

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 26th September 2024

ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against	For
112429	Woodlands United Reformed Church, Woodlands Parkway Timperley, WA15 7QT	Timperley Central	1	✓	✓
113094	Islamic Cultural Centre Grove Lane, Hale, WA15 8JG	Hale	23	✓	
113464	Altrincham College Green Lane, Timperley, WA15 8QW	Hale Barns & Timperley South	43		
113920	5 Ridge Avenue, Hale Barns, WA15 0AY	Hale Barns & Timperley South	71	✓	
114161	25 Barnfield Crescent Sale, M33 6WJ	Ashton Upon Mersey	83		

Highways and Parking

2. The residents/action group submitted 4 documents in July, which included a critical review of the transport survey by an engineer, a second review of the transport survey conducted by the action group, a detailed review of the travel plan and a review of the amended site plan. The LHA have reviewed the responses received by the United Reform Church Steering Group.
3. The LHA note that they similarly have concerns surrounding the parking survey methodology used which was not in compliance with the Lambeth Method as stated in the officer report and is not deemed to provide a true reflection of the current level of parking demand. Nonetheless, and as also previously commented upon, they also accept that the planning application does not seek to change the Use Class of the existing site. The independent review, whilst detailed, fails to take account of this and the associated planning implications (or rather, a lack of).
4. The existing site comprises a large hard landscaped area to the rear of the building which is used as a car parking area. The forecourt area to the front of the building is similarly used, with mapping images suggesting that vehicles parked in an arrangement similar to that now presented by the proposed parking layout, thus the proposal to provide four parking spaces to the front of the building is no different to previous parking practices. The existing access and egress arrangements to the rear parking area also remain unchanged, albeit the application, if approved, would result in the provision of front and rear pedestrian entrance points meaning that anyone using the rear car park will not need to walk around to the front of the building to gain entry. Measured off plan the proposed car parking spaces achieve the minimum size requirements and unlike the existing site, the proposal would also provide accessibility parking spaces and bicycle parking. In regards to SPD3 parking standards the proposed development would require 102 spaces in comparison to the existing site which requires 93, with the proposals looking to provide a level of parking in keeping with that already available, although this is not currently demarcated.
5. Based on other similar places of worship located within the Borough, the LHA do not disagree that the proposed development may result in an intensified use of the site and an increase in the number of people driving there, including in the evening and early morning, seven days a week, and whilst they also share concerns that the demand for on street parking could increase, it is concluded that an LHA objection on highways grounds cannot be justified given that the proposals do not also seek to change the Use Class . The building is and it will remain a place of

worship and planning permission is not required to accommodate a change in the user/owner/lessee of the building.

Response to submitted question

6. The received question states they consider the basis on which issues of noise-nuisance, highway-traffic and parking were assessed were based on an assumption that the small increase in floorspace proposed at the building would equally lead to only a small increase in the number of attendees. This assumption is not based on any actual attendance figures. It asks whether the applicant was asked to give some accurate figures for the numbers of people attending the centre. In response, it is important to note that although there is to be a change in occupier of the building and faith group practicing at the place of worship, the use of the building in regards to planning use class is not changing. The assessment of the impacts of the proposal can therefore only be based on the increase in floorspace i.e. the development for which planning permission is sought and is a matter of planning judgement.
7. As detailed within the committee report paragraphs 19 and 38 the use of the building by a new faith group could already take place without planning permission and officers are mindful of this in their assessment. The application being considered relates to the extension and alteration of the building along with changes to the landscaping and car parking. The assessment has not been taken on existing and proposed attendees because this will be changeable and not necessarily directly related to the extension. Projected numbers of those expecting to attend was not considered to assist consideration of the proposals; nor could it be restricted through a planning condition given that there is currently no restriction on the existing number of people that could attend, furthermore such a condition would not be enforceable.
8. Whilst officers appreciate the concerns raised by local residents in regards to noise and parking, this assessment relates to the development proposed, which does not include a material change in the use of the building.

