority. This application results in a detrimental impact on pedestrians by introducing dangerous and constrained vehicle movements into a confined and already poor pedestrian environment.
- The NPPF states at paragraph 112 that applications should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards; allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles.
- The application fails all four of these tests. The proposals do not give priority to non-car modes. The proposals focus vehicle access over the safety of pedestrian accessibility. The proposals exacerbate the scope for conflict between pedestrians and vehicles by virtue of the poor visibility from the site access. The proposals do not allow for efficient deliveries – there is no ability for service vehicles to enter and egress Garden Lane in a forward gear without using adjacent private land.
- The application therefore fails the key tests set out in NPPF and must therefore be refused on highways and road safety grounds *alone*.
- The main theme of the LHA consultation response is the comparison of the application proposals to the existing arrangements. This approach is fundamentally flawed. The existing property pre-dates current standards and design principles and also pre-dates much of the more recent development that has taken place around it. The surrounding built environment and highway context is fundamentally different now to when the current property was built. The visibility from the driveway (whether

existing or proposed) is totally substandard. The manoeuvring space which is wholly different now to when the property was built, is totally substandard.

- The proposals involve the complete demolition of the existing site and the applicant has the ability to seek to deliver a scheme that meets current access and visibility standards.
- The risk to pedestrians is referenced in the consultation response, which states “***As such, pedestrians will need to be aware of all vehicle movements including those to/from existing access points and the car parks located to the south and the north of the proposed development.***” This is totally at odds to current standards and policy. Safe pedestrian access should be a fundamental requirement. The LHA consultation response in raising this matter clearly considers this is not the case with the application proposals.
- The LHA response also does not consider the restricted visibility, which is a fundamental omission, and makes no reference to local highway standards or the key highway tests in the NPPF. There is also no consideration of how the current property will be demolished and the new house will be built without impacting on the safe and efficient operation of Garden Lane. Given the position of the front immediately at the back of the carriageway, how will the footings be laid and the wall built without causing significant disruption to Garden Lane and how will it be built without exposing construction workers to risk from working in the highway?
- It is noted that there is another application on the agenda for a new dwelling at Foxglove Drive (108791) which the LHA has **objected to** on the grounds of insufficient visibility where the driveway meets the footway, resulting in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Why do the highway authority consider this an unacceptable matter on Foxglove Drive and not on Garden Lane?

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### Heritage Officer – 08.02.2023

Confirm that the recommended amendments, as listed below, have been incorporated within the revised plans and are acceptable. These address my outstanding concerns and I confirm support of the application on heritage grounds subject to conditions.

- Lowered front windows on Garden Lane elevation
- Revised front door design + fanlight
- Removal of porch side walls
- Decorative ridge tiles included
- The front boundary wall height and arch design has been corrected

(This further response has been provided for clarification and the avoidance of doubt).

**LHA** – The LHA has responded further to the comments raised in the above further objection.

The LHA re-iterate the comments made at the time of the previous application, 102313/FUL/20. The LHA states that PIC (Personal Injury Crash) data has been checked and this demonstrates that across the 23 year period from January 1999 to December 2021, no PICs were recorded for Garden Lane nor at its junction with Victoria Street. There is therefore no historical, current or potentially emerging road safety problem associated with this location. There is also a Certificate of Lawful Development which confirms that a double garage could be constructed under permitted development rights using this access. The reasons for refusal of the previous permission did not cite highway safety or other related matters and no highway concerns were raised by the Planning Inspectorate at the subsequent planning appeal. Given that the 23 year injury collision record does not highlight any road safety problem, the Certificate of Lawful Development and the existence of other accesses along this road including to multiple space car parking areas, the LHA considers that an objection could not be sustained on highway grounds. The site is occupied by an existing dwelling which could be re-occupied at any point without any further permission with the inclusion of a double garage.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

There is a reference in Paragraph 5 to Bowdon Conservation Area. This is an error and should read Old Market Place Conservation Area.

The following comments are made in response to the further objection received regarding highway concerns.

The objector refers to the fact that a previous application, 92764/FUL/17, was refused on highway safety grounds. It is noted that the LHA did not object to that application, which was refused contrary to officer recommendation.

As the LHA consultation response states, a dwelling has existed on the site for many years and the application proposal does not include an amendment to the position of the existing access. The proposed development would involve an increase of one parking space at a location where multi-space car parks are present and off-road parking is provided for other residential properties. The LHA has therefore raised no objections to the proposed development.

A Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development 98538/CPL/19 was granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension and front porch and the construction of a garage/outbuilding (a double garage) on 12 August 2019. The currently proposed development does not provide any additional parking spaces over and above those which could be provided through the implementation of the

Certificate of Lawful Development. This is considered to be a realistic “fallback” position, which could be implemented in relation to the existing property.

Furthermore, a road safety problem has not been identified, and analysis of the latest available 10-year personal injury collision data for the area shows no collisions have occurred on Garden Lane.

The LHA has commented in relation to the previous application, 102313/FUL/20, that, when considering the adopted highway at this location, including the lack of pedestrian facilities, existing vehicle access points, and the number of parking spaces (including the car parks) currently provided on Garden Lane that an objection to the proposed development could not be sustained on highway grounds.

The objector refers to the fact that the front wall of the property would form the boundary with Garden Lane. This is the case with the existing property. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling at the time of the previous application, 102313/FUL/20, (which was not refused on highway grounds) was set back only marginally from Garden Lane.

With regards to application 108791/FUL/22 at Foxglove Drive, the circumstances are not directly comparable as that application proposes a new vehicular access where there is no vehicular access at present and the access would be onto a classified road. Furthermore, amended plans have been requested in that case in order to address the LHA concerns but no further information has been submitted.

The LHA has commented on the objection as summarized in the Consultation section above and has confirmed that it raises no objections in relation to the proposed development.

It is noted that there is a typing error in paragraph 34 of the main report. This should state that the main part of the dwelling is positioned a greater distance away from the eastern boundary than the previously proposed scheme (102313/FUL/20) (6.3m compared with 3.4m in the previous scheme).

In respect of the conclusion and planning balance, it is confirmed, for the avoidance of doubt, that it is considered that the proposed development would comply with the Development Plan taken as a whole. Paragraph 90 of the main report states that there are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting permission. For the avoidance of doubt, it is considered that the benefits would comprise of the replacement of a dwelling that has been vacant for a number of years and is in a relatively dilapidated condition as well as a small amount of economic benefit resulting from the construction process.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation is unchanged.

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Nick David  
(Applicant)**

### **APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

- Further supporting drainage information

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit:** No objection providing floodlighting operates as planned.

**Lead Local Flood Authority:** No objections.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

The school, described as Broadoak Comprehensive School on the planning application form, should be referred to by its correct title Broadoak School. Records have been amended accordingly.

### **NOISE IMPACTS**

1. The application proposes the following operating hours for the AGP and associated floodlighting:

08.00-22.00 Monday to Friday during term time

08.30-22.00 Saturday and Sunday during term time

09.00-22.00 Monday to Friday during school holidays

08.30-22.00 Saturday and Sunday during school holidays

2. The committee report notes that the Council's Environmental Protection service has advised that the frequency and duration of exposure to noise are key contributory factors in influencing a receptor's tolerance to unwanted noise, which an NIA cannot easily quantify. The increased degree of exposure to noise from both the existing and proposed AGPs in conjunction late into the evening has the potential to cause nuisance to nearby residential properties. It was therefore suggested that consideration should be given to appropriate timetabling for the facility, with a finish time of 20.00 hours.
3. The applicant has advised that they could accept a condition restricting the use of the pitch to a 20.00 hours finish on Saturdays, Sundays, bank