CONDITIONS

The recommendation to approve and conditions outline within the committee report remain unchanged.

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:** Damien Bourke
(Neighbour)

FOR:

REPRESENTATIONS

An additional objection has been received from no. 56 Grove Lane since publication of the committee report. The main concerns from this representation are summarised below.

- *Existing traffic congestion/safety concerns would be worsened by the expansion of the mosque facilities*
- *Fire safety risk to Mosque users from the current situation and with an extension*
- *Noise disturbance from late night and early morning worship*
- *Parking and accessibility issues from visitors to the site*
- *Urge the Council to reconsider the extension and suggest relocation of the Mosque instead*
- *Invite Council members to experience the conditions faced*

OBSERVATIONS

The highways and noise concerns raised within the additional objection letter are considered to have been addressed in the Committee report. Regarding relocation of the Mosque, this has been considered in the past, but the community has not been able to secure an alternative site.

Fire safety and capacity issues are not a matter specifically controlled by Planning for this application. The site will need to operate in accordance with all other relevant regulations and Members should assume that these regulatory regimes will operate as they should.

CONDITIONS

The recommendation to approve is unchanged.

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:** Nicola Leach
(Neighbour)
Councillor Nathan Evans
(Ward Councillor)

FOR:

CONSULTATION

Environmental Health (Nuisance): The EHO have provided additional comments confirming their support of conditions for an Operational Management Plan and Maximum occupancy Levels.

REPRESENTATIONS

Nine further letters of objection have been received from local residents 6 of which are from addresses which had not previously submitted recommendations. A letter was also received from the local MPs office which reiterates the fact neighbours have concerns on the suitability of the location, the consultation process and requesting the decision be deferred.

OBSERVATIONS

The content of the objections which is considered to be material, relating to amenity of local residents, amenity of future occupants and highway safety, is considered to already been addressed in the Committee report.

CONDITIONS

The recommendation to approve is unchanged.

Page 83 **114161/HHA/24: 25 Barnfield Crescent, Sale.**

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:**

FOR:

PLANS

Further to the publication of the Committee report, officers noted a discrepancy in the proposed floorplans. Specifically, the proposed first floor plan showed the planned extension set further away from the shared boundary with No.27 Barnfield Crescent than what was being shown on the proposed ground floor and elevation plans. The agent has since submitted a revised plan to correct this discrepancy.

The wording of Condition 2 is proposed to be revised accordingly:

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers SLW/IM/02/PA; (received by the Local Planning Authority on 24 September, 2024) SLW/IM/04/PA; (received by the Local Planning Authority on August 5, 2024) and the submitted location plan (received by the Local Planning Authority on August 9, 2024).

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation to grant is unchanged.

AGENDA ITEM 7: 273 DAVYHULME ROAD, DAVYHULME, M41 8GA:

MAKING OF IMMEDIATE ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION TO REMOVE PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THE BUILDING.

Correspondence has been received from the owners of Jawbone Cottage setting out the personal circumstances which had led them to buy the property. They wish to demolish the cottage and build a replacement dwelling on the site together with another property, subject to planning permission, after longstanding (and well known to the Planning Service) neighbour issues had meant they felt that they needed to move.

They have asked officers to confirm what can be done with the property as their advisors say it is beyond satisfactory repair.

Officers will make contact with the owners to discuss their options. The Article 4 Direction is not a complete bar to demolition of the property but means that planning permission will be required. This means that officers have the ability to properly consider the condition of the property and its heritage interest as part of an overall planning balance in any future scheme. This scheme would be brought to the Committee. It should be noted that the whole of the site is allocated as Protected Open Space which will also need to be addressed in any future planning submission.

FROM THIS POINT ON REFER TO ORIGINAL AGENDA ORDER UNLESS INDICATED BY THE CHAIR

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