holidays and public holidays but not during the week. It is advised that a restriction on the hours of use sought during the week would prevent the delivery of the scheme, with Football Foundation funding being awarded on the basis of the submitted development plan. The applicant has advised that whilst the new 3G pitch is expected to be principally funded by the Football Foundation, any offer of a grant to the school by the Foundation hinges on achievement of a detailed and clearly defined multi-year football development plan for the facility. This is an integral part of the grant application and the key to a grant being awarded. The over-arching aim of this development plan is to grow the game of football and to provide opportunities for clubs/groups in the local community, and the Borough as whole, to participate in grass roots football activities. At a more detailed level this is broken down into target groups of users, for example women and girls football, disability football and hard to reach groups particularly in areas of high deprivation such as Partington. A programme of use is created, which is based upon demand measured through extensive community engagement. The demand fulfils the needs for access to such a facility by local football clubs and recreational football groups to meet their own growth, development and widening participation. The participation levels for target groups set in the development plan are unable to be met if the available peak demand, midweek usage hours are restricted to anything earlier than a 22.00 hours finish time. There would also be implications for the financial viability of the facility through loss of revenue stream if usage hours were restricted in midweek to 20:00. The programme of use is based upon a pricing structure. This is similarly determined via the community engagement process and is geared to ensure that the price paid by users is affordable, a significant consideration in an area of high deprivation. Setting a pricing structure to compensate for reduced community use time would completely negate the objective of developing participation and growing football in the community where there is high demand, as it would make the facility unaffordable for those users. The Football Foundation has stated that it would not consider an investment into the proposed facility if the hours of use were restricted to a 20.00 hours finish during the week.

4. With the existing facilities on site and its distance from residential properties, the Partington Sports Village site is considered to be one of the best locations for the provision of sports facilities, including artificial grass pitches in the Borough. It also noted that initial concerns about potential noise disturbance that may have resulted from the artificial pitch approved in 2007 on this site have not materialised in the form of complaints to Environmental Protection. Given the substantial sporting benefits of the scheme identified in the committee report, submission documents and the consultation response from Sport England, Officers consider that on balance, the scheme is acceptable with the hours proposed. The noise information submitted with the application confirms that all relevant criteria are met, that the existing facility operated until 22.00 and that the proposals result in a 'negligible' change in noise levels. Whilst it would be beneficial to monitor the potential impacts of the development for a year

(for the reasons given by Environmental Protection), it is not considered that any such impacts are likely to be of a severity to warrant a more restrictive condition in this case.

5. On this basis, a condition is recommended to allow the use of the facility and floodlights for the hours proposed by the applicant, as amended to require a finish at 20.00 hours on Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays and public holidays.

## FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

6. Since the publication of the committee report, further drainage information has been provided by the applicant. It is proposed that the drainage serving the pitch would be a network of perforated pipes through the sub-base of the pitch which allows the water to be distributed through the pitch sub-base which acts as attenuation. Flows which exceed the capacity of the perforated pipe network, or which back up from the flow control would be stored within the pitch sub-base and be released at the restricted rate. The pitch sub-base has been designed to accommodate the 1 in 100 year + climate change to a restricted greenfield runoff rate of 3.68l/s. All storage is provided within the pitch sub-base, and flows from lower magnitude event would also be stored in the same way, where attenuation is required. It is advised that there is no network which would flood, or surcharge during these events.
7. It is also noted that the wider site drainage has been surveyed and the proposed drainage system will connect into the existing system, where there are no pre-existing issues downstream of the AGP.
8. The Lead Local Flood Authority has confirmed that on the basis of the information submitted, the application is acceptable in terms of matters of flooding and drainage. A condition is recommended to require compliance with the submitted proposed drainage scheme.

## ECOLOGY

9. Comments have now been received from the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. These advise that no objections are raised to the application, noting that the affected habitats are not notable and providing the floodlighting operates as proposed. Recommended conditions will ensure that this is the case and as such, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

## **PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

10. As set out in the committee report, Officers acknowledge that there will be some degree of harm to the character of the area, given the location of the development next to certain natural landscape features. However, this harm is mitigated to a degree by the nature of the site within the grounds

of a school, the presence of an existing facility of a similar appearance immediately adjacent, the colour of the fencing and the distance of the facility to most public viewpoints. As such, this harm is considered to have limited weight in the determination of the application.

11. Given the comments of the Council's Environmental Protection service, Officers also acknowledge that there is the potential for limited harm to arise to residential amenity as a result of an increased degree of exposure to noise from both the existing and proposed AGPs in conjunction late into the evening during the week. It has been established that conditioning more restrictive hours would result in funding for the project not being forthcoming, and the scheme not being delivered; it is therefore not feasible for this harm to be mitigated by these means.
12. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of lighting issues, its highways impacts and with regard to all other material planning considerations.
13. There are substantial sporting benefits associated with the provision of this facility, as set out clearly within the submitted information and the consultation response from Sport England. The proposal would replace an existing natural turf playing field with a new outdoor facility meeting current Football Foundation standards; the site will be available for community use (a Community Use Agreement would be secured by condition), enabling more sport development to take place and local clubs and the local community to access the site for football activity. There is also an identified strategic need/community demand for the use of the site as a football hub.
14. On balance, the limited harm identified to the character of the area and the potential limited harm to residential amenity is considered to be sufficiently outweighed by the substantial sporting benefits of the scheme, and the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable. As such, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

## **CONDITIONS**

The following additional conditions are recommended:

1. *The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following submitted drainage information:*
  - Drainage Strategy (ref. McA006, produced by SSL, dated 16/11/22)
  - Drawing no. 06 Rev.00 – Proposed AGP Drainage Layout
  - Drawing no. 08 Rev.00 – Proposed AGP Drainage Strategy
  - Emails from Oliver Pennington, dated 26/01/22 and from Michael Eastman, dated 01/02/22 confirming survey details and proposed connection point for new drainage at MH2.



*Reason: To secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution, having regard to Policy L5 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

2. *The Artificial Grass Pitch and associated floodlighting shall not be used outside of the following times:*

*During school term:*

*08.00 – 22.00 Monday to Friday*

*08.30 – 20.00 Saturday, Sunday, bank holidays and public holidays*

*During school holidays:*

*09.00 – 22.00 Monday to Friday*

*08.30 – 20.00 Saturday, Sunday, bank holidays and public holidays*

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

**Page 144                      109828/HHA/22: 19 Ashford, Sale**

**SPEAKER(S)              AGAINST:                      Mamdouh Asher  
(Neighbour)  
Statement to read out**

**FOR:**

### **NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATION**

A further joint representation has been received from neighbours on Elmwood and Ashford and is summarised below:

The application should be refused for the following reasons:

- Proposal is disproportionate to original dwelling and would be out of keeping with the spacious character of the area and result in loss of sense of openness and loss of light, contrary to Policy L7.
- Should be noted the existing property was granted permission for a utility room and store room which is not a habitable space. The extension has since been remodelled to provide living accommodation allowing the former living room to become a bedroom.
- Not significantly reduced in scale as stated in officer report.

- Conversion of garage means no longer a 'linked-detached' which causes a loss of amenity and visually creates terracing.
- Being over half the width of the property fails to reflect guidance/policy and doesn't address scale- particularly at the rear as the rear elevation is flat
- Justification given for the increased width is that the property is wider, this is only the case due to previous extensions.
- The previous extension and the existence of a car port and garage shouldn't provide justification for the increased width of the first floor extension.
- Disagrees the scheme would have an acceptable appearance.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

The main report assesses all points raised within these objections. Notwithstanding the objectors' comments regarding previous extensions, the application property has a larger plot than other surrounding properties and it is considered that this allows the proposed extension to be accommodated without unacceptable impacts in terms of design or amenity.

### **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**